

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Ali Sapirman <ali@housingactioncoalition.org>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 1:19 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Please support the Redwood LIFE Evolve Plan without delay!
Attachments: letter_report_266631_20230424_1955.csv; HAC Redwood LIFE_ Evolve Housing Plan Letter.pdf

Dear Redwood City Council and staff,

I am writing on behalf of The Housing Action Coalition with our enthusiastic support for the Redwood LIFE Evolve plan. I have attached our formal letter of endorsement, as well as 7 community member letters of support. Please move this project forward without delay!

In solidarity,

Ali

--

Ali Sapirman | Pronouns: They/Them

South Bay & Peninsula Organizer | Housing Action Coalition
50 Otis St, San Francisco, CA 94103

Cell: (407) 739-8818 | Email: ali@housingactioncoalition.org



To opt out of all HAC emails, respond to this email with "unsubscribe all".

Timestamp	First name	Last name	Email	Address	City	State/Prov	Stat	ZIP code	Count	Language	Mobile Number	Mobile Opt	Source	Referer	Target	Nan	Target Stat	Target Dist	Target OCC	Letter Subj	Letter Body
2023-04-15	thalia	lubin	thalia@tha	11 Palm Cir	Woodside	California	CA	94062	US	en			0 e1		Ali Sapirma	CA			ocd-divisio	Affordable	I support
2023-04-15	Michael	Szeto	michael.szeto@gmail.c	Redwood C	Redwood C	California	CA	94063	US	en			0 e1		Ali Sapirma	CA			ocd-divisio	Downtown	I write in
2023-04-20	Ingrid	Jimenez	ingrid@housingactionc	South San I	South San I	California	CA	94015	US	en	16502717452		0 e1		Ali Sapirma	CA			ocd-divisio	In support	I write in
2023-04-20	Joseph	Vandenort	joseph.vandenorth@g	Woodside	Woodside	California	CA	94062	US	en			0 e1		Ali Sapirma	CA			ocd-divisio	Please supp	I write in
2023-04-21	Tina	Wong	tina@tinacwong.com	South San I	South San I	California	CA	94066	US	en			0 e1		Ali Sapirma	CA			ocd-divisio	Pls support	I write in
2023-04-24	Michelle	Clapham	mclapham	528 Hazel /	San Bruno	California	CA	94066	US	en	18598064003		0 e1		Ali Sapirma	CA			ocd-divisio	Support for	I write in
2023-04-24	Jess	Hudson	Hello.jess.hudson@gm	Millbrae	Millbrae	California	CA	94030	US	en			0 e1		Ali Sapirma	CA			ocd-divisio	Please sup	I write in



50 Otis Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 541.9001
info@housingactioncoalition.org
housingactioncoalition.org

April 6th, 2023

To whom it may concern,

On behalf of the Housing Action Coalition, we're pleased to share our support of the proposed Redwood LIFE plan due to the project's significant investment in affordable housing in Redwood City.

The Housing Action Coalition (HAC) is a member-funded non-profit organization whose mission is to advocate for more housing for residents of all income levels across the state of California. To that end, HAC does everything we can to help increase the amount of funding available for affordable housing. While it is not in HAC's mission to support non-housing projects, the number of new homes that will be generated from the Redwood LIFE plan presents a significant opportunity to bolster Redwood City's affordable housing supply.

The biggest issue cities face when it comes to producing subsidized affordable housing is the lack of financial resources. Longfellow's commitment of \$85 million, well beyond the required amount for affordable housing in Redwood City, will make a considerable impact on the community and surrounding area. Based on our experience and conversations with affordable builders, we believe that funding could result in 850 new subsidized affordable homes at no cost to taxpayers.

We look forward to working with Longfellow and other HAC members to ensure that the funding becomes available and leveraged as soon as possible so these homes can get built. For that reason, we respectfully request the City Council direct staff to allow the project to move forward and begin its CEQA review.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Corey Smith", written over a light blue horizontal line.

Corey Smith, *Executive Director*
Housing Action Coalition (HAC)

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Andrea Osgood <aosgood@edenhousing.org>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 2:52 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Council Meeting 4/24 Item 8A
Attachments: Eden_Letter_Longfellow_042423.pdf

You don't often get email from aosgood@edenhousing.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Please see attached letter. Thank you,

Andrea Osgood (she, her, hers)
Senior Vice President of Development

22645 Grand Street Hayward, CA 94541

Office 510-247-8103 |

aosgood@edenhousing.org | edenhousing.org



Eden Housing creates and sustains high-quality affordable housing communities that advance equity and opportunity for all.



April 24, 2023

Honorable Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

On behalf of Eden Housing, which has been building affordable housing in the Bay Area for 55 years, we're writing to express support for the Redwood LIFE Evolve project submitted by Longfellow Real Estate Partners. Their proposal to modernize an aging office park will bring numerous community benefits Redwood City, including a commitment to make a significant investment in affordable housing as part of this development.

Eden Housing is proud to partner with Longfellow on a strategy to take their significant financial contribution – \$85 million – to support affordable housing development for the Redwood City community. Given the tremendous need for affordable housing, we appreciate a commercial developer willing to commit to a framework for its contributions years before its approvals. Eden has drafted a preliminary pro forma demonstrating how approximately \$10 million of their contribution could be leveraged to produce 100 affordable one- to three-bedroom units for low, very low, and extremely low-income families. Using current underwriting standards, this initial analysis indicates that Longfellow's proposed \$85 million contribution could generate as many as 850 affordable units in Redwood City.

Given Longfellow's commitment to make this significant investment in affordable housing (above City required levels) – along with the other proposed community benefits such as parks and open space, childcare, and sea level rise improvements – we encourage the City Council to start the environmental analysis to better understand the proposed development.

The mechanisms that we have historically used to produce affordable housing have shifted significantly in recent years and these kind of creative partnerships with commercial developers are an important replacement strategy to continue producing the housing that is desperately needed in the communities we serve.

22645 Grand Street | Hayward, CA 94541 | Tel: 510-582-1460 | edenhousing.org



Broker License No. 872400





Thank you for your consideration and leadership on building housing for families and individuals at all income levels in your community.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "A. Osgood", is positioned below the word "Sincerely,".

Andrea Osgood
Senior Vice President of Real Estate Development
Eden Housing





50 Otis Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 541.9001
info@housingactioncoalition.org
housingactioncoalition.org

April 6th, 2023

To whom it may concern,

On behalf of the Housing Action Coalition, we're pleased to share our support of the proposed Redwood LIFE plan due to the project's significant investment in affordable housing in Redwood City.

The Housing Action Coalition (HAC) is a member-funded non-profit organization whose mission is to advocate for more housing for residents of all income levels across the state of California. To that end, HAC does everything we can to help increase the amount of funding available for affordable housing. While it is not in HAC's mission to support non-housing projects, the number of new homes that will be generated from the Redwood LIFE plan presents a significant opportunity to bolster Redwood City's affordable housing supply.

The biggest issue cities face when it comes to producing subsidized affordable housing is the lack of financial resources. Longfellow's commitment of \$85 million, well beyond the required amount for affordable housing in Redwood City, will make a considerable impact on the community and surrounding area. Based on our experience and conversations with affordable builders, we believe that funding could result in 850 new subsidized affordable homes at no cost to taxpayers.

We look forward to working with Longfellow and other HAC members to ensure that the funding becomes available and leveraged as soon as possible so these homes can get built. For that reason, we respectfully request the City Council direct staff to allow the project to move forward and begin its CEQA review.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Corey Smith".

Corey Smith, *Executive Director*
Housing Action Coalition (HAC)

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Kristen Anderson <dr.kristenanderson@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 3:01 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: Christine Padilla
Subject: Item: 8.A. Study Session of the Redwood Life Research and Development (Life Sciences Office and Laboratory) Proposal at 800 – 3400 Bridge Parkway

You don't often get email from dr.kristenanderson@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Honorable Mayor Gee and City Councilmembers:

As Redwood City's long-time, past Child Care Coordinator, currently on Build Up for San Mateo County's Children planning team, I'm writing to express support for the Redwood LIFE Evolve proposal submitted by Longfellow Real Estate Partners. While it is still early in the process, Longfellow has committed to providing \$2 million to support Build Up San Mateo County, our child care facilities initiative. Should the project move forward with this commitment, I hope to participate in further research and discussion of the various potential uses of these funds to support both immediate and longer-term child care needs to benefit residents and workers in Redwood Shores and the broader community.

I respectfully encourage the Council to direct staff to further study the project and allow the environmental review to move forward. Thank you for your consideration and your service to our City.

**Sincerely,
Kristen**

**Kristen Anderson
Child Care Planning and Policy Consultant
Redwood City**

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Steve Tremulis <autogx@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 2:55 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan!

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

Please *preserve* the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan is thoughtfully designed to balance the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life.

There is plenty of land nearer the freeway that is more appropriate for this type of industry, and there is no need to have such massive structures in a residential neighborhood. There are plenty of smaller buildings near the freeway that could be redeveloped rather than bringing the associated biological and chemical hazards well into a residential neighborhood.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive buildings, roughly twice as tall as the current ones, built on a hilltop and looming over the residents below.
- Greatly increased industrial noise and light pollution in a residential neighborhood.
- Biosafety level 3 infectious agents and toxins in a residential neighborhood.

Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, a fine library, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents that could leak.

A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people living nearby. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to ***preserve* the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.** Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Steve Tremulis
261 Monaco Drive
Redwood Shores

MGR-Crystal Tuifua


From: Billy James <billyjamespr2002@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 11:34 AM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Tonight's study session on Longfellow plan

You don't often get email from billyjamespr2002@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear friends:

Have you seen this?

[California Overhauls Its Sea Level Rise Plan as Climate Change Reshapes Coastal Life | KQED](#)



California Overhauls Its Sea Level Rise Plan as Climate Change Reshapes ...

The state estimates that adapting all 400 miles of the bay shoreline will cost \$110 billion by 2050.

Billy James 650-366-1017

—o
- \ < -
(*) / (*)

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Sarah Kinahan <skinahan@smcoe.org>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 11:14 AM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Comment on Item 8A

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Redwood City Council Members,

I am writing in regard to Item 8A, Study Session of the Redwood Life Research and Development Proposal, on tonight's Council meeting agenda.

I would like to express support for the inclusion of funding for child care as a proposed community benefit in this project. An adequate supply of child care is critical to the economic vitality of Redwood City. Currently, the City has a shortage of close of 2,400 child care spaces for children ages 0-12. In particular, there is a need for more infant-toddler child care – only 40% of the demand for care for this age group is currently being met in the City.

Thank you for your consideration of Redwood Life's proposal. I commend them for including funding for child care as a proposed community benefit.

Sincerely,
Sarah Kinahan



Sarah Kinahan
(she, her)
Coordinator, Child Care Partnership Council

650.802.5647 - Phone
650-802-5622 - Fax
skinahan@smcoe.org

101 Twin Dolphin Drive
Redwood City, CA 94065
www.smcoe.org

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Amy Buckmaster <amy@chambersmc.org>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 10:11 AM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Alex Khojikian; MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto
Subject: Item 8A - Study Session Comments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Honorable Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council
City of Redwood City
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063

Dear Mayor Gee, Vice Mayor Espinoza-Garnica and members of the City Council,

On behalf of the Board of Directors of Chamber San Mateo County, I am writing to express our support for the City Council to direct staff to initiate the CEQA process for the Redwood LIFE Evolve proposal submitted by Longfellow Real Estate Partners. A project proposal which conforms with and respects Redwood City's general plan and is zoning compliant.

Our Board of Directors has thoroughly reviewed the plans and given it a Conceptual Endorsement based on the economic development benefits of modernizing an outdated office park into a 21st Century life science campus, the extraordinary potential for public benefits like affordable housing, childcare, parks, sea level rise protection, decarbonization, and transportation improvements from impact fees, developer community benefits, and new annual increases in property tax funding for the City's budget.

In addition to initiating the CEQA process to fully understand how Longfellow's proposal may or may not impact Redwood Shores, it is equally important to cease any reliance on the Westport Specific Plan and data last analyzed in 1995. City staff, city commissions, and the City Council need to evaluate Longfellow's proposal on the most up-to-date information possible – not be limited by an outdated specific plan last contemplated when I was in college.

The ability to make data-driven decisions should be the City's top priority, and collecting the data does not limit this or any future city council from saying "yes" or "no" to the proposal. It simply ensures better decisions will be made using data evaluated now versus data from 1995.

I would also like to dispel any notion or hyperbole associated with a limited number of voices claiming that Longfellow has not engaged the Redwood Shores community. Longfellow has in fact engaged in sustained, transparent, and varied community engagement activities since they acquired the office park. As with any transformational proposal, the loudest voices must be heard but not assumed to be representative of all voices. I am also a resident of Redwood Shores and I speak to other Shores residents regularly who value the positive impact this project could have on the quality of life for Shores residents and property owners.

Given the project's potential to make positive, lasting changes to our community, we ask that the City Council allow the project to advance and undergo environmental study.

Kind regards,
Amy Buckmaster

--

Amy Buckmaster (she/her/hers)
President & CEO

Chamber San Mateo County

Office: [650-364-1722](tel:650-364-1722) | Fax: [650-364-1729](tel:650-364-1729)

Learn more about our Chamber at:



MGR-Crystal Tuifua

Subject: FW: Support for Redwood LIFE Evolve plan

From: Michelle Clapham <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 10:31 AM

To: Council-Jeff Gee <jgee@redwoodcity.org>

Subject: Support for Redwood LIFE Evolve plan

You don't often get email from info@email.actionnetwork.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Mayor Jeff Gee,

I write in strong support of the Redwood LIFE Evolve plan. Redwood City and the rest of the Bay Area have a severe housing shortage, displacement, and affordability crisis. To alleviate our region's housing problem, more affordable homes for various income levels must be built. Unfortunately, one of the biggest barriers to affordable housing is funding, and it is critical we produce innovative solutions to build affordable new homes.

Some of the benefits of the Redwood LIFE Evolve plan include:

Investment for affordable new homes: The biggest issue cities face when it comes to producing subsidized affordable housing is the lack of financial resources. Longfellow's commitment of \$85 million, well beyond the required amount for affordable housing in Redwood City, will make a considerable positive impact on the surrounding community. Longfellow has partnered with Eden Housing, a well-known affordable housing producer, to identify potential target projects to fund. Eden Housing estimates that approximately \$10 million of Longfellow's contribution could be leveraged to produce 100 affordable one- to three-bedroom units for extremely low and very low-income families. Based on these calculations, Longfellow's proposed \$85 million contribution could generate as many as 850 affordable units in Redwood City.

Environmental sustainability and open space: The Redwood LIFE Evolve project will transform acres of surface parking into parks with expansive green, publicly accessible open spaces, as well as make visual and scenic enhancements to the San Francisco Bay Trail. The Redwood LIFE Evolve project will update its outdated office park into a modern campus designed to meet LEED Gold Standards. It will also accelerate critical sustainability initiatives for Redwood City, including the City's Climate Action Plan and resiliency goals. This includes transforming

Redwood LIFE Evolve into a 100% electric life science campus and eliminating the use of natural gas on-site, drastically reducing carbon emissions.

Creating childcare access: Beyond the housing shortage, we also have a significant childcare shortage. Infant and early childhood care have been shown to deliver tremendous benefits for communities, families, and children. However, according to a 2022 needs assessment conducted by the San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council, Redwood City lacks the resources to fill 1,103 subsidized spaces for children 0 to 4 years old because of a lack of funding. Longfellow has committed to providing \$2 million to BuildUp San Mateo to support their grant program, which directs resources to the most urgent childcare needs in Redwood City, such as subsidizing low-income infant child care and supporting teacher recruitment and retention.

Please support the Redwood Life Evolve plan without delay!

Michelle Clapham

mclapham10@gmail.com

528 Hazel Avenue,

San Bruno, California 94066

Redwood Life Project Plan Community Response

July 26th, 2022

Greetings Mr. Kuchenig,

Thank you for the time, care, and attention you continue to provide in response to our questions and concerns. We have prepared the following document in response to “rwl_-_planning_application_-_06-07-2022.pdf,” the applicant’s Project Narrative, and associated Documents on the city’s website relevant to the Redwood LIFE development application. The project plan (PP) is accessible at this link:

http://webgis.redwoodcity.org/community/documents/projects/phed/113/rwl_-_planning_application_-_06-07-2022.pdf.

According to these documents, the project plan (hereafter: “PP”) proposes to redevelop the Bayshore Technology Park, sited on the Westport landfill and consisting of four parcels: Parcel A (APN: 095-012-220), Parcel B (APN: 095-012-450), Parcel C (APN: 095-012-460), and Parcel D (APN: 095-012-150). The PP further proposes to increase the development space from 967,680 square feet to 3,316,970 square feet by unspecified phased development.

Please note that all comments are intended to be provided to the various agencies responsible for reviewing the project plan and responding to community issues and concerns. Additionally, the language in this document is generated from language in the PP and our independent research. Therefore, terminology used may not conform with the terms or language in the various agencies' rules and guidelines.

We thank the responsible agencies and individuals for their efforts and sincere desire to keep our Redwood Shores bayfront community thriving and a great place to live.

Sincerely,

Steven and Nina Goodale,

Property owners residing at The Boardwalk HOA in Redwood Shores, California

cc:

Sierra Club Loma Prieta Sustainable Land Use Committee (SLU) - Gita Dev, Co-Chair

Sierra Club Loma Prieta Sustainable Land Use Committee (SLU) - Gladwyn d'Souza, Co-Chair

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) - Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) - R. Zachary Wasserman, Chair

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) - Dave Pine, Chair at Large

OneShoreline - Board

Table of Contents

Terminology	3
Document Format	3
General Comments	4
Access to Files	4
Bio Retention	5
Bird Safety	5
Biosafety Levels (BSL)	5
Data Sheet (PP) Errors and Omissions	6
Drainage	6
Easement	7
Elevations	7
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	7
Fill	7
Fire	7
Flight Paths	8
G1 Parking Garage	8
Grade	8
Heights	9
Hotel	9
Landfill	9
Landscape	9
Leachate	10
Levee	10
Light and Light Pollution	10
Methane	11
Noise	11
Parcel Maps Incomplete & Inconsistent	11
Parking	12

Phases	12
Proximity	13
Sea and Ground Water Level Inconsistently Represented	13
Sea and Ground Water Level Rise	13
Sections	14
Shade	14
Traffic	19
Congestion	19
Trails	19
Utilities	20
Westport Municipal Landfill	20
Westport Specific Plan	20
Wind Borne Effects	22

Terminology

Project Plan (PP)
 Biosafety Level (BSL)
 Floor Area Ratio (FAR)
 Sierra Club Loma Prieta Sustainable Land Use Committee (SLU)
 San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)

Document Format

When appropriate, the corresponding page numbers in the PP are provided.
 Header Topics are listed alphabetically and the body text format is:

Topic

Related page(s) in the plan:

Related point #1

Related point #2

Continued...

General Comments

Related page(s): N/A

The Westport Specific Plan, dated December 9, 1994, established guidelines that repeatedly stated its intent “to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.” The surrounding neighborhoods, while now denser and more established with the additions of the Redwood Shores Branch Library, Redwood Shores Elementary School, and housing developments along Marine Parkway and Shearwater, should still be the guiding principle for any plans at the site. In other words, the guidelines previously established are even more relevant today. Why, then, should the city permit the site to expand to over three times as large and thereby shrink the residential and bay ecosystem setbacks? We and other community members overwhelmingly believe that the Westport Specific Plan should stand.

Further, in our view, a significant PP omission occurs in the fact that the site is a closed, unlined municipal landfill, which requires regular monitoring and multi-jurisdictional regulatory compliance to ensure the safety of the workers on the site, the neighboring communities, and the sensitive bay ecosystem.

Additionally, the PP conspicuously omits the [City of Redwood City Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program NPDES Permit Requirements Checklist](#). It thereby fails to adequately address permanent stormwater pollution prevention measures, given Sea Level and Groundwater Rise projections, site-specific flood and other natural hazard vulnerabilities, and the project’s related significant environmental impacts thereon.

Another glaring inadequacy of the PP arises in its citing Development Standards that claim to be consistent with the city’s General Plan for Commercial Park zoning, yet it simultaneously references a nonexistent “Redwood LIFE Precise Plan” rezoning request. Moreover, other than describing the current Westport Specific Plan as “outdated,” the PP fails to justify a basis for a General Plan amendment that specifies why the proper functioning of the community requires the adoption of the Precise Plan rezoning as proposed. The PP therefore fails to comply with Redwood City Zoning Code Article 52.5A, which specifies as follows:

The request for initiation by an interested party **will be accompanied by materials supportive of the request and showing the nature of the requested Precise Plan or amendment. Submitted materials must be submitted to the Planning Director or designee and should include statements justifying why the proper functioning of the community requires the adoption or amendment of the Precise Plan as proposed**, and in the case of a requested amendment to the Precise Plan, why the amended Precise Plan is more suitable for the area than the existing Precise Plan [emphasis added].

The PP is further substantially incomplete and often misleading with terms or statements that are intentionally ambiguous or misleading. The Redwood City Planning Application Requirements, referenced at: <https://www.redwoodcity.org/home/showpublisheddocument/24746/637824141891870000> is a comprehensive list of required application materials; however, the majority of the information it requires is absent from the current PP. Consequently, we believe that the applicant should be instructed to resubmit a complete application that enables a level of review that complies with [Redwood City Zoning Ordinance, Article 41, et seq.](#)

Access to Files

Related page(s): N/A

Please share the 3D files for this development for public review.

The PP is composed mostly of images copy/pasted onto a PDF, which makes research, citing and searching difficult. Please provide a version of the PP where all text, including tables with numeric values, is formatted as text instead of an image.

Bio Retention

Related page(s): 44

A near and long term operation and maintenance plan for bio retention areas should be provided.

Bird Safety

Related page(s): N/A

Given the PP's site-specific, multi jurisdictional bayfront location that borders the Belmont Slough, and which also comprises migratory as well as endangered bird habitat, including the Ridgway's Rail, standards for Bird Safe Buildings and Dark Skies Lighting Design should be implemented, similar to other cities in our region with environmental resource conservation objectives, such as the city of Cupertino:

<https://www.cupertino.org/home/showpublisheddocument/29511/637601410052430000#:~:text=Bird%2Dsafe%20Solutions.and%20insect%20and%20rodent%20control>.

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/sf_planning/0-0-0-18643

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/cupertino/latest/cupertino_ca/0-0-0-96597#JD_19.102.010

Biosafety Levels (BSL)

Related page(s): 109,115,135

Redwood City, Zoning Ordinance, Article 47 - Planned Community Permits - 47.4 Findings, Section B. states: "The establishment, maintenance or operation of the use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use, or the property and improvements in the neighborhood, or the City." According to the publication, *Biosafety in Microbiological and Biomedical Laboratories*, <https://www.cdc.gov/labs/BMBL.html> BSL2, 3, and 4 labs would contain agents that could be detrimental to public health and safety. Accordingly, the PP should be required to confirm compliance with the following:

Labs are as far away as possible from both the Belmont Slough and residential properties.

Indicate minimum distance of lab buildings, with the more dangerous Biosafety labs levels 2 or higher (highly infectious diseases and Recombinant-DNA research), from residential zoning and from Bay edge wetland habitat.

Indicate whether buildings will be designated for biotechnology research or biopharmaceutical production or both.

Indicate whether labs will be "Dry" or "Wet."

Indicate if vivariums will be present and what biocontainment methods will be implemented.

Moreover, this PP would put concentrations of Bioscience labs beneath established flight plans for the San Carlos airport. For reference, per Sierra Club Biosafety Level Laboratories Guidelines 3-30-22, "San Francisco Airport and all area airports do not permit Levels 2, 3 and 4 labs within some Land Use Safety Compatibility Zones."

The Sierra Club has released a "Planning Review and Entitlements of Biotech Developments," which is an excellent reference guideline regarding Bioscience and BSL levels:

<https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/loma-prieta-chapter/conservelatters/Sierra%20Club%20Biosafety%20Level%20Laboratories%20Guidelines%203-30-22.pdf>

Data Sheet (PP) Errors and Omissions

Related page(s): 2

The PP indicates a phased development but does not mention that it is a speculative development that will seek a 25-year long development agreement, according to the applicant's statements at a community engagement meeting.

The PP indicates that, "The project will request an entitlements package and a Planned Community District zone as part of a..." but doesn't specify what they are requesting.

"Any Concessions or Waivers requested" and "Any Variances of Exceptions Requested" are not checked and are both marked N/A.

Drainage

Related page(s): 20, 44, 48

Fill will create a new steeper slope towards Peninsula Landing but runoff storm waters and leachate isn't addressed. Why is there no new bio retention directly protecting Peninsula Landing?

PP doesn't address the requirements of an impervious capped landfill.

The existing drainage ditch along the Boardwalk HOA is removed. What protects The Boardwalk from excess stormwaters?

The existing drainage ditch along Peninsula Landing is removed. What protects Peninsula Landing from excess stormwaters?

PP does not meet water board storm water standards, per

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/water_issues/programs/stormwater/construction_new.html

SWCP SECTION 2 OF 6:

i. Impervious area

- 1) Existing on-site impervious surface area (square feet)
- 2) New impervious surface area (square feet)
- 3) Replaced impervious surface area (square feet)
- 4) Net Impervious Area (square feet)
- 5) Total of new plus replaced impervious surface area (square feet)

When groundwater rises what effect will it have on the leachate system? Leachate systems are typically gravity fed and if the groundwater rises into the system it may cancel out the flow.

Easement

Related page(s): 18

The "Varies Public Service Easement for Sewer and Water Utilities (DN 99-090684)" has been removed.

Elevations

Related page(s): 94, 111

The landfill, the clay cap and perimeter cut-off wall, existing ground level, fill above cap, new ground heights, water table, ND88, and sea level and groundwater rise projections are either mostly or entirely missing from the side elevations.

Include minimum 2 sections through the landfill that go all the way through the landfill - N-S and E-W

PP height details fail to consistently match from page to page and elevation to elevation. The other N1 illustration states 138'

Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

Related page(s): 2, 14

There are no marinas in this area, this point is superficial and does not seem to contribute to a FAR bonus.

Fill

Related page(s): 172

A top down topography map of existing fill depths and fill composition is needed.

The PP does not indicate new fill locations, new fill depths, or new fill compositions.

Fire

Related page(s): 24, 27

The courtyard between N4, N6, and N10 would be the worst place to have a fire. There are no roads for fire trucks. This poses a detriment to the public health, safety, or welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use, or the property and improvements in the neighborhood, or the City.

Please indicate standpipe locations on the PP.

During emergencies labs require a hazmat response, the Redwood city fire department is responsible for responding to lab emergencies in both Redwood City and San Carlos. To date, San Carlos has added enough biotech development that they have placed a moratorium on new developments in its Northeast Area. The magnitude of the PP in the event of a hazmat or fire would additionally strain the Redwood City fire department.

Flight Paths

Related page(s): 2

The site is directly underneath the San Carlos Airport “Oracle Departure” flight path and at the near edge of the San Carlos airport “TPS 800 typical traffic pattern”. See image below.



San Carlos Airport Flight Paths

For reference, the San Francisco Airport has banned BSL2 through BSL4.

G1 Parking Garage

Related Page(s): 3, 157, 160, 169, 8, 62, 9, 50

The G1 building is not included in the plans but referenced in it and mislabeled in multiple locations in the plan. It may be the garage between N4 and N5 as sections of a low garage are in the elevations for both N4 and N5. As this is a large and sprawling structure it should be properly represented in the PP.

Grade

Related page(s): 172, 173, 174, 175

Topography of existing grade is needed. Older maps are not current due to settlement.

Some structures appear to be under existing grade, such as N5, which is up to one story below existing grade. The PP contradicts statements made by Longfellow representatives that none of the proposed buildings would be below grade. Moreover, given the proposed project's site-specific Sea Level rise vulnerabilities, the establishment or operation of below-grade structures increases the likelihood that the project may be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use, or the property and improvements in the neighborhood, or the City.

Heights

Related page(s): 125, 172, 173

Building heights are **consistently over 100' tall**, 3 to 4 times as tall as existing site buildings. N6, and presumably N11, would be 148 ft' tall. For reference, they would be taller than EVERYTHING else in Redwood Shores except the 4 tallest Oracle buildings.

Additionally, the added fill will increase the overall height elevation of the buildings. Respectively, N7 will actually be 138' tall, N13 will be 133' tall.

Hotel

Related page(s): 2, 3

Page 2 states a "104 key hotel" but the parking summary on page 3 lists "Hotel / 1 space per key / 280 spaces" which seems to indicate a 280 room hotel.

The city will generate no tax revenue until the hotel is built in the proposed final phase, estimated to be around the year 2050.

Landfill

Related page(s): 49, 172

Considering how important the clay cap and perimeter cut-off wall enveloping the landfill is to nearby human habitation, the environment, and site worker safety, a more comprehensive representation of the landfill cap is needed, including a structural survey of both the cap and connected perimeter cut-off wall.

Since the site is on a landfill, the site plan should specify where the landfill is on the site.

The PP should also include sections through the landfill that go all the way through the landfill, at least - N-S and E-W.

The PP fails to disclose that the site is a closed and monitored municipal landfill.

The sheet note states building piles **and foundations** breaking the landfill cap as necessary..." This seems to indicate that not only will the piles break the cap but the foundation that sits on the piles will do so as well. The PP should sufficiently specify a plan to maintain the containment features of the cap if the cap is broken.

Landscape

Related page(s): 2, 157, 166, 169

The summary states, "all trees to be removed" but the PG 163 Legend states there are "existing to be transplanted."

Please clearly define the landscape plan "sectors," as portions of the defined areas are missing. A map of the entire site with sectors clearly represented is necessary.

Trees and plants suitable for and preferred by native insect, animal and bird species should be selected.

There needs to be a plant pallet defined as these plans don't list specific plants or trees.

Native and local plants and trees should be prioritized.

The landscape plans should indicate the thickness of soil above the cap, given that the trees indicated on landscape plans need root space and the majority of the site must maintain the protective clay cap.

Leachate

Related page(s):

The leachate capture system is not represented in this plan.

The current leachate capture system should be represented as well as projections and plans for 2050 and 2070 sea level rise.

For reference, the included images show flooding at the parking lot at the intersection of Island Drive and Bridge Parkway on December 5th, 2021.



Levee

Related page(s): 172, 173

A 2:1 slope is very steep and is not what is recommended for this area in the face of sea level rise. An ecotone levee at 20:1 is recommended for our operational landscape unit #25 (Belmont-Redwood OLU)

<https://seachangesmc.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Belmont-OLU-Factsheet.pdf>

Light and Light Pollution

Related page(s):

Exterior lighting along the bay edge and lighting facing habitation should be shown in the PP.

Methane

Related page(s):

The methane capture system is not represented in this plan. The current methane capture system should be represented as well as projections and plans for 2050 and 2070.

Noise

Related page(s): 49

The construction method employed in placement of piles could create loud noises, reaching up to 120 decibels, affecting the environment and surrounding neighborhoods. Assurances that pile driving will utilize methods to insure absolute minimal noise and vibration impacts should be secured prior to approval.

The city of San Francisco commissioned a biosciences task force to study the appropriateness of bio science labs in the city. The report is here:

https://sfgov.org/sfc/biosciences/Modules/FinalBIOSCIENCE021505_3119.pdf?documentid=1824

On page 7, they address the added noise generated by bioscience labs, under Medium Bioscience Use:

“Research and development of biopharmaceutical products requires scaled up processes that create greater volumes of material for testing and proving compliance with regulatory requirements. Facilities and their environmental impacts are measured by the volume and type of material they produce. **Because increased volume increases noisy equipment, cooling towers, chillers, boilers, and air compressors, material handling is more intense in pilot production, and operations may require extra shifts to meet demands for development cycles, the use is less compatible with a mixed-use environment. A buffer zone from non-industrial uses may be appropriate.**”

The PP should be required to specify location on maps of noise creating equipment intended to support laboratories.

Parcel Maps Incomplete & Inconsistent

Page 9 of the PP Narrative document states under the heading, “ALIGNMENT WITH REDWOOD CITY GENERAL PLAN AND REQUESTED ENTITLEMENTS,” that, among multiple approval requests, the applicant will:

request that the City take the following actions to review and approve the project: prepare and certify an EIR pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); rezone the property to Planned Community District (P District); adopt a new Redwood LIFE: Evolve Precise Plan; approve Planned Community Permits for the initial phase(s) of construction (Longfellow will request approval of later phases based on evolving market conditions); **approve a Tentative Subdivision Map**; and enter into a Development Agreement [emphasis added].

Further, Page G1.01 of the PP Application, states under the heading, “Project Description”:

There are approximately 3.1 million square feet of research and development space (laboratory and office), a 104-key hotel and approximately 46,000 square feet of stand-alone amenity space **across five reconfigured parcels** [emphasis added].

Additionally, Page G1.01 of the PP notes under the heading, "Project Information," the four APNs that correspond with the current Parcel Map for which the applicant will seek the city's approval for a Tentative Subdivision Map. These APNs are listed as: APNs 095-012-220; 095-012-450; 095-012-460; 095-012-150. However, inconsistent with Page G1.01, which specifies the four APNs to be reconfigured, Page C1.04, titled "Existing Parcel Plan," fails to specify the four corresponding APNs to be reconfigured over five proposed parcels. Instead, this section indicates, "Parcel One (25.68 AC)" and "Parcel Two (58.60 AC)."

Accordingly, because it fails to provide the required Tentative Subdivision Map, PP, Page C1.04, titled "Existing Parcel Plan," does not comply with [City Code CHAPTER 30 - SUBDIVISIONS ARTICLE II. - PARCEL MAP CHAPTER 30 - SUBDIVISIONS](#).

Parking

Related page(s):

Any and all public parking needs to be labeled as such.

Phases

Related page(s): 3, 6

Neither the demolition nor construction phases of the PP specify any corresponding dates or duration. By contrast, in a recent meeting with the Sierra Club, Peter Fritz, the Redwood LIFE project applicant, specified a plan to request a twenty-five year development agreement from the city, which would notably also be subject to market conditions.

Furthermore, Page 9 of the PP Narrative document notes that, among the applicant's plan to seek multiple approval requests, the applicant will request that the city:

"...approve Planned Community Permits for the initial phase(s) of construction (Longfellow will request approval of later phases based on evolving market conditions) [emphasis added]."

The applicant should be required to specify the "evolving market conditions" upon which it may seek future approval requests.

Moreover, each phase should be described fully with any and all substantive steps clearly described and correlated to a timeline; steps such as demolition, tree removal, levee and grade changes to name a few.

To minimize impact on the residential neighborhoods, the applicant should be required to modify the phasing plan so that the furthest buildings from residential are built first and then build back towards the SW.

Specifically:

Phase 6 becomes phase 1

Phase 2 remains phase 2

Phase 3 remains phase 3

Phase 1 becomes phase 4

Phase 4 becomes phase 5

Phase 5 becomes phase 6

Phase 7 remains phase 7

The city will generate no taxes until the hotel is built in the final phase. Estimated to be around the year 2050.

Proximity

Related page(s): 6, 155

The PP reduces existing setbacks and moves the office park much closer to residential than current standards. The roads, paths and buildings shouldn't move closer than existing distances and should instead maintain consistent offsets.

Existing Distances:

3400 Bridge Parkway to The Boardwalk (residential), 238'

Center of nearest existing roadway to Boardwalk, 181'

Existing nearest walking path to Boardwalk, 60'

PP Distances:

N12 to Boardwalk 146'. This constitutes a loss of -92'

Longfellow Lane, center, to Boardwalk 118'. This constitutes a loss of -63'

New path to Boardwalk 28'. This constitutes a loss of -32'

N1 to Marine Parkway (roadway) 146'

Other Local Comparisons:

Closest Oracle Building to road 220'

"Uninterrupted Occupancy" are what wikipedia defines as "weasel words", words or statements that are intentionally ambiguous or misleading. This development will certainly interrupt the neighboring occupancy, as most if not all the habitable units at Boardwalk against the property connecting line have bedrooms, home offices, and the like, on the side of the property line.

Sea and Ground Water Level Inconsistently Represented

Related page(s): 172

This page seems to indicate Mean Low Water as the baseline. ND88 is a recognized and more practical baseline than projecting from the low water mark (MLW).

Accurate mapping of the existing water table is required. The water table shown on pg 172 is higher than MLW, which seems unlikely.

Projected water table needs to be accurately projected for the entire site. This should also be used to see where groundwater will infiltrate the landfill.

Sea and Ground Water Level Rise

Related page(s): 172

Either large portions of Bridge Parkway will need to rise or a robust series of pumps will be needed. Without lifting the road, as currently planned, a pumping plan is needed and financial assurances made that it is maintained. Otherwise the sidewalk, street, and sidewalk shown on pg 172 could be underwater once the groundwater rises with sea level rise.

For reference the included images show inundation and flooding at the parking lot at the intersection of Island Drive and Bridge Parkway December 5th, 2021.



Levees will not stop ground waters from rising behind them. Low permeability “young bay mud” still allows water to permeate through it, it just takes longer at approximately a foot a year.

0.000001	cm movement per second
31536000	seconds per year
31.536	cm per year
12.41574803	inches per year
1.034645669	ft per year

“underlying Bay Mud has relatively low permeability (less than 10^{-6} cm/s)”

https://www.marincounty.org/~media/files/departments/cd/planning/environmental-impact/redwoodlandfill/rl_fei_r1_001_111.pdf

Sections

Related page(s): 174

The landfill, the clay cap and retaining wall, existing ground level, fill above cap, new ground heights, water table, ND88, and sea level and groundwater rise projections are either mostly or entirely missing from the sections.


Include minimum 2 sections through the landfill that go all the way through the landfill - N-S and E-W

Shade


Related page(s):

Shadow studies showing shadow impacts upon the wetlands and surrounding neighborhoods need to be provided.


Using this web site, <http://shadowcalculator.eu/#/lat/50.08/lng/19.9>, the following images were generated for both the midsummer and midwinter dates showing significant shadows from the PP over both residential and the environment:




06-22-2022 6:09AM




06-22-2022 7:31PM




06-22-2022 8:22PM



12-22-2022 7:33AM



12-22-2022 4:25PM



12-22-2022 4:29PM

To replicate these images visit [HERE](#), copy and import the following text:

```
{
  "shapes": [
    {
      "coords": [
        {
          "lat": 37.53555775928875,
          "lng": -122.25540825119084
        },
        {
          "lat": 37.53590232046265,
          "lng": -122.25499519100255
        },
        {
          "lat": 37.53619158046579,
          "lng": -122.2553814291007
        },
        {
          "lat": 37.53579172075316,
          "lng": -122.25579985370702
        }
      ],
      "heights": [36.5, 36.5, 36.5, 36.5],
      "coords": [
        {
          "lat": 37.53731457925574,
          "lng": -122.25678154220647
        },
        {
          "lat": 37.53692323311245,
          "lng": -122.25628801574773
        },
        {
          "lat": 37.536599945618875,
          "lng": -122.2567332624442
        },
        {
          "lat": 37.53696577083622,
          "lng": -122.25722142448491
        }
      ],
      "heights": [36.5, 36.5, 36.5, 36.5],
      "coords": [
        {
          "lat": 37.53838226317955,
          "lng": -122.25523658981389
        },
        {
          "lat": 37.538024952333345,
          "lng": -122.254780614281
        }
      ]
    }
  ]
}
```

36}, {"lat":37.5383439799565,"lng":-122.2544104694373}, {"lat":37.53867576723664,"lng":-122.25483962287969}, {"heights":[36.5,36.5,32.5,36.5]}, {"coords":[{"lat":37.53746782082011,"lng":-122.25435094584222}, {"lat":37.53803782013969,"lng":-122.25373940218682}, {"lat":37.53756140309689,"lng":-122.25329951990838}, {"lat":37.53711901311738,"lng":-122.25386814821954}], {"heights":[32.5,32.5,32.5,36.5]}, {"coords":[{"lat":37.53534091922676,"lng":-122.25642161120172}, {"lat":37.53486448495373,"lng":-122.25696878184075}, {"lat":37.53457521980295,"lng":-122.25656108607049}, {"lat":37.53506867144346,"lng":-122.2560031865954}], {"heights":[36.5,36.5,36.5,36.5]}, {"coords":[{"lat":37.53543450417274,"lng":-122.2578056310534}, {"lat":37.53534942695398,"lng":-122.25693659533258}, {"lat":37.53472836031664,"lng":-122.25756959666009}, {"lat":37.53494956272573,"lng":-122.25811676729913}], {"heights":[36.5,33.5,36.5,36.5]}, {"coords":[{"lat":37.534217890714686,"lng":-122.25880341280694}, {"lat":37.53316290913148,"lng":-122.25903944720025}, {"lat":37.53316290913148,"lng":-122.25848154772515}, {"lat":37.534260429981636,"lng":-122.25842790354486}], {"heights":[36.5,36.5,36.5,36.5]}, {"coords":[{"lat":37.53806334239537,"lng":-122.25571350802178}, {"lat":37.537484835788256,"lng":-122.25644306887384}, {"lat":37.53712752064173,"lng":-122.25597100008721}, {"lat":37.53777408965285,"lng":-122.25520925272698}], {"heights":[36.5,36.5,36.5,36.5]}, {"coords":[{"lat":37.53967122689205,"lng":-122.25671128977532}, {"lat":37.53908422545929,"lng":-122.25762324084039}, {"lat":37.53879497667691,"lng":-122.25715117205377}, {"lat":37.539416009445624,"lng":-122.25633578051324}], {"heights":[36.5,36.5,36.5,36.5]}, {"coords":[{"lat":37.53870990329207,"lng":-122.25809530962701}, {"lat":37.53846318992719,"lng":-122.25854592074151}, {"lat":37.5376209553937,"lng":-122.2587604974627}, {"lat":37.5376209553937,"lng":-122.25819186915155}, {"lat":37.53814841651787,"lng":-122.25797729243035}, {"lat":37.53844617518227,"lng":-122.25756959666009}], {"heights":[36.5,36.5,36.5,36.5,26.5,36.5]}, {"coords":[{"lat":37.536344824337924,"lng":-122.25469426859613}, {"lat":37.53692333978927,"lng":-122.25399689425225}, {"lat":37.53731468593203,"lng":-122.25459770907159}, {"lat":37.536685128088145,"lng":-122.25531654108758}], {"heights":[33,26.5,26.5,26.5]}, {"coords":[{"lat":37.53560465831907,"lng":-122.25889997233148}, {"lat":37.534558204170914,"lng":-122.25894288767572}, {"lat":37.534558204170914,"lng":-122.25834207285638}, {"lat":37.53560465831907,"lng":-122.2583098863482}], {"heights":[33,33,33,33]}, {"coords":[{"lat":37.53652348400042,"lng":-122.25869612444635}, {"lat":37.53651497640715,"lng":-122.2576983426928}, {"lat":37.536880802041324,"lng":-122.25768761385675}, {"lat":37.53685527938088,"lng":-122.25869612444635}], {"heights":[20]}, {"coords":[{"lat":37.533707417618594,"lng":-122.25755886782403}, {"lat":37.53429446137773,"lng":-122.25684003580804}, {"lat":37.53459223543111,"lng":-122.25733356226678}, {"lat":37.53391160727631,"lng":-122.25797729243035}], {"heights":[20,36,20,20]}, {"coords":[{"lat":37.538982137781886,"lng":-122.25609974611993}, {"lat":37.53868438125772,"lng":-122.2564001535296}, {"lat":37.53819095354274,"lng":-122.25572423685784}, {"lat":37.538471697298185,"lng":-122.25539164294}], {"heights":[36,36,36,36]}, {"coords":[{"lat":37.53784214922261,"lng":-122.25745157946344}, {"lat":37.53734871593431,"lng":-122.25688295115228}, {"lat":37.537672000181686,"lng":-122.2564537977099}, {"lat":37.538156923924795,"lng":-122.25712971438165}], {"heights":[36,36,36,36]}], {"timestamp":1671755940000,"mapCenterLat":37.53816523684405,"mapCenterLng":-122.25101368548833}



Traffic

Related page(s): 2,7,28,50,172, 178

There is no traffic demand management plan (TDM).

The PP should additionally address traffic's effect on the landfill and its cap with sea level and groundwater rise projections, methane production, and leachate capture taken into consideration.

Place strategic prohibitions on large vehicle traffic such as prohibiting large vehicles (semi-trucks) on roadways (Longfellow Lane) nearest Peninsula Landing and The Boardwalk.

Move Longfellow Lane NW to maintain a (center of roadway) traffic setback of at least 180 feet to residential.

Redesign the roadways to minimize traffic, congestion, and headlights from vehicles brightly illuminating the surrounding neighborhoods. Consider design aspects like:

- From Island drive, make Longfellow Lane one-way both to the West and to the East.
- Make G2 and G3 Parking garages enter-only from Longfellow and move the auto exits facing away from habitation to minimize headlight light pollution on neighborhoods.
- Focus traffic so that the gateway entrance at the intersection of Marine Parkway and Island Drive is encouraged as the primary entrance to the complex.

Add a traffic light to the intersection at Marine Parkway and Island Drive.

Moving the road to be directly adjacent to the water will increase the pollutants, such as brake dust, introduced to the watershed by vehicles.

There needs to be a defined setback from the road to the berm / water. Require at least the existent distance from road to watershed. For reference, a sampling of current Bridge Parkway edge to Bay Trail edge yields an average of 78'.

Congestion

The site <https://webgis.redwoodcity.org/storymap/transportation-metrics/> shows that 75% of the workers in the Westport zone (Census Tract 6103.4) drive alone to work. The added worker population will impact traffic on surface streets as well as US 101.

Trails

Related page(s) 172, 173, 178

The walking / biking trail is moved to the landward side of the road and the road is moved closer to the water. This breaks and removes 1000' of the existing trail along the bay and forces pedestrian traffic to cross traffic 4 times (Bridge Parkway, Madrone Lane, Parking Garage entrance to N14, Bridge Parkway) to follow the trail. The break also stops access and violates the Varies Public Access Easement (B7860, P1947, B7859, P2166, B7859, P21190).

PG 172: Define how pedestrians will access the levee path. Stairs, a winding path? Also, define pedestrian access points on a topographic map.

PG 178 Why aren't these trails connected? The outer line is the Bay Trail and this map shows over a half mile of it disconnected and isolated.

Utilities

Related page(s): 2

50% of the sq ft is devoted to Office / R&D and 50% of the PP is devoted to Labs, 3,100,100 total.

Per City of Redwood City / ATTACHMENT Q1 Model (1)

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/home/showdocument?id=7715>

Pg XII-28: per day the offices / R & D would consume (0.13 gal per sqft) = 201,506.5

Pg XII-30: per day the labs would consume (0.21 gal per sqft) = 325,510.5

Water alone, plus whatever the hotel and landscaping would consume, is 527,017 gallons per day. 527,017 gallons is equivalent to nearly 40 standard size swimming pools being drained, every day. Can Redwood city provide these resources presently and in the future?

Westport Municipal Landfill

Related page(s): N/A

Redwood LIFE sits atop the closed Westport landfill. As it was closed in 1974, prior to California Code of Regulations Title 27, the bottom is unlined and sits directly on "young bay mud" which has low permeability but is not impermeable and does not seal the envelope. The waste that went into this dump/landfill was undifferentiated waste, unlike current day municipal waste landfills. In the past people sent their old lead acid car batteries, used motor oil, and old pesticides and chemicals. Businesses sent commercial wastes there, factories were still doing the same, etc. It is illogical to think of an old municipal dump or an old municipal landfill as benign and not as a potentially serious environmental health threat waiting to become realized.


Westport Specific Plan

Related page(s): N/A

The Westport Specific Plan, dated December 9, 1994 establishes the below guidelines (emphasis added) with the intent of lessening the impact on the surrounding neighborhoods. The surrounding neighborhoods, while now denser and more established with the additions of the Belmont Library, Redwood Shores Elementary School, and housing developments along Marine Parkway and Shearwater, should still be the guiding principle for any plans at the site. In other words, the guidelines previously established are still relevant, why should the site be allowed to expand to over three times as large and shrink the setbacks? The Westport Specific Plan should stand.

- PG3(14): "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments."
- PG3(14): "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings. Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

- PG3(14): “The project will not exceed 980,000 sq ft.”
- PG15(9): “Because the site is large, Westport is divided into three distinct corporate campuses, Zone 1, Zone 2, and Zone 3 (Figure 5). This division will allow each campus area to be constructed independently of the other campus areas as market demand dictates.”



Westport Specific Plan Figure 5

- PG20(14): “Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.”
- PG20(14): “The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are set back at least 260 feet from the southeasterly property line in order to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings. Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line.”
- PG27(22): “The pedestrian circulation should provide for attractive views and wandering pathways as well as maximum access to the Belmont Slough.”

Wind Borne Effects

Redwood Shores most common wind directions blow from the W / NW. Superimposing a windrose (using data from the San Carlos Airport) shows the prevailing August winds blowing directly over Redwood Shores:



Average August Windrose (superimposed)

Noise, construction dust / debris, and smell are carried on the wind. This graphic indicates neighborhoods with the highest wind borne disruption.

https://mesonet.agron.iastate.edu/sites/windrose.phtml?station=SQL&network=CA_ASOS



SIERRA CLUB

LOMA PRIETA CHAPTER

San Mateo, Santa Clara & San Benito Counties

August 2, 2022

Mr. Ryan Kuchenig, Principal Planner
Planning and Community Development
City of Redwood City
Via email: planning@redwoodcity.org; rkuchenig@redwoodcity.org

Redwood Life Bridge Parkway Pre-Application Submission

Dear Mr. Kuchenig,

On behalf of the Sierra Club, the Sustainable Land Use Committee of the Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter (SLU) advocates on land use issues in San Mateo, Santa Clara and San Benito Counties. We have been following this proposed development, have met with the development team and have the following comments on the adequacy of the preliminary submission.

Jobs/Housing: Since Redwood City is facing a housing crisis as well as an affordability crisis, each commercial development should be required to include information on how it plans to address the housing demand that it will create. We assume this will be raised as an issue during the project review period.

Our concerns about incompleteness of the submission fall into the following general categories:

1. Landfill information: The site is on an existing undifferentiated landfill that is monitored and that is projected to be pierced by piling, infiltrated by ground water and potentially submerged with sea level rise in the coming decades
2. Wetlands protection: The site is along a very rich wetland with existing wildlife including endangered species. Therefore, water quality issues and shading of wetlands by tall buildings are both of great concern. Information about the protection of the existing landfill and shadow studies from taller buildings should be included.
3. Bio-Safety Levels: The proposed development is titled as Life Sciences, with 50% of the sq ft devoted to Office / R&D and 50% is devoted to Labs. Bio-Safety levels for the labs need to be included in the submission. Biological and Biotech labs have four distinct safety levels. However, the submittal does not make clear what biosafety levels the labs in this development will be restricted to. This is critical information for the safety of the adjoining sensitive ecology of the slough as well as for adjoining residential developments since the soils in this area are subject to liquefaction.

4. Setback for a Levee Overlay Zone along the water edge: Given sea level rise, it is important for the City to ensure that there is sufficient setback along the water's edge - a Levee Overlay Zone - for all new construction, from the slough edges to allow the levees to grow higher, to account for sea level rise through this century, as well as to move the levees away from the water's edge to allow for a gentle sloping levee face facing towards the water to allow refuge for wildlife, and ecosystem migration space as sea levels rise.

1. Landfill

The site is a closed municipal landfill, with potential hazardous materials, which requires regular monitoring and multi-jurisdictional regulatory compliance to ensure the safety of the workers on the site, the neighboring communities, and the sensitive Bay ecosystem of Belmont Slough which supports several endangered species.

An existing topography survey needs to be included. The Site Plans need to include precise information on the edge and extent of the landfill in plan view and the Section drawings need to include the topography and profile of the landfill cap and containment wall in all sections. Older topographic maps may not be current due to settling of landfill. Sections through the site should clarify the profile of the landfill and its cap, the existing grade and the amount of additional fill being imported as surcharge over the existing grade.

The landfill does not have a base and is directly on Bay mud. As sea levels rise, ground waters will rise through the Bay mud into the landfill. Low permeability "young bay mud" still allows water to permeate through it.

The sections should include the sea level rise based on the most recent California Ocean Protection Council's projections¹ (updated 2022) for sea level rise.

2. Wetlands Protection

Penetration of the Landfill Cap: Drawings indicate that hundreds of piles will be required to support the structures. These penetrations will cause some release of materials within the landfill. Since this is an undifferentiated landfill, with unknown hazardous materials², piles driven through the landfill raise concerns that waste will be pulled through the clay layer or leaked to outside by piling and will potentially contaminate groundwater and waters of Belmont Slough and the Bay.

Drawings should indicate the number of piles and the sections should clarify depth of penetration through the landfill as well as how release of landfill materials will be contained to prevent them from polluting the groundwater.

Settlement of soils: Sections indicate a significant surcharge of new soil over existing grades.

Drawings need to indicate existing topography and proposed final grades to determine accurately the surcharge on the existing grade and anticipated additional settlement of the landfill over time.

¹ State of California Sea Level Rise Guidance, 2018 Update, page 25. Ocean Protection Council website: http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/agenda_items/20180314/Item3_Exhibit-A_OPC_SLR_Guidance-rd3.pdf

² Refrigerators, air conditioners, paints, pesticides, tires, chemical drums, batteries, household and industrial cleaners, used motor oil, discarded pharmaceutical drugs, etc.

Stormwater system: The Regional Water Quality Control Board has included the Westport Landfill in its recent list of landfills that are now required to upgrade their reporting system to include sea level rise information in their protocols. Storm water systems are already flooded at king tides indicating the storm systems are completely inadequate

Storm water collection systems need to include the information on anticipated settlement and containment of pollution from ground water rising through the landfill with sea level rise as well as a result of piles driven through the containment system.

Leachate and Methane: The leachate and methane capture system is not well represented. The current leachate and methane capture systems should be represented as well as plans for sea level rise.

Phasing, Noise and Disruption: It is our understanding that this is to be a market driven speculative development and the developer is seeking a 25-year long development agreement for phased construction allowing market demand to control construction periods. Construction, including periods with pile driving, phased over a 25-year period, will be disruptive to wildlife in Belmont Slough as well as to the adjoining residential neighborhoods. Wildlife takes time to adjust to environmental changes.

The phasing drawings should clarify the duration of time frames during which there will be construction disruptions during the anticipated 25-year period.

3. Biosafety Levels (BSL) & Industrial Zoning

Typically, biochemical and pharmaceutical labs are located only within Industrial zoning. Biotechnology labs have 4 levels of bio-safety. While bio-safety Level 1 has no major separation concerns and can sometimes be located in commercial office zoning, Bio-safety Levels 2 thru 4 require definite separation requirements especially from residential areas and from ecologically sensitive areas such as the Bay and wetlands.

If Biosafety Labs Level 2 are to be permitted in this speculative development, these buildings need to be as far away as possible from both the Belmont Slough and residential properties.

Drawings need to specify whether BSL Level 2 labs or higher are anticipated to be allowed in this development whether in new buildings or in existing buildings

Indicate minimum distance of lab buildings from Bay edge wetland habitat and from residential zoning. Biosafety labs levels 2 (highly infectious diseases and recombinant - DNA research) should be located in industrial zoning or, if allowed at this site, be a Conditional Use with separation requirements and Health and Safety procedures in place. Biosafety Levels 3 and 4 should not be permitted in an ecologically sensitive environment and in proximity to residential areas.

Indicate whether buildings will be designated for biotechnology research or bio-pharmaceutical production or both.

Indicate if animal research labs will be present and what biocontainment methods will be implemented.

Delivery routes to buildings that may include BSL Level 2 and higher need to be included in drawings for safety and containment of hazards.

Noise levels of required HVAC systems should be included in the pre-submittal drawings as noise levels are generally much higher than for normal office buildings given the need for special systems, positive pressure requirements and also for needed backup generator systems to ensure uninterrupted power for safety protocols.

The Sierra Club has released a “Planning Review and Entitlements of Biotech Developments,” as a reference for public agencies for Bio Safety levels:

<https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/loma-prieta-chapter/conservenletters/Sierra%20Club%20Biosafety%20Level%20Laboratories%20Guidelines%203-30-22.pdf>

4. Buildings: Setbacks, Shadows and Proximity to Bird Habitat

Setback for Flood Protection and Habitat Overlay Zone: A building setback from the Belmont Slough edge, for all new buildings, should ensure sufficient land area is available for flood protection levee designs that can be expanded over time as needed for sea level rise, without wetlands encroachment³. In addition to sufficient space for a flood protection “horizontal” levee, the building setback should create a terrestrial buffer to maintain the quality and function of the wetland, support existing wildlife, and support higher levels of wetland biodiversity. For these purposes, we recommend a flood protection and habitat overlay zone that includes a substantial building set back of minimum 100 feet and preferred 330 feet. ^{4 5}

We recommend requiring that the drawings clearly include a Levee Overlay Zone (LOZ) along the waters’ edge establishing a minimum 100’ setback to provide sufficient distance from the wetland edge for future increases to levee height. ⁶

³ State of California Sea Level Rise Guidance, 2018 Update, page 25. Ocean Protection Council website: http://www.opc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/agenda_items/20180314/Item3_Exhibit-A OPC SLR Guidance-rd3.pdf

⁴ [Wetland Basics, CalTrans](#): A typical wetland setback standard is 100 feet, but setbacks may be larger based on the resource of concern, such as presence of special-status species habitats or other considerations. The Coastal Act restricts development within wetland resources, and requires protection against significant disruption of habitat values. It also requires that areas adjacent to wetland resources be sited and designed to prevent degradation of those resources and to be compatible with the continuance of that habitat.

⁵ The Environmental Law Institute (2003) recommends a 100 m (~330 foot) width based on the synthesis of 156 studies of riparian and wetland terrestrial buffers. [Urban Ecology Technical study, Moffett Park Specific Plan 2020](#)

⁶ Burlingame’s sea level rise ordinance, approved in 2021, establishes a 100-foot setback with the levee located at the farthest distance from the bay edge, in order to allow space for a gentle sloped face towards the bay, and allowing for the levee to be raised over time.

Shadows -Habitat Protection and Building Heights: Building heights are **more than 100'**, to **about 150' tall**, Tall buildings should be located to minimize shadows on the wetlands⁷ in the Bay and on residential units. Sunlight (in terms of both quantity and quality of solar radiation) is needed for plant species to conduct photosynthesis, propagate and survive. Shadowing can affect photosynthesis, aquatic insect production and fish productivity.

To minimize shading of Bay habitat, the first 100 feet of building, beyond the LOZ boundary, should be no taller than 4 stories.

Bird Safety: Given the bayfront location that borders the Belmont Slough which includes wetlands providing resident, migratory as well as endangered bird habitat, standards for Bird Safe Buildings and Dark Skies Lighting Design should be employed in this submittal, similar to other cities in our region with environmental resource conservation objectives.

For building elevations, the Cities of Cupertino and San Francisco could be used as local resources to guide bird friendly building facade design and for interior as well as exterior lighting design for new buildings, remodeling of existing buildings and the site design, especially in proximity to the Slough.

<https://www.cupertino.org/home/showpublisheddocument/29511/637601410052430000#:~:text=Bird%2Dsafe%20Solutions,and%20insect%20and%20rodent%20control>.

https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/san_francisco/latest/sf_planning/0-0-0-18643

Respectfully submitted,



Gita Dev, Co-Chair
Sustainable Land Use Committee
Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter



Jennifer Hetterly
Bay Alive Campaign Coordinator
Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter

cc:

Gladwyn d'Souza, Conservation Chair, Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter

James Eggers, Executive Director, Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter

Len Materman, Executive Director, OneShoreline, San Mateo County; Len@oneshoreline.org

Alyx Karpowicz, SF Bay RWQCB, Alyx.Karpowicz@waterboards.ca.gov

⁷ Studies have shown the importance of sunlight to estuarine ecosystems and that shadowing from bridges (Broome et al. 2005 Effects of Shading from Bridges on Estuarine Ecosystems. CTE/NCDOT Joint Environmental Research Program Final Report <https://connect.ncdot.gov/projects/research/RNAProjDocs/2001-12FinalReport.pdf>) and docks (Logan et al. 2017 Effects of Docks on Salt Marsh Vegetation: An Evaluation of Ecological Impacts and the Efficacy of Current Design Standards <https://www.mass.gov/doc/effects-of-docks-on-salt-marsh-vegetation-an-evaluation-of-ecological-impacts-and-the-efficacy/download>) can negatively affect plant growth and invertebrate density in estuarine ecosystems. By extension, tall buildings along East Palo Alto's treeless marsh plain that thrives in open sunlight are likely to introduce even broader shadow impacts.

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: richard kim <rkimneuro@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 9:43 AM
To: Redwood City City Council
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from rkimneuro@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Thank you.

And as a biotechnology executive myself, I wanted to point out additional points. Many biotech companies are leaving the Bay Area for reasons that are beyond the scope of Redwood City or Shores for the likes of Boston and Texas. Many won't return back. As I bike and walk along the exact area where Redwood Life intends to build, it just defies logic as current buildings sit more than half empty and why are we increasing square footage just when we are anticipating a recession? And outside of biotech, the Oracle HQ sits nearly empty as they ready to leave the area permanently. Why not at least try to fill up existing vacancies?

Richard Kim, M.D.
CMO, ImStem Biotechnology

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Redwood City City Council](#)
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 9:34 AM
To: [richard kim](#)
Cc: [GRP-City Clerk](#); [CD-Ryan Kuchenig](#)
Subject: RE: Stay with the Westport Plan

Dear Richard,

On behalf of the City Council, thank you for writing to express your thoughts about the Study Session of the Redwood Life Research and Development (Life Sciences Office and Laboratory) Proposal at 800 – 3400 Bridge Parkway. Each Councilmember has received your comments and they will be considered when the City Council discusses this item at its meeting tonight.

Respectfully,

Pamela Aguilar, CMC (*she/her*)
City Clerk
City of Redwood City
Phone: (650) 780-7220
www.redwoodcity.org

From: richard kim <rkimneuro@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2023 10:04 AM
To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to *preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form***. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be

encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Richard Kim, M.D.

3 Oceanside Way, Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
4/17/2023 6:50	Joanna Ngo	4 Avocet Dr, Redwood City 94065
4/17/2023 10:59	Javier uribe	531 Woodside Rd apt 413, Redwood City 94061
4/18/2023 11:14	Peng Zhao	63 cove on, Redwood City, 94065
4/18/2023 11:19	Merrily Robinson	952 Ruby St Redwood City, CA 94061
4/18/2023 11:22	Raghav Sharm	563 Compass Cir. , RWS, CA 94065
4/18/2023 13:12	Patrick Fram	10 avocet drive, Apt 207 , redwood city, 94065
4/18/2023 15:35	Qimghuai Kong	418 Tiller Lane Redwood City CA 94065
4/18/2023 17:42	Mayhew Seavey	548 Shorebird Cir Unit 3204, Redwood City, 94065
4/18/2023 19:58	Chung Man Fan	501 Baltic Circle Unit 513, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/18/2023 22:32	Rabendra Patel	425 Windfield Ln, Redwood City,CA-94065
4/19/2023 6:34	Paul Kelly	809 Lakeshore Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
4/19/2023 8:07	Sam Nakib	983 Governors Bay Drive, Redwood City CA 94065
4/19/2023 20:24	Julio leiva	11 yarnall place redwood city ca 94063
4/19/2023 22:58	Nancy Kelly	809 Lakeshore Drive , Redwood City , Ca 95065
4/20/2023 13:12	Lisa Carreno	654 Buckeye St. Redwood City, CA 94063
4/20/2023 16:17	Blair Robertson	851 Columbia Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/20/2023 17:02	Scott Rice	215 Poseidon Ln, Redwood City 94065
4/20/2023 17:20	Logan Schneider	3121 Bay Rd, Redwood City, CA 94063
4/20/2023 17:33	Amanda Mendoza	1019 Jones Ct, Redwood City 94063
4/20/2023 20:56	Luis Espino Cervantes	769 Douglas Ave Redwood City Ca 94063
4/20/2023 21:21	Robyn White	513 Shoal Circle, Redwood City, 94065
4/20/2023 23:08	Theresa Gonzalez	41 Broadway Street, Redwood City, 94063
4/21/2023 16:05	Maribel Rios	719 Stambaugh Street Redwood City 94063
4/21/2023 22:04	Salvador Miranda	2016 Gossamer Ave., Redwood City 94065
4/21/2023 22:07	Elysia Miranda	2016 Gossamer Ave. Redwood City 94065
4/22/2023 17:32	Sang Le	844 Portwalk Place, Redwood City CA 94065
4/22/2023 17:52	Natasha Okhuoya	531 Shoal Circle, Redwood Shores, 94065
4/22/2023 19:45	Miguel Sandoval	1014 tenth avenue, Redwood City CA 94063
4/22/2023 20:11	Michelle Erazo	952 Haven Ave, Redwood City CA 94063
4/22/2023 21:33	Leela sanjeev	308 sea cliff lane Redwood City 94065
4/23/2023 9:56	Richard Kim	3 Oceanside Way Redwood Shores CA 94066
4/23/2023 9:57	Song Soo Jung	3 Oceanside Way Reswood Shores CA 94065
4/23/2023 11:31	Sarah Delzio	304 Treedust st. Redwood City, CA 94065
4/23/2023 16:24	Caroline Tudor	1042 Montgomery, San Carlos, CA 94070

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Julie Waters <jwaters@califesciences.org>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 9:09 AM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Council Agenda Item #8A: Redwood Life Proposal Study Session
Attachments: CLS Letter to Redwood City re Longfellow Project.pdf

Hello Mayor and City Councilmembers,

On behalf of California Life Sciences, I'm writing to register our support of the Redwood Life project. Please find our support letter attached.

Thank you,

Julie

JULIE WATERS

Senior Director, Local Government and Community Relations

685 Gateway Blvd., Suite 100
South San Francisco, CA 94080

M 510.409.9921

califesciences.org





April 21, 2023

Honorable Mayor Gee and Members of the Redwood City Council
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

On behalf of California Life Sciences, we're writing to express our support for the Redwood LIFE Evolve proposal submitted by Longfellow Real Estate Partners. This transformative project will deliver important community benefits while allowing Redwood City to attract world-class life science and innovation companies that will help secure long-term economic growth for future generations.

Life science is the economic backbone of the peninsula. San Mateo County is home to 807 life science establishments, employing 40,349 people at an average wage of \$274,258. The life science industry in San Mateo County represents \$14.1 billion in annual economic impact.

This is not just a question of economic value – these companies are developing life-saving treatments and cures for all human ailments, improving health outcomes and quality of life.

Redwood LIFE is where leading life science companies are pioneering therapies and treatments for some of the world's most critical health issues. While the region has seen substantial growth in traditional office development, demand for purpose-built life science labs and innovation office space continues to outpace supply. The life science companies calling Redwood City home today want to grow and expand. However, they may be forced to seek opportunities in other cities if they cannot find adequate space locally, causing the City to lose vital revenue.

Redwood LIFE Evolve will create a 21st-century campus for today's leading life science companies; transform acres of surface parking into parks with expansive green, publicly accessible open spaces; address sea-level rise and invest in levee improvements; provide inviting community space for its neighbors; exceed environmental sustainability best practices; and make enhancements to the San Francisco Bay Trail.

California Life Sciences respectfully request that the City Council study the project without delay and initiate the CEQA process.

Sincerely,

Julie Waters

Senior Director, Local Government and Community Relations
California Life Sciences

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Bart Pantoja San Mateo County BCTC <bart@sanmateobctc.org>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 7:30 AM
To: Council-Jeff Gee; Council-Lissette Espinoza-Garnica; Council-Alicia Aguirre; Council-Kaia Eakin; Council-Diane Howard; Council-Elmer MartinezSaballos; Council-Christopher Sturken
Cc: GRP-City Council
Subject: 8.A. Study Session of the Redwood Life Research and Development
Attachments: Redwood LIFE Evolve.pdf

Honorable Mayor Gee & Council Members,

Attached is a letter with comments regarding the study session item #8 scheduled for the April 24th meeting. Thank you in advance for your attention to this correspondence.

Regards,
Bart Pantoja
Financial Secretary-Treasurer
The Building & Construction Trades Council of San Mateo County
1153 Chess Drive, Foster City CA 94404
(650) 358-9977





**SAN MATEO COUNTY
BUILDING & CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL**

1153 Chess Drive #206 • Foster City, CA 94404 • Tel. (650) 358-9977 • Fax (650) 358-9979

April 23, 2023

Honorable Mayor Gee and Members of the Redwood City Council
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

On behalf of the Building & Construction Trades Council, I am writing to express support for the Redwood LIFE Evolve proposal submitted by Longfellow Real Estate Partners. This important economic development project will transform an aging business park into a 21st-century, all-electric life sciences destination while turning old, outdated asphalt parking lots into acres of new parks and community space.

While we are still working out the details, Longfellow has committed to using 100% union labor on the project. This would become one of the most important projects in the region for us, as it would mean more than 2,000 union jobs per project phase. Additionally, it would be a vehicle for creating apprenticeship opportunities for new members.

This project would also provide benefits that are important to our members such as an unprecedented investment in Affordable Housing, grants for childcare, sea level rise protection and ongoing revenue to fund City services and schools and other benefits that align with Redwood City's Strategic Priorities for Children and Youth, Transportation, Housing, and Equity.

Given the project's potential to make positive, lasting changes to our community, we ask that the City Council allow the project to advance and undergo environmental study through CEQA. We have a real need for projects like this and would hate to see it delayed longer than necessary. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Bart M. Pantoja
Business Manager | Financial-Secretary-Treasurer
Building & Construction Trades Council of San Mateo County
1153 Chess Drive, Suite 206, Foster City, CA 94404
P: (650) 358-9977
bart@sanmateobctc.org

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Caroline Dinsmore <caroline@carolinedinsmore.com>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 6:21 AM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Alex Khojikian; MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto
Subject: I Support Redwood LIFE Evolve

Dear Mayor Jeff Gee & Members of the City Council,

I live in Redwood Shores and am writing today to support the Redwood LIFE Evolve project.


The project will bring tremendous benefits to Redwood City including much needed tax revenue to address the City's projected budget deficits and avoid cuts to public services and jobs. It will also provide economic resilience in the form of jobs and revitalize an outdated office park with waterfront green space for the community.

The project's benefits will be far reaching, including sea level rise protection and a historic investment in affordable housing of \$85 million.

I support the project and hope that the City Council agrees to begin studying it at this early stage, and not further delay its many benefits.

Best,

Caroline



Caroline Dinsmore - Realtor and Founder

Caroline Dinsmore & Co. | Coldwell Banker Realty
DRE#: 01458457 | 6507732226 | caroline@carolinedinsmore.com
580 El Camino Real, San Carlos CA 94070
www.CarolineDinsmoreAndCo.com/



[Click to schedule a meeting](#)



Please consider your environmental responsibility. Before printing this e-mail message, ask yourself whether you really need a hard copy.

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION: This email message and any attachment may contain privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which the email is addressed. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, that person is hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us as soon as possible by telephone (collect calls will be accepted). Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Gary Baldocchi <gdb357@aol.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2023 8:47 PM
To: GRP-City Council; Council-Jeff Gee; Council-Lisette Espinoza-Garnica; Council-Alicia Aguirre; Council-Kaia Eakin; Council-Diane Howard; Council-Elmer MartinezSaballos; Council-Christopher Sturken
Cc: sc_biosafety@googlegroups.com; sclp-slu@googlegroups.com; dpine@smcgov.org; rmueller@smcgov.org; len; MichaelJFerreira@gmail.com; arak@cityofsancarlos.org; sierra@smdailyjournal.com; emibach@padailypost.com; info@biosafetynow.org
Subject: Public comment: Redwood Life Project--Please preserve the existing Westport Specific Plan and prohibit high containment biosafety laboratories (City Council Meeting 4/24/23)
Attachments: Redwood Life Public Comment.docx

You don't often get email from gdb357@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

4/23/2023

Dear Mayor Gee, Vice-Mayor Espinosa-Garnica and Council Members Aguirre, Eakin, Howard, Saballos and Sturken,

We respectfully request that you reject Longfellow's Redwood Life application for a new Precise Plan for the Westport Office park and preserve the existing Final Westport Specific Plan.

In addition, please reject Redwood Life's proposed siting of high-containment Biosafety Level 3 labs in the development and join San Carlos and other cities in enacting a Biosafety ordinance that will regulate Biosafety levels and hopefully prohibit high-containment biohazard labs (BSL-3, 4) near residential neighborhoods and the bay.

We support the Sierra Club and Bay Alive, Loma Prieta Chapter's public comments in their letter dated April 20, 2023.

Our attached letter contains supporting documentation and research to support our requests. It includes the following key points:

- (1) There is insufficient local oversight and regulation of private, high-containment biosafety labs;
- (2) Privately operated biosafety labs lack transparency and public accountability;
- (3) There are critical weaknesses and gaps in the federal oversight of high-containment labs;
- (4) Enhanced pandemic pathogen research conducted in BSL-3 labs poses catastrophic risks to public and environmental health and safety;

- (5) Multiple cities prohibit BSL-3 labs, vivaria and certain types of animal research near residential zoning and environmentally sensitive areas;
- (6) Cities should enact a stringent Biosafety ordinance that regulates biohazards and prohibits BSL-3 and 4 labs (Conditional Use permits for high-containment labs are inadequate due to cities' lack of expertise, lack of Biosafety committees and limited financial resources to conduct the necessary oversight);
- (7) If a city allows BSL-3 labs, it should require all developers and biosafety lab tenants to comply with strict guidelines similar to those enacted by Cambridge, MA and strictly limit the square footage dedicated to BSL-3 labs;
- (8) High containment labs should not be sited within 1,500 feet of residences and the bay front due to chemical emissions from rooftop exhaust stacks, odors, noise, glare, frequent deliveries and 24/7 operation;
- (9) Scientists and researchers have identified multiple instances of lab accidents that have resulted in serious and sometimes lethal disease transmission;
- (10) High-containment labs use 5-10 times the amount of energy as other office uses and require the use of natural gas or other types of flammable gases. Millions of square feet of new biolab developments will strain our overtaxed energy grid and increase the risk of rolling blackouts;
- (11) High-containment labs are unable to comply with REACH codes and Climate Mitigation Adaption plans, including local and state prohibitions on natural gas use. They often cannot use rooftop solar panels due to tall exhaust stacks;
- (12) High-containment labs use an inordinate amount of water, cannot use recycled water and will strain county water storage capacity;
- (13) Fire departments and first responders may choose not to enter BSL-3 labs in the event of a fire or emergency due to the risks of exposure to potentially lethal pathogens; and
- (14) We ask Redwood City to reject developers' strategies and tactics that have allowed them to circumvent stringent environmental review and public hearings in order to site BSL-3 labs in densely populated residential areas.

We greatly appreciate your careful and thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

Debbie and Gary Baldocchi

San Carlos residents (former long-term Redwood Shores residents and frequent visitors to Redwood Shores)

April 23, 2023

Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council City of Redwood City

Via email: council@redwoodcity.org, jgee@redwoodcity.org, lespinoza-garnica@redwoodcity.org, aaguirre@redwoodcity.org, keakin@redwoodcity.org, dhoward@redwoodcity.org, emartinezsaballos@redwoodcity.org, csturken@redwoodcity.org

Subject: Public Comment--Redwood Life project in Redwood Shores – Please preserve the existing Westport Specific Plan and prohibit high containment biosafety laboratories

Dear Mayor Gee, Vice Mayor Espinosa-Garnica, and Council Members Aguirre, Eakin, Howard, Saballos, and Sturken,

We respectfully request that you reject Longfellow's Redwood Life application for a new Precise Plan for the Westport Office park and preserve the existing Final Westport Specific Plan.

In addition, please reject Redwood Life's proposed siting of high-containment Biosafety Level BSL-3 labs in this development and join San Carlos and other cities in enacting a Biosafety Ordinance that will regulate Biosafety levels and hopefully prohibit high-containment biohazard labs (BSL-3 and 4) near residential neighborhoods. We provide the following detailed information, supporting documentation and research to support our requests.

Background

We lived in Redwood Shores from 1983 until 2003 when we moved to San Carlos. We love Redwood Shores and regularly visit our dentists, shop at businesses and eat at restaurants there. Its' beautiful sloughs, marshlands, water views, and walking paths make it the jewel of the Peninsula.

I am a retired prosecutor. During the first 10 years of my career, I was a Registered Nurse with a Master's Degree in Nursing. In the mid-80s, I was the Director of Nursing for Shriners Hospital for Children in San Francisco, an assistant clinical professor at UCSF and served on the San Francisco Directors of Nursing Infectious Diseases committee during the HIV epidemic. The committee's focus was instituting policies and procedures to prevent hospital, laboratory or blood bank acquired infections from spreading to patients, staff and the community.

There is an unprecedented proliferation of private, high containment biohazard labs throughout Silicon Valley. Now, more than ever, local ordinances are needed to regulate the foreseeable public and environmental health and safety impacts. The lack of comprehensive federal, state, and local biosafety regulations is a glaring public health

and environmental safety issue. Prominent scientists, including Richard Ebright, a molecular biologist at Rutgers University, has pushed for federal regulations for high-containment labs for years.

In a recent issue of [Science](#) magazine, he said: *Current U.S. biosafety guidelines, which only cover federally funded research and are enforced with fines and loss of grants, should be replaced with federal regulations with the force of criminal penalties, the group says. (There are stricter U.S. regulations for research on certain risky pathogens and toxins known as select agents, but these laws mainly are intended to prevent terrorists or enemy nations from getting access to potential bioweapons, Ebright notes.*

San Carlos Proposed Biosafety Ordinance

Many Silicon Valley community members have encouraged our cities to adopt Biosafety Ordinances that will regulate these labs and prohibit BSL-3 and 4 labs. We are very impressed that San Carlos city staff and City Council members have a demonstrated track record of protecting public and environmental health and safety. They welcome and encourage public engagement and are responsive to our requests.

In response to public concerns, they are currently considering a proposed Biosafety Ordinance. They should make a final decision in May. On March 27th, city staff recommended that the City Council adopt the ordinance that will prohibit BSL-3 and 4 labs. The other option is a Conditional Use Permit procedure that would allow BSL-3 labs with extensive regulations and prohibit BSL-4 labs. (There are currently no BSL-4 labs in California.)

We do not think that allowing private, BSL-3 labs with a Conditional Use Permit adequately protects the community and environment from the potential harmful effects of hazardous materials and pathogens. San Carlos city staff admitted they have no biosafety or biosecurity experience or expertise and that regulations and oversight will be complex, time-consuming and expensive. Planner Costa Sanders pointed out that cities on the east coast that allow high-containment labs have biosafety/biosecurity committees that provide oversight. She said: *we don't have that expertise*. See video of the meeting: [Link to 2/6/23 Planning Commission](#) (Minute: 29.)

Staff conceded that only 1% of biosafety lab tenants will request BSL-3 use. EDAC Director Al Savay said that the city *does not think the economic impacts on market dynamics will be significant* and that he *feels good about moving forward with the proposed ordinance (to ban BSL 3 labs) based on public safety and community concerns*. (Minute: 26.) The city staff specifically stated that banning BSL-3 labs will have NO significant economic impacts.

In fact, the private developers for a proposed 410,000 square foot Life Sciences complex at 642 Quarry Road, San Carlos recently withdrew their request for BSL-3 use after public opposition to their Mitigated Negative Declaration.

We recognize that it can be difficult for a city to balance risks to public and environmental health and safety with sustainable economic growth. EDAC Director Al Savay acknowledges that protecting both are possible.

We hope the Redwood City Council will agree. We, and Redwood City community members, will greatly appreciate your decisive actions to protect public health and environmental safety.

Silicon Valley community members partner with environmental groups Bay Alive and Sierra Club, Loma Prieta Chapter, to oppose high-containment labs

The *Sierra Club, Loma Prieta Chapter, and Bay Alive* hosted a webinar on Life Sciences Development on March 2, 2023. I am not a member, but they graciously invited me to attend the planning sessions as a member of the public.


The group had many meetings with city and county leaders, biosafety experts, biotech consultants, scientists and university professors, including the webinar speakers:

- (a) Dennis Carlone, Cambridge, MA City Council member and Urban Design/Architecture consultant;
- (b) Sam Lipson, Senior Director of Environmental Health, Cambridge Public Health Department;
- (c) Vanessa Cook, Ph.D, Associate BioSafety officer, UC San Diego. Dr. Cook also works for BioNet, Biological Safety Information Network; and
- (d) Paul Magginetti, a senior biosciences quality engineer and board member of Greater East San Carlos (GESC.)

We also met with San Mateo County Supervisor Dave Pine and representatives from the San Mateo Department of Environmental Health and Safety. We confirmed that there are no county ordinances regulating biosafety levels in private labs. Zoning ordinances that govern biosafety labs are enacted by cities, unless they are located on county property.

Discussion

(1) What are biosafety levels



<https://biosafety.utk.edu/biosafety-program/the-biosafety-program/biosafety-manual/2-principles-of-biosafety/>

Additional information and description of biosafety hazards can be found in this letter by the [Sierra Club, Loma Prieta Chapter](#).

(2) There is insufficient local oversight and regulation of private high-containment biosafety labs

It is concerning to see how little public information is available about private high-containment biolabs located in Silicon Valley. We perceive this to be a coordinated effort by the billion-dollar biotech industry that attempts to shut down questions and stifle local regulations by claiming they are already "highly regulated." Unlike university and federally funded labs, they have fragmented and incomplete oversight. Universities like Stanford have [comprehensive Biosafety manuals](#) and committees. That is not true for private labs which may include underfunded start-ups.

The number of high-containment biolabs (HDBLs) continues to increase; that trend will likely continue with COVID-19 worldwide as countries and states will choose to prioritize and build them. Since many academic and private laboratories are not under governmental oversight, it is difficult to obtain accurate counts of HCBLs (Peters, 2018). In our references, we also noted inconsistencies in the HCBLs especially those listed in the BSL-3 category. [The Significance of High-Containment Biological Laboratories Performing Work During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Biosafety Level-3 and 4 Labs.](#)

Scientists across the nation are raising public safety concerns, including Stanford researcher Dr. David Relman who [recommends stronger oversight](#). Another group of scientists who are advocating for national and international regulations and oversight is *Protect our Future*. <https://biosafetynow.org/>

One of its co-founders, Richard Ebright, who testified before congress at the *Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Spending*, recently summed up the public safety risks: *The government does not even maintain a comprehensive database of where such experiments are taking place, let alone practice any rigorous oversight of them. Instead, there are different standards based on crude risk categorization, funding source and research facility. It's a crazy patchwork quilt of "rules" giving rise to a 'big zone' of uncertainty about which labs are doing what under whose oversight and with what level of security and precaution.*

At the February 6, 2023 San Carlos Planning Commission meeting, a local developer from MBC Biolabs outrageously claimed that BSL-3 labs are "foolproof." They are not. See: [Treason of the Science Journals](#) a compelling article by author Ashley Rindsberg.

In fact, the lack of oversight of Silicon Valley's privately-owned and operated biosafety labs has drawn the recent attention and concern of the (NIH) National Institute of Health's National Science Advisory Board for Biosecurity (NSABB). The NSABB has held numerous meetings about biosafety and biosecurity, with specific focus on Potential Pandemic Pathogen Care and Oversight (PC3O) and Dual Use Research of Concern (DURC). [NSABB Board of Directors Meeting—January 27, 2023.](#)

One notable public comment was from a biosafety/biosecurity public health expert at Columbia University who urged the NSABB to focus on BSL-3 labs in the private sector. Privately funded labs are a prominent focus of these meetings. They discussed the need for transparency, in connection with the need for public membership on biosafety committees, as well as transparency of the process, in terms of rules and regulations. They also discussed standards for review.

In a prior NSABB meeting on September 21, 2022, Dr. Richard Ebright pointed out 6 major gaps in the biosafety/biosecurity framework, including the lack of oversight of private, non-federally funded labs. ([NSABB Board Meeting - September 2022 Wednesday, September 21, 2022](#)) Timestamped at approximately 33:00.

At approximately 42:00, Dr. Kenneth Bernard, a NSABB board member stated: *"We have to deal with the problem of domestic research that's not funded by the US government. That's a big chunk right now, especially out here in the west with Silicon Valley."*

We agree with scientists from Biosafety Now who attended the March 6, 2023 Planning Commission meeting at our request. Dr. Bryce Nickels described the representations by developers that private labs are "highly-regulated" as *gaslighting in the extreme*. <https://twitter.com/BiosafetyNow/status/1633269996775251968>

These scientists and many others are interested in learning how cities in Silicon Valley will address the issue of high-containment biolabs in proposed ordinances. National, international and local media, including the [Palo Alto Daily Post](#) and the [San Mateo Daily Journal](#) are also following the story.

(3) Lack of transparency and secrecy

The public doesn't know how many private BSL-3 labs are in the bay area or where they are located. At the February 6th San Carlos Planning Commission meeting, Planner Costa Sanders said she thinks there are seven BSL-3 labs in the bay area, but conceded that *due to proprietary or security reasons an inventory of labs is not readily available online*. [Link to 2/6/23 Planning Commission](#) (Video: 11:54.)

One of the city's consultants, Carla Boragno, former vice president of site services for Genentech, was asked about the number and location of private BSL-3 lab in the bay area. She did not know how many, but said that *she is aware of one in San Francisco, but is not at liberty to say which one*. (Video: 12:00).

Private, high-containment biolabs located near residential areas should not be allowed to justify their secrecy and lack of transparency by claiming *proprietary or security issues*. The public has a right to know what pathogens are being researched in labs next door. We need local, enforceable regulations that will minimize the risk of infectious diseases spreading into the community.

(4) Enhanced potential pandemic pathogen research conducted in BSL-3 labs poses catastrophic risks

There are many types of research performed in BSL-3 labs. The most high-risk is enhanced potential pandemic pathogen research or (ePPP). The life threatening issues were recently addressed in an easy to read article in [Vox](#) titled: *What should be kept off-limits in a virology lab? New rules around gain-of-function research make progress in striking a balance between reward---and catastrophic risk*. Kelsey Piper. February 1, 2023.

A more in-depth description is provided by biosafetynow.org.

High-Risk Research with Potential Pandemic Pathogens

Enhanced potential pandemic pathogen (ePPP) research is defined as research activities reasonably anticipated to increase transmissibility or pathogenicity of a potential pandemic pathogen. Historically ePPP research also has been referred to as “gain-of-function research of concern” (GoFRoC). The amount of ePPP research performed in the US is difficult to estimate. However, because ePPP research is carried out in high-level biocontainment laboratories (BSL-3 and BSL-4), the number of high-level biocontainment laboratories in the US, provides an estimate. The total number of US BSL-3 and BSL-4 laboratories is not known, but likely is between 1,000 and 2,000.

Multiple GAO reports over the last decade have lamented the fact that no federal, state, or other entity knows numbers, much less locations, of US BSL-3 and BSL-4 laboratories. Numbers of BSL-3 laboratories are known only for the subset of laboratories that are either operated by state public health departments or registered

with the CDC or USDA Select Agent programs. These totaled 1,782 (possibly with some duplication) in 2009, with many facilities present in each state

What are the risks associated with ePPP research?

ePPP research involves the creation of new health threats—health threats that did not exist previously and that might not come to exist by natural means for tens, hundreds, thousands, or tens of thousands of years. Most ePPP research to date has been performed in the US with US funding, or overseas with US funding.

ePPP research poses high—potentially existential—risks. ePPP research poses both material risks and information risks. ePPP research is performed because it is easy and fast (much faster and much easier than vaccine or drug development) and because it is fundable and publishable. Not because it is needed

Because ePPP research poses high—potentially existential—risks and provides limited benefits, the risk-benefit ratio for the research almost always is unfavorable and in many cases is extremely unfavorable. ePPP research is a small part of biomedical research (less than 0.1% of all biomedical research and less than 1% of virology). However, because ePPP research of concern can cause pandemics, this small part of the biomedical research enterprise is highly consequential and requires effective oversight.

How is ePPP research currently monitored and regulated in the US?

Before 2014, there was no national-level US oversight of gain-of-function research of concern. In 2014-2017, there was a moratorium on federal funding for “selected gain of function research,” defined as research activities reasonably anticipated to increase transmissibility or pathogenicity of influenza, SARS, or MERS viruses. The policy was referred to as the “US Government Research Funding Pause on Selected Gain-of-Function Research Involving Influenza, MERS, and SARS Viruses,” or, for short, as the “Pause.” Under the Pause, 18 projects were paused. However, at least 7 of the 18 projects that were paused were allowed to re-start almost immediately (based on a certification by the NIH Director that the projects were “urgently necessary to protect the public health or national security”).

More important, other projects that met the definition for coverage under the Pause—including a project on engineering of SARS- and MERS-related coronaviruses by EcoHealth Alliance and the Wuhan Institute of Virology—were not paused, due to the failure of the NIH to identify and flag all covered projects

In 2018-present, there has been a requirement for HHS-Secretary-level risk-benefit assessment prior to awarding HHS funding for “research involving enhanced potential pandemic pathogens,” defined as research activities reasonably anticipated to increase transmissibility or pathogenicity of a potential pandemic pathogen.

The policy is referred to as the “HHS Framework for Research Involving Enhanced Potential Pandemic Pathogens,” or, for short, as the “[P3CO Framework](#)” Under the P3CO Framework, covered projects are to be identified and flagged by HHS funding agencies (i.e., the NIH and the CDC), and covered projects are to be reviewed by a committee appointed by the HHS Secretary (i.e., the HHS P3CO Committee).

The P3CO Framework applies to funding for proposed research and operates before funding and conduct of the research (not after completion of the research). Accordingly, identification of covered projects coverage under the policy is based on proposed research and evaluates “reasonably anticipated” results of the proposed research (not results after completion of the research). The “reasonably anticipated” standard employed by the policy is equivalent, in all respects, to the “reasonable person” standard employed in US administrative and civil law.

The definitions of the research activities covered by the P3CO Framework, and the definitions of research activities exempted from the P3CO Framework, are clear. They are as clear as in any US statute or rule having a “reasonable person” standard. The policy covers research activities reasonably anticipated to increase the transmissibility or the pathogenicity of a potential pandemic pathogen, including research activities in which neither the pathogen to be modified nor the enhanced pathogen to be generated is known to infect humans.

What are the shortcomings in US oversight of ePPP research?

In principle, the [P3CO Framework](#) provides for risk-benefit assessment and risk-mitigation review for gain-of-function research of concern. However, in practice, the P3CO Framework largely has existed only on paper. In the four-and-one-half years since the policy was announced, only three projects have been reviewed: two projects that had been carried over from the Pause, and one new project. Most covered projects—including the project on engineering of SARS- and MERS-related coronaviruses by EcoHealth Alliance and the Wuhan Institute of Virology—were not reviewed, due to a failure by the NIH to identify covered projects, flag them, and forward them to the HHS P3CO Committee for review.

The HHS P3CO Committee has operated with complete non-transparency and complete unaccountability. The names and agency affiliations of its members have not been disclosed, its proceedings have not been disclosed, and even its decisions have not been disclosed. Responsibility for oversight is assigned to federal agencies that perform research and/or fund research. This constitutes an inherent conflict of interest. Oversight applies only to HHS-funded research. **Oversight is not codified in regulations with force of law, and, as a result, compliance is neither mandated, monitored, nor enforced.**

Oversight is undermined by the failure of federal research funding agencies to identify covered projects, flag them, and forward them to the HHS P3CO Committee for review.

Oversight is not transparent and accountable, neither at the level of the federal research funding agencies, nor at the level of the HHS P3CO Committee.

What can be done to mitigate the risks of ePPP research?

Lapses in US oversight of ePPP research may have caused the COVID-19 pandemic, and could cause future pandemics. Therefore, it is imperative that ePPP research be subject to national- or international-level oversight to ensure that, before the research is started, risk-benefit assessment is performed, risk-benefit profiles are acceptable, and mitigable risks are mitigated.

Effective oversight includes three components: Research proposals that include gain-of-function research of concern must be identified. A risk-benefit assessment and a risk-mitigation review must be performed. This entails enumerating anticipated risks, enumerating anticipated benefits, weighing risks and benefits, and reaching a decision either (i) to proceed as proposed, (ii) to proceed with additional risk mitigation, or (iii) not to proceed. Compliance with the decision from the risk-benefit assessment and risk-mitigation review must be mandated, monitored, and enforced. [High-Risk Research with Potential Pandemic Pathogens](#).

(5) Summary of critical weaknesses and gaps in the oversight of high-containment labs

There is substantial evidence from multiple governmental investigations, including the FBI and Department of Defense, that the COVID-19 pandemic may have been caused by a laboratory accident;

The rapidly increasing power and rapidly decreasing costs of advanced biotechnology has made lab-generated pandemics a threat to the survival of the human species;

Despite the major risks to the public, dangerous “gain-of-function” research that enhances potential pandemic pathogens (ePPP) is subject to almost no national or international oversight;

Existing US oversight of research on dangerous pathogens has four critical weaknesses:

(A) There are no US regulations with force of law for biosafety of research on pathogens other than designated Federal Select Agents. Instead, federal biosafety oversight involves only unenforced guidelines.

(B) There are no US regulations with force of law for biorisk management of research on pathogens other than smallpox virus. Instead, federal biorisk management involves only an unused policy framework.

(C) Current US oversight of biosafety for pathogens other than select agents and biorisk management for pathogens other than smallpox virus applies only to federally funded research. Privately funded research is NOT covered.

(D) Current US oversight of biosafety and biorisk management is undermined by systemic conflicts of interest. Responsibility for oversight is assigned to federal agencies that perform research and fund research, and almost all actual oversight is delegated to, and left to the discretion of, researchers, their institutions and privately-owned companies.

To date, the public has largely been unaware of, and excluded from, discussion of the threat posed by research in high-containment biohazard (Biosafety Level) BSL- 3 and 4 laboratories;

Private high-containment biohazard labs conducting research on designated federal select agents are not required to disclose their identities, locations or the types of pathogens or genetically modified organisms researched. Moreover, the Federal Select Agent Program is not allowed to disclose their identities or locations. As a result, the public, first responders, and state and local governments are unable to ascertain the number, identity and location of these laboratories;

Numerous scientists, researchers and non-profit groups advocate for reducing the number of high-containment biohazard laboratories and for strengthening biosafety, biosecurity and biorisk management for research on pathogens. biosafetynow.org.

(6) Multiple cities prohibit BSL-3 labs, vivaria and certain types of animal testing

It is concerning that there are so few local biosafety lab regulations and local ordinances enacted by other cities in Silicon Valley. The biosafety lab industry is new to San Carlos and Redwood City so it understandable that our cities do not yet have ordinances in place.

The city of Berkeley requires a 500' setback for BSL-2 labs and prohibits BSL-3 organism research in some zoning. "*Commercial Physical or Biological Laboratories: Commercial physical or biological laboratories using Class 3 organisms are not permitted in the MU-LI district. Use of Class 2 organisms are permitted only in locations at least 500 feet from a Residential or a MU-R district.*" BMC 23.206.080.B.512

Extensive biosafety ordinances have been enacted in east coast cities, but perhaps that is because they have many more labs and a much longer history of regulating them. Multiple cities near Cambridge, MA [ban BSL- 3 and 4s](#). The ones that allow them have extensive guidelines and ordinances.

Historically, there have been few BSL-3 labs in the bay area and they were located on University and medical center campuses, in South San Francisco and areas that are not near residential neighborhoods.

(7) Conditional Use Permit requirements

We are not opposed to BSL 1 and 2 labs sited in areas that are environmentally and ecologically suitable, are located a safe distance from residences, childcare and senior facilities, and are governed by robust university, city or county guidelines, biosafety committees, ordinances, or regulations. San Mateo County Department of Environmental Health and Safety does not have biosafety committees, guidelines or ordinances that specify **where** biosafety labs should be sited and how privately-owned, speculative developments with multiple unknown BSL tenants should be operated and monitored. Most San Mateo county regulations address hazardous materials, not hazardous biological cellular materials or pathogens.

Ventilation--Negative and Positive Air Pressure

San Carlos' initial proposed ordinance banning BSL-3 labs did not contain any regulations that govern BSL 1 and 2 labs, vivaria or animal testing. These facilities are less concerning than BSL 3 and 4 labs, but they are not without risk. Of utmost concern is ensuring appropriate ventilation design and construction. See Stanford's: [Ventilation Concerns for Biosafety Level 2 Laboratories](#). It reads in part:

1. Air pressure in laboratories and animal care rooms should be negative in relation to the corridor or adjacent non-laboratory areas. Rooms housing immunocompromised animals should be at a positive pressure with respect to adjoining areas. Consult with SU Fire Marshall for design details.

Potentially harmful aerosols can escape from the containment of the laboratory room unless the room air pressure is negative to adjacent non-laboratory areas. As a general rule, air should flow from low hazard to high hazard areas.

2. Dedicated sterile tissue culture rooms should be balanced neutral or slightly positive with respect to adjoining areas. Tissue culture rooms that involve the use of biohazardous agents shall be negative as stated in C-1 above.

This will minimize the potential for possible contamination of experiments within these rooms.

3. An autoclave should be provided with a canopy hood, slotted exhaust, or other suitable means of local exhaust. In addition, autoclave rooms should have a minimum of 10 air changes per hour.

Unpleasant heat and odors will linger in the room unless provided with effective local exhaust and adequate frequency of air changes.

Because of the risk of airborne pathogens escaping to adjacent non-laboratory areas, we ask local cities to provide specific guidelines that ensure the above ventilation guidelines are incorporated into building design and construction. We also request that

cities prohibit all BSL-2 labs within a specified distance (500 or more feet) from residences, childcare and senior facilities; require floor plans of BSL labs and a description of the organisms in use; a procedure to alert the city and the public of lab accidents, employee exposure to transmissible pathogens and an emergency response plan.

If cities choose to allow high-containment BSL-3 labs with Conditional Use Permits, we respectfully request that they consider hiring a third-party biosafety and biosecurity consultant, to be paid for by developers or BSL tenants, to perform biosafety and biosecurity oversight responsibilities similar to those adopted by Cambridge, MA.

[See Cambridge, MA biosafety regulations:](#)

The responsibilities of the Cambridge Biosafety Committee include:

- *Reviewing the appropriate design and operation of all laboratory areas within the proposed facility for research or manufacturing involving regulated biological agents at the biosafety containment level (Biosafety Level) request for that location;*
- *Determining whether appropriate and reasonable practices to contain and mitigate biological hazards match the potential biological hazards associated with the specific agents in the form present, particularly as they impact lab workers and the community;*
- *Listening to each presentation for a new or amended permit and providing feedback or submitting questions to the applicant as applicable;*
- *Reviewing laboratory walkthrough inspection summaries provided by Committee staff before determining that all applicable standards and practices for safe operation of a biological laboratory are met;*
- *Reviewing practices, expectations, and standards imposed on the regulated laboratories by the Committee in order to establish clear enforcement protocols and to offer transparency to the regulated community. Key policies and direction will be summarized in a companion document to the ordinance and the regulation;*
- *Providing a community perspective in assessing the impact of any application and anticipating issues of greater public concern or interest;*

We also ask cities to consider developing a specific Laboratory Biosafety permit, such as the one below:

To receive a [Laboratory Biosafety permit](#), every new applicant must present to the Cambridge Biosafety Committee. The presentation must include:

1. *Street address of the proposed facility or facilities. Please include a specific floor or suite within the building.*
2. *Total floor area of biological laboratory space (estimate is OK) and proposed biological containment level(s) or biological safety levels (BSL).*
3. *A summary of research or manufacturing activities and agents, organized by Risk Group as determined by the Institutional Biosafety Committee for the applicant.*
4. *A floor plan indicating all laboratory areas, biological containment levels or BSL(s), waste storage location and pathway for removal, doors, and exits.*
5. *Documentation of a medical surveillance agreement with a local occupational health provider or an in-house clinical provider.*
6. *Documentation showing that an air balance was conducted to document a steady negative airflow into any BSL-2 lab areas.*
7. *Summary of compliance status for all local and state health and safety regulations requiring permits (e.g., flammable storage and cryogenic gas permit, DEP VSQG or SQG chem waste permit, state radiation permit, MWRA wastewater permit).*
8. *A list of vendors that support the safe operation of the laboratory.*

Presentations generally last 20 to 45 minutes, and should provide a broad explanation of the recombinant technologies, risk of infection, biological vectors, and host organisms being used. For an example, see our [sample presentation](#). For more information, please view the [Cambridge Biosafety Committee's Policies and Procedures](#).

At a minimum, we ask that a Conditional Use Permit address the following: Will it require the developer to have an internal Responsible Official (RO) who has the authority and responsibility to ensure tenants compliance with regulatory agencies? Will it require tenants to have a formal biosafety committee? If the developer later requests a conditional use permit for a BSL-3 lab as part of a remodel, will members of public be notified? How will they be notified? Who is included in the notification? Will members of the community have an opportunity to provide public comment?

(8) Deliberate misrepresentations about the number of high-containment labs proposed in San Carlos and Silicon Valley

Developers claim that only 1% of lab tenants will lease BSL-3 lab space. However, at three recent San Carlos Planning and City Council meetings, developers and lobbyists unanimously claimed that banning BSL-3 labs would have a “catastrophic effect” on attracting lab tenants. Although it is difficult to know how many private high-containment labs are already operating in the bay area, there appears to be few because private developers are rushing to fill the void.

For example, Gladstone, which is affiliated with UCSF, rents BSL-3 lab space and there is such high demand, there is a two-week waiting list for them to even respond to applications. See how easy it is for a private individual to rent BSL-3 lab space.

<https://gladstone.org/form/bsl-3-lab-request>

How many high-containment labs will be added to the seven currently operating in the area? We think that at least three will be proposed in San Carlos based on building plans that show 23 feet tall rooftop exhaust stacks. Several developers, including Alexandria, have refused to reveal the proposed biosafety levels claiming future tenants are either unknown or they are unable to reveal biosafety levels due to tenant confidentiality.

If Redwood City chooses not to ban high-containment labs, we respectfully request that you strictly limit the number of square feet that may be used for BSL-3 labs so that they do not overwhelm our small cities and natural resources. In addition, they should be sited at least 1,500 feet away from residences and the bayfront due to chemical emissions from rooftop exhaust stacks, odors, noise, glare, frequent deliveries and 24/7 operation.

(9) Multiple biolab accidents have caused infectious disease transmission

Many bioscience industry insiders, developers and lobbyist claim that lab accidents are rare and that labs do not need additional oversight or regulation. Regulations cut into their profits. Like oil pipeline, nuclear power proponents and other intensive resource consuming industries, they vigorously resist efforts by community members and environmental groups who challenge their safety and attack us as uninformed or alarmist.

We provide the following detailed information about lab accidents to refute that narrative.

(a) Lab leaks occur at a stunning frequency. A 2019 report actually said that there were four or more lab releases of these select agents, or highly contagious viruses or toxins, in the US in 2019," added Dr. Chan. She would like to see more public oversight of labs on a national and international level. This could come from impacts to funding or publishing of findings. She believes it will lead to safer conditions and more transparency. <https://www.cbsnews.com/boston/news/covid-origin-wuhan-lab-leak-alina-chan-mit-harvard/>

*(b) Science. **France issues moratorium on prion research after fatal brain disease strikes two lab workers.** Barbara Casassus, July 28, 2021.*

PARIS—Five public research institutions in France have imposed a 3-month moratorium on the study of prions—a class of misfolding, infectious proteins that cause fatal brain diseases—after a retired lab worker who handled prions in the past was diagnosed with Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease (CJD), the most common prion disease in humans. An investigation is underway to find out whether the patient, who worked at a lab run by the National Research Institute for Agriculture, Food and Environment (INRAE), contracted the disease on the job.

- (c) *Financial Times*. [Scientists fear future leaks as top-level labs proliferate](#). Kiran Stacey, Helen Warrell, Yuan Yang. June 4, 2021.
- (d) *Wall Street Journal*. [How Easily Can a Virus Escape From a Lab?](#) By Alina Chan and Matt Ridley. November 11, 2021.
- (e) *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. [Human error in high-biocontainment labs: a likely pandemic threat](#) . Lynn Klotz. February 25, 2019.
- (f) *ProPublica*. [Here are six accidents UNC researchers had with lab-created coronaviruses](#) . Alison Young and Jessica Blake. August 17, 2020.
- (g) *Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Inspector General*. [The National Institutes of Health and EcoHealth Alliance did not effectively monitor awards and subawards, resulting in missed opportunities to oversee research and other deficiencies](#). Christi A. Grimm, Inspector General. January 2023.
- (h) *USA Today*. [Lab-Created bird flu virus accident shows lax oversight of risky 'gain of function' research](#). Alison Young. April 11, 2023

In addition, we were curious where we might find examples from Biosafety labs that publicly report "accidents" or incidents. We checked Boston University, National Emerging Infectious Diseases Laboratories, Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) monthly minutes. Because they receive federal funding, they disclose near misses and lab incidents. Some of these occurred in BSL-2 and 3 labs. There are also BSL-4 labs onsite. See Research Occupational Health Program (ROHP) and Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) reports.

Most of the lab accidents involved BSL-2 and BSL-3s. Most were employee exposures due to needle sticks, glove lacerations and mice bites, but a couple are related to employees whose nasal swabs were positive for environmental SARS-Co-V-2, despite not working in the BSL-labs. Those were thought to be from exposure to workers who do work in the labs and share office space and break rooms with others. Here are a few excerpts from monthly minutes in Jan/Feb 2021 and Jan/Feb 2022:

(1) <https://www.bu.edu/researchsupport/files/2021/05/January-2021-IBC-Meeting-Minutes-WEB.pdf>

This incident involved the escape of prion infected mice:

EHS Report: *On the morning of 12/24/20, an animal care staff member discovered a cage in with no mice present and reported the finding to the animal care supervisor who notified the corresponding lab and ASC vet services and operations staff. ASC set up more traps within the room to trap these three mice, which were reported to be prion-infected. On the morning of 12/26/20, one mouse was caught by an animal care staff and subsequently euthanized by a vet tech per vet instructions due to numerous limb injuries.*

EHS investigation revealed that these wild type mice C57BL6 were sent from an external vendor and had been inoculated intra-cerebrally on 11/30/20 with mouse-adapted RML prions (a standard laboratory strain). There is a strong barrier to inter-

species transmission of prions, so this strain poses little threat to humans. In addition, this strain is not known to be shed by the animals (it remains in the CNS), so the risk to other mice is also minimal. Prions are not casually transmissible (for example, by respiratory or fecal routes), and even the oral route requires the ingestion of tissues of the central nervous system. Finally, these mice are only 30 days into the incubation period, which normally lasts 150 days, so the titer of infective prions in their brains of these escaped mice is extremely low. Given all these considerations, it was believed that these three mice pose little risk to the health and safety of ASC and other personnel, to other laboratory animals, or the community. No recombinant DNA or synthetic nucleic acids were administered to them. By 12/29/20 the other two mice were caught and humanely euthanized.

The three mice made an inch-wide hole and escaped out of the cage by tearing through the filtered top. The feeding bottles that had been used to administer the liquid diet were either accidentally pushed too far back giving the mice access to the filter cage top or it is also possible the mice pushed it back themselves. ASC has already made corrections and worked with the lab so this mishap can be avoided in the future. All the cages now have food hoppers, cutting off access to the filtered top.

(2) <https://www.bu.edu/researchsupport/files/2021/05/February-2021-IBC-Meeting-Minutes-WEB.pdf>

Just one month later, there were 6 incidents, one involved a worker who only worked in BSL-2 labs, but works in shared space with others who work with inactivated virus. Amplicon exposures are common, but can be minimized with stringent and frequent decontamination:

ROHP Report

Since the last IBC meeting on 1-26-21, ROHP has six incidents to report:

*1-28-21: ROHP received notification of a **needle stick injury** from a syringe to finger after the researcher resuspended a pellet taken from intestinal luminal fluid extracellular vesicles (from patients having inflammatory bowel disease). She discarded the pair of nitrile gloves she was wearing, allowed the blood to drain from the wound (6 drops), washed her hands with water and soap for a minute and sanitized her hands with 70% ethanol. **Please note this researcher did not report this incident to her supervisor or ROHP until the next day.***

*1-29-21: An asymptomatic researcher tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 which was later deemed to be related to **environmental SARS-CoV-2 amplicon exposure**. **This researcher works in BSL2, does not work with SARS-CoV-2 but works in shared space with others that do work with inactivated virus.***

*2-3-21: ROHP received notification of **laceration to a finger** with a razor used to slice mouse lung tissue. This incident was related to an IBC protocol, but the tissue did not contain any biologics.*

2-8-21: An asymptomatic researcher at the NEIDL tested positive for SARS-CoV-2. This researcher denied working with SARS CoV2 but works in shared space. Her positive test was later deemed to be related to **environmental amplicon exposure**.

2-8-21 and 2-17-21: One asymptomatic researcher at the NEIDL tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 twice. This researcher works in BSL3 with SARS-CoV-2 and in BSL2 with a different coronavirus strain. This was later **deemed to be related to amplicon exposure and not any live virus**.

ROHP continues to work with Healthway, Safety, PIs and BPHC regarding all researchers who test positive for SARS- CoV-2 to determine if it was community related infection or due to environmental amplicon exposure.

One member asked when researchers are continuously wearing masks in the lab, how it is possible for them to contract amplicon contamination in their nasal swabs. The Research Safety Director and ROHP Medical Director indicated that this is still unknown but they discussed some possibilities such as touching door knobs or lab work surfaces before changing into workplace clean masks or placing personal clothing on chairs in the lab before donning a lab coat or such.

(3) https://www.bu.edu/researchsupport/files/2022/03/January-2022-IBC-Meeting-Minutes_WEB.pdf

Research Occupational Health Program (ROHP) & Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) Report:

12/16/21: MD/PhD student reported experiencing low grade temperatures and other symptoms after he **accidentally injured his thumb** percutaneously on 12-6-21 while cleaning forceps that he had used to remove infected lungs from mice injected with NL63 virus. He cleaned the wound with soap and water and applied topical antiseptic medication. Discussion with ROHP suggested that the symptoms are consistent with community-based viral infection, Researcher was advised to stay home until afebrile for 24 hours without taking antipyretics and to isolate from his roommate who is asymptomatic. Advised to follow up with ROHP should symptoms worsen or not improve or as needed. BPHC has been notified. EHS Report: Safety specialist interviewed both PI and researcher. **Root cause of the incident was attributed to not being conscientious.** Steps to prevent reoccurrence included review of exposure control plan and procedures for reporting incidents. Advised on proper decontamination techniques and sharps safety practices. Online Sharps safety training was assigned as a reminder. **(They do not say what illness caused the fever, but indirectly attribute the illness to exposure to infected mice lungs bc researcher was not being conscientious.**

12/21/21: A fully vaccinated, asymptomatic PhD student tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 on 12/21/21. The student had been in the NEIDL office space prior to testing but denied entering lab spaces. **She reports she has not worked in the BSL 2 lab for a couple of months and she does not work with SARS-CoV-2, but shares office space and break room with others that do.** Repeat testing performed outside BU on 12/23/21 was negative, the student remained asymptomatic and was cleared to return to work 12/29/21. This student was educated on the importance scheduling routine

SARS-CoV-2 testing prior to entering the work space. After this incident ROHP prompted Dr. Corley, NEIDL Director, to send out notification to NEIDL researchers to get routine surveillance testing prior to entering the lab. There have been no incidents since then. EHS Report: Results of samples collected for testing will be reported on when received. BPHC has been notified.

1/3/22: An asymptomatic postdoc researcher who works in the NEIDL, tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 on 1-3-22. He reported no known exposures, no recent travel, fully vaccinated, and received a booster shot. Released from isolation and **deemed amplicon exposure**. He denied working with SARS-CoV-2 but does work in shared possible influenza and not likely related to the reported forceps injury incident as NL63 is a respiratory virus that does not cause any symptomatic infection in human space that does perform SARS-CoV-2 work. ROHP deemed this positive case is deemed to be an **Amplicon contamination**. Amplicon prevention education was provided and the researcher is cleared to return to work. BPHC has been notified.

1/6/22: A fully vaccinated, asymptomatic PhD student tested positive for SARS-CoV-2. The student worked in NEIDL BSL2 in shared space where SARS-CoV-2 rDNA work is performed. Repeat testing performed was negative and the researcher was cleared from isolation on 1-10-22. Amplicon prevention education was provided by ROHP. **Deemed amplicon contamination due to testing at the end day after being in the laboratory.** Report will be submitted to BPHC.

1/12/22: Potential biological exposure to a BSL4 staff who entered a NEIDL BSL4 lab unsuited not realizing it was in use. The incident was reported to ROHP by the NEIDL Biosafety Officer and the NEIDL Response Team. The staff member also reported the possible exposure to EHS. After the exposure, she took a whole-body shower and was advised to remove her contacts and use the eye wash. However, it was deemed no-to-low risk incident of infection to the researcher, as there were no pathogens in the lab and no work was being done at the time of this incident. Employee was cleared to return to work but was escorted to ROHP for further evaluation and counseling. ROHP provided the employees with a medical surveillance wallet card with ROHP contact information and a thermometer. She was advised to call ROHP or NEIDL Control should she have any concerns and was cleared to return to full duty work with no restrictions. Report submitted to BPHC.

1/22/22: An Animal Care Technician sustained an ABSL1 transgenic mouse bite on the right finger near to middle knuckle. The PI of the study reports that the Adipo-cre transgenic mice involved in the incident, express a protein called Cre recombinase (exclusively in their fat cells). This incident took place in ABSL1 and the mouse contained no hazardous agent. There is no hazardous concern regarding this transgenic mouse other than the potential for infection or local allergic reaction with a mouse bite. ROHP discussed the importance of washing for full time period (10-15 min) following a bite and risk of infection from own skin flora. She could apply antibiotic ointment over the site of the bite marks until they are resolved. Instructed to monitor for signs of infection. A report will be submitted to BPHC. EHS Report: More information will be provided on this mouse bite incident at the next IBC meeting.

(4) https://www.bu.edu/researchsupport/files/2022/03/February-2022-IBC-Meeting-Minutes_WEB.pdf

In February 2022 they reported a "near-miss" that was considered a NIH reportable incident:

Research Occupational Health Program (ROHP) & Environmental Health and Safety (EHS) Report ROHP reported three (3) incidents to the committee:

- *A visiting researcher cut left thumb with razor blade while cutting unfixed human kidney tissue;*
- *A graduate student sustained a puncture to left 2nd digit with a needle that had been used to inject lentivirus vector on transgenic mice;*
- *A PhD student sustained percutaneous injury to left 5th finger from unknown glass shard.*

*EHS reported on a **near-miss incident** to the committee: • Needles found in biohazard trash. EHS provided follow-up on the root cause of these incidents and corrective actions. **It was noted that the needle stick injury with lentiviral vector inside is a NIH reportable incident and the report will be sent to NIH and BPHC***

(10) High energy use and power outages

BSL-3 labs are particularly energy intensive because of the HVAC negative (and positive) air pressure requirements, lab animal cooling and heating requirements and 24/7 operation. In an extended power outage, temperatures in glass, high-rise buildings could "[quickly fall or rise to dangerous levels.](#)" In addition, biolabs also require the use of natural gas, tanked gas and other highly flammable and toxic gases. Many are unable to use solar panels because they require 23 feet tall rooftop exhaust stacks. In other words, high-containment biolabs are unable to comply with local REACH codes, prohibitions on natural gas use and Climate Mitigation Adaptation plans.

Unfortunately, a laboratory is a prodigious consumer of natural resources. For example, laboratories typically consume 5 to 10 times more energy per square foot than do office buildings. And some specialty laboratories, such as clean rooms and labs with large process loads, can consume as much as 100 times the energy of a similarly sized institutional or commercial structure. [EPA, Laboratories for the 21st Century: An Introduction to Low-Energy Design.](#)

Labs have redundant power systems, including backup generators, but the generators are not designed to last for more than 24-48 hours according to several developers we have spoken with. The back-up generators are intended to last long enough to allow them to shut down the labs. During power outages in the summer of 2022, Santa Clara Valley Medical Center (SCVMC) and O' Connor hospital lost power for hours. See the doctors' descriptions of moving ICU patients in the dark using light from their cell phones. <https://www.fiercehealthcare.com/providers/backup-generators-fail-northern-california-hospital-during-record-breaking-heatwave>

Unfortunately, many of the generators are powered by diesel which is in increasingly short supply in California. Ordinances should require developers to maintain at least a weeks' supply of diesel fuel on-site.

Some Menlo Park residents were without power for multiple days during the week of February 20, 2023. Their City Council held an emergency meeting on February 23rd. *Residents called for the city to improve its communication amid a week of high winds and storms that have left households without power for multiple days across the city. They see weather as prep for a potential major natural disaster. However, according to city officials, some small pockets of Menlo Park still remain without power. "If we struggle the first 48 hours for something relatively small like we did this time, how will we communicate when something more serious happens? How can we just learn from this so that we do better in the future." **The city will reimburse residents \$400 per night if they are still without power.***

<https://www.smdailyjournal.com/content/tncms/live/>

Stanford recently posted an article titled: [Preparing for a Power Outage in a Research Facility](#). It reads in part: *Normal occupancy and research operations are always prohibited in affected buildings during power outages, regardless of emergency generator status.*

(11) High water use and limited supply and capacity

One proposed development in San Carlos at 642 Quarry Road submitted a Mitigated Negative Declaration in December 2022 that discussed the tremendous amount of water that high-containment labs require. *Water service to the project site is provided by the Mid-Peninsula Water District (MPWD). MPWD supplies water to consumers within San Carlos, Redwood City, and parts of the unincorporated County of San Mateo. **Within the system there are ten storage tanks in which a combined total of 11,360,000 gallons of water are stored** (MPWD 2022). (MND Page 167.) **The proposed water demand for the project is estimated to result in an incremental increase above existing site use by 73,400 gallons per day (or 27 million gallons per year.)** (MND Page 167.)*

Millions of square feet of biolabs planned in San Carlos, Redwood City and San Mateo County will strain existing water supply and capacity, especially BSL-3 labs and vivaria which have higher water demand. Biolabs are unable to use recycled water. What strategies can be utilized to address this so that labs will not have priority over residents for limited water resources? Should labs have onsite water storage tanks, not only for water supply, but also for fire suppression? Should the Biosafety ordinance require this?

(12) Fire departments and first responders may NOT enter BSL-3 labs in the event of a fire or emergency

Emergency responders, including the Redwood City fire chief, indicated that that the fire department and first responders, including paramedics, will not enter a BSL-3 lab in the

event of a fire or medical emergency due to the potential exposure to unknown deadly pathogens, rDNA, infected transgenic lab animals, other biohazards or infectious biologic agents. (However, the Redwood City Fire Marshal contradicted the chief in a recent San Carlos City Council meeting and said that it would depend on the circumstances.) In addition, a San Mateo Environmental Health and Safety representative told us that the County Hazmat team will not respond to a fire in a BSL-3 lab. Who will?

We were told by Vanessa Cook, Associate BioSafety officer, UC San Diego, that the procedure in the event of a fire requires BSL-3 occupants to decontaminate themselves by removing their PPE, wiping down their exposed skin with disinfectant wipes and then evacuating from the BSL-3 lab space. She said that the fire department will "let it burn."

Although there are sprinklers and fire extinguishers in BSL-3 labs, they often contain tanks of highly flammable gases that pose an explosion risk in the event of fire. Cambridge, MA has a coordinated emergency response plan in place to address these critical public safety issues.

If BSL-3 labs are allowed, Redwood City should coordinate its emergency response and evacuation plan with neighboring cities, the county, Caltrans, and state and federal governmental agencies because of the labs proximity to major evacuation routes (Hwy 101), El Camino Real, and a commuter train track. The ordinance should include a detailed description of the emergency response plan.

(13) We ask Redwood City to reject land developers' strategies and tactics that have allowed them to circumvent stringent environmental review and public hearings in order to site BSL-3 labs in densely populated residential areas

A BSL-3 lab was set up in 2020 in Foster City in an existing Gilead building in 30 days--but that was during the Covid-emergency and they had federal grant money and oversight. The developers bragged about how they got away with doing it and how they plan to get away with it in the future.

The article reads in part: ***Focusing Gilead's real-estate strategy on scientific efficiency rather than operational economics served the company well during the pandemic. When COVID-19 hit, Joydeep Ganguly, senior vice president of corporate operations, and his team engineered and delivered a Biosafety Level 3 (BSL-3) laboratory on the main campus in only four weeks, so Gilead's scientists could work with the virus safely. Amid unprecedented urgency to create drugs, the innovative campus and laboratory systems played an important role in attracting crucial talent to the company.*** See [Workplace real estate in the Covid-19 era: From cost center to competitive advantage, Companies today should build workplaces that help them realize their strategies. Here's why and how.](#)

The article concludes by encouraging real estate developers to be bold in the face of the "unprecedented opportunity" provided by the covid-era that will allow them to

maximize their profits and make them “more competitive than ever.” It encourages developers to “prevent cultural or industry norms,” presumably environmental review and community opposition, from shaping their decisions. It reads in part:

Traditionally, real-estate choices have been made by a real-estate team that typically reports to a chief procurement or operations officer. The most important decisions are escalated to the CFO.

But today’s real-estate team has new responsibilities, namely: making the current footprint consistent with corporate objectives and the moments that matter. This calls for a different set of decision makers. The CEO can set the real-estate agenda, supported by the chief human-resources officer (CHRO), the CIO, the CFO, and the head of real estate. Experts from all these domains can help make real estate a source of competitive advantage.

In the wake of the pandemic, historical precedent or cultural or industry norms should not shape real-estate decisions. Today, a company’s larger goals must serve as the guide. CEOs and executive teams know what makes companies successful and are best positioned to create a physical environment to match. Merging a company’s approach to real estate with its strategy is a change in the way things have been done and a new responsibility. It’s also a once-in-a-generation opportunity to act boldly and emerge from the pandemic stronger and more competitive than ever.

We are confident that Redwood City Council members agree with members of the public who think that private developers’ profits and corporate objectives should not come at the expense of public health, environmental safety and transparency. We urge the city to address this strategy by requiring developers and tenants to submit new Environmental Impact reports on all proposed developments that will house biosafety labs or vivaria.

We anticipate vigorous push-back from members of the private biotech industry and lobbyists. They want to continue business as usual because they have gotten away with little local regulation or oversight in South San Francisco and other areas of Silicon Valley for years. Many of those labs are in areas east of Hwy 101 and are farther away from residential areas. They were built before there were hundreds of developers planning millions of square feet of biolabs along the Peninsula--the most sensitive, at-risk ecological area in California.

San Mateo County is the California county most threatened by sea level rise and extreme weather events because of its’ geologic limitations, proximity to the bay and the highly dense population crowded into a concentrated area between Hwy 101 and the hills near Hwy 280. This is especially true for Redwood Shores which is built on land-fill and the bay.

We are concerned that if Redwood City permits BSL-3 labs, many of those lab tenants will flock here and overwhelm the existing infrastructure, strain our already overtaxed

resources and increase the public's risk of accidental exposure to lethal pathogens from lab-acquired infectious diseases, lab accidents or lab containment failure due to flooding, fires or power outages. These risks are foreseeable.

(14) Conclusion

Thank you for considering our comments, supporting documentation and research. We summarize the key points here:

- (1) There is insufficient local oversight and regulation of private, high-containment biosafety labs;
- (2) Privately operated biosafety labs lack transparency and public accountability;
- (3) There are critical weaknesses and gaps in the federal oversight of high-containment labs;
- (4) Enhanced pandemic pathogen research conducted in BSL-3 labs poses catastrophic risks to public and environmental health and safety;
- (5) Multiple cities prohibit BSL-3 labs, vivaria and certain types of animal research near residential zoning and environmentally sensitive areas;
- (6) Cities should enact a stringent Biosafety ordinance that regulates biohazards and prohibits BSL-3 and 4 labs (Conditional Use permits for high-containment labs are inadequate due to cities' lack of expertise, lack of Biosafety committees and limited financial resources to conduct the necessary oversight);
- (7) If a city allows BSL-3 labs, it should require all developers and biosafety lab tenants to comply with strict guidelines similar to those enacted by Cambridge, MA and strictly limit the amount of square footage dedicated to BSL-3 labs;
- (8) High containment labs should not be sited within 1,500 feet of residences and the bayfront;
- (9) Scientists and researchers have identified multiple instances of lab accidents that have resulted in serious and sometimes lethal disease transmission;
- (10) High-containment labs use 5-10 times the amount of energy as other office uses and require the use of natural gas or other types of flammable gases. Millions of square feet of new biolab developments will strain our overtaxed energy grid and increase the risk of rolling blackouts;
- (11) High-containment labs are unable to comply with REACH codes and Climate Mitigation Adaption plans, including local and state prohibitions on natural gas use. They often cannot use rooftop solar panels due to tall exhaust stacks;
- (12) High-containment labs use an inordinate amount of water, cannot use recycled water and will strain county water storage capacity;
- (13) Fire departments and first responders may choose not to enter BSL-3 labs in the event of a fire or emergency due to the risks of exposure to potentially lethal pathogens; and
- (14) We ask Redwood City to reject developers' strategies and tactics that have allowed them to circumvent stringent environmental review and public hearings in order to site BSL-3 labs in densely populated residential areas.

We respectfully request that you reject Longfellow's Redwood Life application for a new Precise Plan for the Westport Office park and preserve the existing Final Westport Specific Plan.

In addition, please reject Redwood Life's proposed siting of high-containment Biosafety level BSL-3 labs in this development. We hope you will join other cities in enacting a Biosafety Ordinance that will regulate Biosafety levels and prohibit high-containment biohazard labs (BSL-3 and 4) in Redwood City.

We greatly appreciate your careful and thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

Debbie and Gary Baldocchi
San Carlos residents

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: George England <george_england@att.net>
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2023 4:30 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Redwood Life Development

Regarding the Redevelopment of the Westport Site:

Redwood Shores was planned as a community with a balance between residential and commercial development. The scale of the redevelopment project proposed by Redwood Life will completely change the character of the neighborhood. It will tip the balance between homes and businesses in the direction of commercial development. This is not what those of us who live in the immediate vicinity of the site expected to have to live with when we moved to the Shores.

Let's keep the Westport Specific Plan and the maintain our balanced community .

Regards,

George England

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: genecampbell99@gmail.com
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2023 4:14 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from genecampbell99@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

Please preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan is thoughtfully designed to balance the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life.

There is plenty of land nearer the freeway that is more appropriate for this type of industry, and there is no need to have such massive structures in a residential neighborhood. There are plenty of smaller buildings near the freeway that could be redeveloped rather than bringing the associated biological and chemical hazards well into a residential neighborhood.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive buildings, roughly twice as tall as the current ones, built on a hilltop and looming over the residents below.
- Greatly increased industrial noise and light pollution in a residential neighborhood.
- Biosafety level 3 infectious agents and toxins in a residential neighborhood.

Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, a fine library, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents that could leak.

A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people living nearby. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Gene Campbell

236 Monaco Drive

From: richard kim <rkimneuro@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2023 10:04 AM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to *preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form***. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study

infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Richard Kim, M.D.

3 Oceanside Way, Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: ray fowler <rayfowler@live.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 22, 2023 8:31 AM
To: GRP-City Council; GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Westport Specific Plan study session
Attachments: Two-story vs. Six-story.pptx

You don't often get email from rayfowler@live.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Redwood City Council

Thank you for scheduling a study session for next Monday, April 4, 2023 to consider Longfellow Real Estate Partners' proposal to build a massively out of place office and bioscience complex on its Redwood LIFE campus.

There are a lot of numbers being tossed around, but the bottom line is that Longfellow's project is too large, will add thousands of commuters driving through residential neighborhoods, will not be completed for 20+ years, and most importantly... the project will worsen the affordable housing crisis in Redwood City. All those numbers are reason enough to reject Longfellow's proposal.


However, there are other reasons to reject the proposal. The Council takes pride in being a progressive political body. Setting political philosophies aside, the Council's brand of progressiveism focuses on improving the quality of life for Redwood City residents. That's why voters elected you to serve our city's interests. Longfellow's project will do just the opposite. Yes, it would prove to be a years long inconvenience to folks living in Redwood Shores, but it will also prove to be environmentally disastrous. Consider what this oversized project will bring to Redwood City: thousands of vehicles polluting our town, businesses that will compete with Redwood City residents for scarce electric power resources, and construction that requires deep pile driving through an unlined landfill that will disturb the toxic substances buried under the Redwood LIFE campus.

I have attached two photos comparing a two-story building on the Redwood Life campus and a six-story bioscience building in a San Carlos commercial zone. I would encourage you to drive to the Redwood LIFE site and take a look at the campus, then imagine those buildings three times their current height on a property situated next to homes. That visual is also reason enough to reject Longfellow's proposal.

Sincerely,

Ray Fowler
Redwood City resident since 1986

Two-story vs. Six-story



MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: David Shen <David.Shen@proteologix.com>
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2023 6:03 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Alex Khojikian; MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto
Subject: Support for Redwood LIFE Evolve

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

I am a resident of Redwood Shores. I am also the CEO of Proteologix, based on the Redwood LIFE campus. I believe Redwood LIFE Evolve will bring tremendous benefits.

At Proteologix, our passion for science drives us to discover and develop transformative medicines that improve patient's health and quality of life. Our core mission is to deliver and develop differentiated biologics to treat immunological disease with precision immunology.

The work that we and other life science companies are doing will continue to improve the well-being of our aging population and future generations. This campus is a wonderful home for us and our employees of diverse backgrounds. As we continue to grow, we hope to do so here in Redwood City, and Redwood LIFE Evolve provides a path for us to do that.

As a resident of Redwood Shores, I look forward to the many benefits this project could bring to the community, including parks, an amenity center with events and programming, and much more.

I request that the City Council study this project and its benefits.

Thank you,

David Shen, Ph.D.

Founder, Chairman & CEO
Proteologix, Inc.
1400 Bridge Parkway
Suite 202
Redwood City, CA 94065

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Patrice Olds <polds@cityofsanmateo.org>
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2023 4:58 PM
To: GRP-City Council; Council-Jeff Gee
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Alex Khojikian; MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto
Subject: Support Letter - San Mateo Council Member Hedges for Longfellow
Attachments: Longfellow - Hedges 04.21.23.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Please find attached a letter of support from San Mateo Council Member Rich Hedges.

Patrice M. Olds, MMC
City Clerk
City of San Mateo
330 W. 20th Avenue
San Mateo, CA 94403-1388
polds@cityofsanmateo.org
www.cityofsanmateo.org
(650) 522-7042

* PRIVILEGE AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message, together with any attachments, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. It may contain information that is confidential and prohibited from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copying of this message or any attachment is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the original sender immediately by telephone or by return e-mail and delete this message along with any attachments from your computer. Thank you.



CITY OF SAN MATEO
CITY COUNCIL

330 W. 20th Avenue
San Mateo, CA 94403-1338
www.cityofsanmateo.org
(650) 522-7040

April 21, 2023

Honorable Mayor Gee and Members of the Redwood City Council
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

I am writing to express support for the Redwood LIFE Evolve proposal submitted by Longfellow Real Estate Partners, a team I've had the pleasure to work with as a neighbor in San Mateo for more than a year. In the City of San Mateo, the Longfellow team was proactive in its community relations, reaching out to neighbors and the City alike to help facilitate thoughtful discussion and progress around their work.

The Redwood LIFE Evolve will support the long-term economic vitality of Redwood City and San Mateo County by attracting and retaining top life science companies that will create thousands of new local jobs available to those with a wide range of education and skill levels. These businesses and employees will support the local economy through direct spending at local businesses and vendors.

This project is also expected to generate increased revenue for schools, city, and county services through sales and property tax revenue. The project is estimated to inject 9.1 million dollars into the Redwood City General Fund annually. Furthermore, Longfellow will make significant direct investments in the local economy during the construction phase by purchasing construction-related materials and services and creating thousands of good union wage jobs.

Longfellow's proposal to update its property comes with millions of dollars already earmarked for affordable housing, childcare, and sea level rise protections, benefits that align with Redwood City's Strategic Priorities for Children and Youth, Transportation, Housing, and Equity.

Given the project's potential to make positive, lasting changes to our entire region – I'm asking that City Council allow the project to advance and undergo environmental study.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Council Member Rich Hedges
City of San Mateo

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Shirilla, Christine <cshirilla@biocom.org>
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2023 2:36 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Alex Khojikian; MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto
Subject: Support for Redwood LIFE Evolve EIR
Attachments: Biocom California - Support Letter.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from cshirilla@biocom.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello All,

Please find attached a letter of support from Biocom California in support of the EIR process for Redwood Life Evolve. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Best,



Christine Shirilla

Manager of Public Policy, Bay Area

San Diego | Los Angeles | **Bay Area** | Sacramento | Washington, D.C. | Tokyo

1 Tower Place, Suite 150 | South San Francisco, CA 94080
(415) 367-4635 | cshirilla@biocom.org | www.biocom.org





April 21, 2023

Honorable Mayor Gee and Members of the Redwood City Council
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

On behalf of Biocom California, we're writing to express our support for the Redwood LIFE Evolve proposal submitted by Longfellow Real Estate Partners. This transformative project will deliver important community benefits while allowing Redwood City to attract world-class life science and innovation companies that will help secure long-term economic growth for future generations.

Life science is the economic backbone of the peninsula. San Mateo County is home to 807 life science establishments, employing 40,349 people at an average wage of \$274,258. The life science industry in San Mateo County represents \$14.1 billion in annual economic impact. This is not just a question of economic value – these companies are developing life-saving treatments and cures for all human ailments, improving health outcomes and quality of life.

Redwood LIFE is where leading life science companies are pioneering therapies and treatments for some of the world's most critical health issues. While the region has seen substantial growth in traditional office development, demand for purpose-built life science labs and innovation office space continues to outpace supply. The life science companies calling Redwood City home today want to grow and expand. However, they may be forced to seek opportunities in other cities if they cannot find adequate space locally, causing the City to lose vital revenue.

Redwood LIFE Evolve will create a 21st-century campus for today's leading life science companies; transform acres of surface parking into parks with expansive green, publicly accessible open spaces; address sea-level rise and invest in levee improvements; provide inviting community space for its neighbors; exceed environmental sustainability best practices; and make enhancements to the San Francisco Bay Trail.

Biocom California respectfully request that the City Council study the project without delay and initiate the CEQA process.

Sincerely,

Christine Shirilla
Manager of Public Policy, Bay Area

Biocom California

1 Tower Place, Suite 150
South San Francisco, CA 94080
415.943.9375 | BayArea@biocom.org | biocom.org

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Dylan Finch <rwc.voter@dkfmail.net>
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2023 12:24 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: April 24th Council Meeting - Comment on Agenda Item 8A

Dear Council Members,

I would like to voice my support for the Redwood Life project. This is an exciting opportunity to revitalize the existing office park and incorporate new community space. The developer has also committed \$85 million dollars for affordable housing which is huge. Redwood City is in need of more affordable housing and this money could do a great deal to help with that.

I think the issue of increased traffic is an important concern. However, I believe it could be mitigated through better public transit. Marine Pkwy and Ralston Ave connect the site directly to the Belmont Caltrain station in less than 2 miles. These roads are very wide and some space could (in partnership with Belmont) be used for new bus only lanes or light rail tracks to provide a quick and frequent connection to Caltrain which would encourage more people to take transit to the site.

Thank you for your time,
Dylan Finch
Redwood City Resident

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

Subject: Please support the Redwood LIFE Evolve Plan for its impact on affordable housing

From: Joseph Vandernorth <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2023 5:26 PM

To: Council-Jeff Gee <jgee@redwoodcity.org>

Subject: Please support the Redwood LIFE Evolve Plan for its impact on affordable housing

You don't often get email from info@email.actionnetwork.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Mayor Jeff Gee,

I write in strong support of the Redwood LIFE Evolve plan. Redwood City and the rest of the Bay Area have a severe housing shortage, displacement, and affordability crisis. To alleviate our region's housing problem, more affordable homes for various income levels must be built. Unfortunately, one of the biggest barriers to affordable housing is funding, and it is critical we produce innovative solutions to build affordable new homes.

Some of the benefits of the Redwood LIFE Evolve plan include:

Investment for affordable new homes: The biggest issue cities face when it comes to producing subsidized affordable housing is the lack of financial resources. Longfellow's commitment of \$85 million, well beyond the required amount for affordable housing in Redwood City, will make a considerable positive impact on the surrounding community. Longfellow has partnered with Eden Housing, a well-known affordable housing producer, to identify potential target projects to fund. Eden Housing estimates that approximately \$10 million of Longfellow's contribution could be leveraged to produce 100 affordable one- to three-bedroom units for extremely low and very low-income families. Based on these calculations, Longfellow's proposed \$85 million contribution could generate as many as 850 affordable units in Redwood City.

Environmental sustainability and open space: The Redwood LIFE Evolve project will transform acres of surface parking into parks with expansive green, publicly accessible open spaces, as well as make visual and scenic enhancements to the San Francisco Bay Trail. The Redwood LIFE Evolve project will update its outdated office park into a modern campus designed to meet LEED Gold Standards. It will also accelerate critical sustainability initiatives for Redwood City, including the City's Climate Action Plan and resiliency goals. This includes transforming

Redwood LIFE Evolve into a 100% electric life science campus and eliminating the use of natural gas on-site, drastically reducing carbon emissions.

Creating childcare access: Beyond the housing shortage, we also have a significant childcare shortage. Infant and early childhood care have been shown to deliver tremendous benefits for communities, families, and children. However, according to a 2022 needs assessment conducted by the San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council, Redwood City lacks the resources to fill 1,103 subsidized spaces for children 0 to 4 years old because of a lack of funding. Longfellow has committed to providing \$2 million to BuildUp San Mateo to support their grant program, which directs resources to the most urgent childcare needs in Redwood City, such as subsidizing low-income infant child care and supporting teacher recruitment and retention.

Please support the Redwood Life Evolve plan without delay!

Joseph Vandernorth

joseph.vandernorth@gmail.com

Woodside, California 94062

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

Subject: FW: Redwood City EVOLVE

From: Azad Husain <dazahusain@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2023 4:28 PM

To: Council-Jeff Gee <jgee@redwoodcity.org>

Subject: Redwood City EVOLVE

You don't often get email from dazahusain@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Jeff,

My name is Azad Husain and I have been a resident of Redwood Shores for over 25 years. I am writing in support of the Redwood LIFE Evolve project.

I love living in Redwood Shores. It is a beautiful, safe, and walkable community. I have raised my family here and I am proud to call it home. I am a frequent user of the Bay Trail, walking from my home to the library. I am excited about the potential for the Redwood LIFE Evolve project to improve the area around the library for walking, biking, and public transit.

I also have a personal reason to support this project. You see, in 2018, my wife was diagnosed with multiple myeloma. My wife underwent chemotherapy and radiation treatment, but the cancer is never really gone. She is currently undergoing clinical trials for a new treatment. This will make it easier for my wife to get around, even as she continues to battle cancer.

Multiple myeloma may be a rare and incurable disease, but there is hope. There are many life science companies that are working on developing new therapies and cures for multiple myeloma and other cancers. Some of these companies might move to the Redwood LIFE Evolve campus if it is approved.

The project will also create thousands of new local jobs for people with diverse backgrounds and skill levels. This will benefit not only the residents of Redwood Shores, but also the entire region of San Mateo County.

I believe that the Redwood LIFE Evolve project will be a win-win for Redwood Shores and for San Mateo County. It will generate millions of dollars in new tax revenue as well as to contribute to our city's affordable housing goals. It will also showcase Redwood Shores as a leader in life science and innovation.

The alternatives to the Redwood LIFE Evolve project are unacceptable. They would leave our community less walkable and bikeable, and they would not create as many jobs or boost the economy.

I urge you to approve the Redwood LIFE Evolve project. It is a positive development for our community and it will make a real difference in the lives of our residents.

Thank you for your consideration

Best

Azad

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Brigitte & Earl Aiken <stopredwoodlife@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2023 11:22 AM
To: GRP-City Council; GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Effects of Redwood LIFE massive life science campus on Redwood City

To Redwood City council members,

I am reaching out to each of you to ask for your support in opposing Longfellow Redwood LIFE's massive plan, as currently proposed.

This proposed plan calls for a **3.1 million square feet life science campus** between Belmont slough and Marine Parkway in the middle of residential neighborhoods. The demolition and construction will take **20 years to complete**, and this project will bring **7,000 to 13,800 employees**. This number of employees is calculated based on similar developments in the area.

Because of the massive size of this proposed project, there will be negative effects for Redwood City and the surrounding cities. If it passes, we can have:

- Worse traffic congestion on Highway 101 and local streets.
- Higher housing and living costs.
- Rising utilities rates.
- Increase in inequality and social exclusion.

I understand this project can bring some economic benefits to the city; however, the social effects on the lower income residents will be negative and devastated. I urge the city council to weigh those effects when make the final decision.

Each of you has seen signatures for our petition Stop Redwood LIFE weekly. We are an independent grassroots movement of residents and have opposed this project since October 2021. We do not solicit donations to fund our activities and grow through networking.

We ask for your support to oppose this giant project as proposed.

Thank you,

Brigitte Aiken

Stop Redwood Life!

The grassroots movement to stop Redwood Life redevelopment

Web site: www.stopredwoodlife.net

Phone: 650-533-9393

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Rami Elghandour <rami@arcellx.com>
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2023 10:21 AM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Alex Khojikian; MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto
Subject: Support for Redwood LIFE Evolve

Dear City Council,

I am writing to express my support for the Redwood LIFE Evolve project.

I am both a resident of Redwood Shores and the CEO of Arcellx, located on the Redwood LIFE campus.

Our mission at Arcellx is to contribute to a world without cancer by developing advanced cell therapies that enhance efficacy, reduce side effects, and improve accessibility. Our pipeline is growing and ambitious, and includes a potential best in class treatment for multiple myeloma and a pipeline in solid tumors like lung cancer.

As we grow, we hope to do so here. Redwood LIFE Evolve is an opportunity for Redwood City to take part in the many benefits of being home to life science companies. Redwood shores is centrally located and allows us to provide opportunities for local residents as well as draw on talent across the Bay Area.

We are proud to be part of a campus that serves the community's goals. Longfellow has already opened its campus up to neighbors and to local non-profits. Among the many benefits, the proposed parks and community center will allow them to do even more. The project will also generate \$9.1 million in annual revenue to the General Fund, which I understand is critical given the City's projected budget deficits for the next 5+ years.

I hope that the City Council votes to study this project and its many benefits.

Sincerely,
Rami

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Barbara Kelsey <barbara.kelsey@sierraclub.org>
Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2023 12:18 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: Gita Dev; Gladwyn d'Souza; Jennifer Hetterly; James Eggers; dave pine; rmueller@smcgov.org; len; Mike Ferreira; Nina Goodale; dcarch
Subject: Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter comment letter re: Redwood Life Project in Redwood Shores
Attachments: Sierra Club - Rewood Life Letter 4-20-23 docx.pdf
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

April 20, 2023

Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council
City of Redwood City

Subject: Redwood Life project in Redwood Shores - Sierra Club recommends preserving the existing Westport Specific Plan and not allowing BSL-3 labs

Dear Mayor Gee and Council Members of Redwood City,

The Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter's Sustainable Land Use Committee advocates for land use issues, and the Bay Alive Campaign advocates for the ecological health of San Francisco Bay. We strongly recommend that no Biosafety Level 3 or Level 4 labs (BSL-3 and BSL-4) be built in Redwood Shores or Redwood City.

Please find our comment letter attached where we note the areas of concern regarding the Redwood Life proposed development, as well as concerns about its compatibility with Redwood City's General Plan and Public Safety Element.

For all the reasons noted in our letter, we strongly urge you to preserve the existing Westport Specific Plan at this site and also reject the establishment of any high-containment BSL-3 and BSL-4 labs in Redwood Shores and Redwood City.

Respectfully submitted,

Gita Dev, Co-Chair, Sustainable Land Use Committee, Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter
Gladwyn d'Souza, Chair, Conservation Committee, Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter
Jennifer Chang Hetterly, Campaign Coordinator, Bay Alive, Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter

Cc: James Eggers, Executive Director, Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter
Dave Pine, Chair, Board Of Supervisors, San Mateo County
Ray Mueller, Board of Supervisors District 3, San Mateo County
Len Materman, OneShoreline, San Mateo County

--

Sent by:

Barbara Kelsey

she/her/hers


Chapter Coordinator

Sierra Club, Loma Prieta Chapter

3921 E. Bayshore Rd, Suite 204

Palo Alto, CA 94303

barbara.kelsey@sierraclub.org



MGR-Crystal Tuifua

Subject: Please support the Redwood LIFE Evolve Plan for its impact on affordable housing

From: Joseph Vandernorth <info@email.actionnetwork.org>

Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2023 5:26 PM

To: Council-Jeff Gee <jgee@redwoodcity.org>

Subject: Please support the Redwood LIFE Evolve Plan for its impact on affordable housing

You don't often get email from info@email.actionnetwork.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Mayor Jeff Gee,

I write in strong support of the Redwood LIFE Evolve plan. Redwood City and the rest of the Bay Area have a severe housing shortage, displacement, and affordability crisis. To alleviate our region's housing problem, more affordable homes for various income levels must be built. Unfortunately, one of the biggest barriers to affordable housing is funding, and it is critical we produce innovative solutions to build affordable new homes.

Some of the benefits of the Redwood LIFE Evolve plan include:

Investment for affordable new homes: The biggest issue cities face when it comes to producing subsidized affordable housing is the lack of financial resources. Longfellow's commitment of \$85 million, well beyond the required amount for affordable housing in Redwood City, will make a considerable positive impact on the surrounding community. Longfellow has partnered with Eden Housing, a well-known affordable housing producer, to identify potential target projects to fund. Eden Housing estimates that approximately \$10 million of Longfellow's contribution could be leveraged to produce 100 affordable one- to three-bedroom units for extremely low and very low-income families. Based on these calculations, Longfellow's proposed \$85 million contribution could generate as many as 850 affordable units in Redwood City.

Environmental sustainability and open space: The Redwood LIFE Evolve project will transform acres of surface parking into parks with expansive green, publicly accessible open spaces, as well as make visual and scenic enhancements to the San Francisco Bay Trail. The Redwood LIFE Evolve project will update its outdated office park into a modern campus designed to meet LEED Gold Standards. It will also accelerate critical sustainability initiatives for Redwood City, including the City's Climate Action Plan and resiliency goals. This includes transforming

Redwood LIFE Evolve into a 100% electric life science campus and eliminating the use of natural gas on-site, drastically reducing carbon emissions.

Creating childcare access: Beyond the housing shortage, we also have a significant childcare shortage. Infant and early childhood care have been shown to deliver tremendous benefits for communities, families, and children. However, according to a 2022 needs assessment conducted by the San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council, Redwood City lacks the resources to fill 1,103 subsidized spaces for children 0 to 4 years old because of a lack of funding. Longfellow has committed to providing \$2 million to BuildUp San Mateo to support their grant program, which directs resources to the most urgent childcare needs in Redwood City, such as subsidizing low-income infant child care and supporting teacher recruitment and retention.

Please support the Redwood Life Evolve plan without delay!

Joseph Vandenorth

joseph.vandenorth@gmail.com

Woodside, California 94062

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

Subject: FW: Redwood City EVOLVE

From: Azad Husain <dazahusain@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2023 4:28 PM

To: Council-Jeff Gee <jgee@redwoodcity.org>

Subject: Redwood City EVOLVE

You don't often get email from dazahusain@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Jeff,

My name is Azad Husain and I have been a resident of Redwood Shores for over 25 years. I am writing in support of the Redwood LIFE Evolve project.

I love living in Redwood Shores. It is a beautiful, safe, and walkable community. I have raised my family here and I am proud to call it home. I am a frequent user of the Bay Trail, walking from my home to the library. I am excited about the potential for the Redwood LIFE Evolve project to improve the area around the library for walking, biking, and public transit.

I also have a personal reason to support this project. You see, in 2018, my wife was diagnosed with multiple myeloma. My wife underwent chemotherapy and radiation treatment, but the cancer is never really gone. She is currently undergoing clinical trials for a new treatment. This will make it easier for my wife to get around, even as she continues to battle cancer.

Multiple myeloma may be a rare and incurable disease, but there is hope. There are many life science companies that are working on developing new therapies and cures for multiple myeloma and other cancers. Some of these companies might move to the Redwood LIFE Evolve campus if it is approved.

The project will also create thousands of new local jobs for people with diverse backgrounds and skill levels. This will benefit not only the residents of Redwood Shores, but also the entire region of San Mateo County.

I believe that the Redwood LIFE Evolve project will be a win-win for Redwood Shores and for San Mateo County. It will generate millions of dollars in new tax revenue as well as to contribute to our city's affordable housing goals. It will also showcase Redwood Shores as a leader in life science and innovation.

The alternatives to the Redwood LIFE Evolve project are unacceptable. They would leave our community less walkable and bikeable, and they would not create as many jobs or boost the economy.

I urge you to approve the Redwood LIFE Evolve project. It is a positive development for our community and it will make a real difference in the lives of our residents.

Thank you for your consideration

Best

Azad



SIERRA CLUB

LOMA PRIETA CHAPTER

SAN MATEO, SANTA CLARA & SAN BENITO COUNTIES

April 20, 2023

Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council
City of Redwood City
Via email: council@redwoodcity.org

Subject: Redwood Life project in Redwood Shores - Sierra Club recommends preserving the existing Westport Specific Plan and not allowing BSL-3 labs

Dear Mayor Gee and Council Members of Redwood City,

The Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter's Sustainable Land Use Committee advocates for land use issues, and the Bay Alive Campaign advocates for the ecological health of San Francisco Bay. We strongly recommend that no Biosafety Level 3 or Level 4 labs (BSL-3 and BSL-4) be built in Redwood Shores or Redwood City.

Recently, the Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter organized a webinar, "[Planning for Life Sciences Development for Bay Area Cities](#)." The event featured experts from the Boston/Cambridge area, a historic hub for life sciences in the US, and included biosafety experts. An important fact emerged, with decades of experience in the industry and the growing awareness of the increasingly lethal agents used in high-containment BSL-3 and maximum containment BSL-4 labs, several cities in the greater Boston/Cambridge metropolitan area are reversing or have already reversed their biosafety policies to no longer allow BSL-3 or higher labs in their cities, and more are joining their ranks. Some do not even allow BSL-2 labs. Please see [here](#) a partial list of cities and links to their ordinances.

BSL-3 high-containment labs, as defined by the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services,¹ work with indigenous or exotic agents with known potential for airborne transmission or pathogens that may cause serious and potentially lethal infections.² They require complete dependence on mechanical systems that can fail³ through human error, mechanical failure or disasters, as well as safety oversight issues.⁴ They may work well in institutions that have rigorous scientific safety oversight, committees that ensure an understanding of risks,

¹ <https://www.phe.gov/s3/BioriskManagement/biosafety/Pages/Biosafety-FAQ.aspx#biocont8>

² *Gao-18-145, High-Containment Laboratories: Coordinated Actions Needed ...*
<https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-18-145.pdf>.

³ [Boston University](#), June 1, 2016: "A malfunctioning network switch at BU's [National Emerging Infectious Diseases Laboratories \(NEIDL\)](#) resulted in a shutdown of parts of the lab's ventilation monitoring system ... The University has suspended BSL-3 research until the outside engineers review recommended remedial work to prevent future ventilation system malfunctions." There are many such examples.

⁴ [You should be afraid of the next "lab leak"](#), NY Times Nov 23, 2021. "...In fact, the most concerning aspect about high-containment biolabs is that, considered as a collective, they may only be as safe as the worst lab among them. A breach or a breakdown at one could imperil us all."

transparency, regular reporting and inspections, and biosafety procedures for worker, public and environmental safety. **Redwood City does not have such structures in place for this responsibility.**

We note the following areas of concern regarding the Redwood Life proposed development, as well as concerns about its compatibility with Redwood City's General Plan and Public Safety Element.

1. **Sea level rise is a serious problem for this highly vulnerable site.** The proposed project sits atop the former Westport Landfill, which reportedly contains undifferentiated waste and has a history of various toxic contaminants.⁵ The fill has no lining underneath it and sits on bay mud through which groundwater can migrate with sea level rise.

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region, is already concerned about the "inherent vulnerability" of this landfill to rising sea level, groundwater rise, and extreme storm events.⁶

The development proposes driving thousands of additional piles, breaking through the cap of the vulnerable landfill, for new 130' tall high-rise buildings. Disturbance of the landfill, which is already a concern for water quality, could release toxins into the Bay water which would pollute the [Redwood Shores Ecological Reserve](#) wetlands in Belmont Slough.

2. **The project asks entitlements for Biosafety levels 1 thru 3 (BSL-1, BSL-2 as well as high risk, high containment BSL-3 labs).** High-risk, high-containment labs adjacent to sensitive natural ecosystems of the [Redwood Shores Ecological Reserve](#) could detrimentally impact the Bay ecology itself. Wildlife and Bay water quality are at risk as Belmont Creek flows through this zone of sensitive wetlands in the Bay. Flooding and seismic events are extremely predictable hazards in this part of the Bay Area, therefore biosafety concerns related to BSL-3 labs are a critical issue.
3. **Building heights would far exceed Westport Specific Plan standards.** Proposed 130' tall buildings, plus potential 16' to 26' tall rooftop mechanical and lab exhaust equipment, would be much taller than allowed in the existing Westport Specific Plan (maximum 53' heights) and would loom over existing housing. These would also potentially cause shading of wetlands of the [Reserve](#) that are vitally important for wildlife.
4. **The site adjoins residential development.** The proposed Redwood Life project would allow high-risk, high-containment BSL-3 labs and animal research labs (A-BSL-3) in proximity to an already mature residential area and the Bayfront, potentially endangering residents as well as wildlife in the slough with unknown, highly infectious agents.
5. **Redwood Shores, especially this area, has a history of flooding and flood events are increasing with climate change.** The proposed changes to the site, including

⁵ GeoMatrix Consultants. "Revised Discharge Monitoring Plan Westport Landfill Site Redwood City, California," pg. 9

⁶ https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/board_decisions/adopted_orders/2022/R2-2022-0031.pdf Oct. 13, 2022

raising the elevations at this site, could result in surrounding residential areas receiving more flooding. Rising ground water is also an increased risk in this low-lying neighborhood.

6. **The area is in a “high liquefaction” zone per the USGS seismic hazard maps.** In a serious seismic event, which is very predictable, lab facilities and, especially, supportive utilities, necessary for containment of biohazardous agents, can be damaged and disrupted causing a biohazard event.
7. **Reduced setbacks in the proposed plan could constrain future sea level rise (SLR) protection options.** It is anticipated that SLR projections will worsen over time. Thus, it is critically important that shoreline developments reserve sufficient setback/buffer zones to accommodate a variety of flood protection strategies that can be strengthened over time, including nature-based and hybrid solutions. A setback of 100 feet or more along the bay edge may be needed for this purpose.⁷
8. **Reduced setbacks in the proposed plan would exacerbate noise and air quality impacts on established residential neighborhoods.** All biolabs require more HVAC equipment, exhaust systems and emergency generators than office buildings, and are more noisy than other commercial buildings. Indeed, several cities have adopted noise ordinances for labs as well as requiring lab buildings to be set back from residences as much as 500'.⁸ High containment Biosafety level 3 labs (BSL-3) are required to have additional dedicated air handling units, some with exhausts as tall as 26', as well as redundant systems to contain highly contagious disease agents. The exhaust air quality can also be an issue for this industry as the air that the labs expel requires high levels of filtration using mechanical filters that can fail to perform perfectly and could exacerbate asthma and other disease risks in neighboring residential areas.⁹
9. **Peninsula counties and cities lack oversight policies and powers for biosafety and biosecurity.** San Mateo County Environmental Health staff report that they have no authority or responsibility to inspect for biohazards or biohazard incidents, with the exception of the Coronavirus pandemic.¹⁰ The State hazardous materials databases, which fire departments and emergency responders depend upon, include chemical and

⁷ OneShoreline’s Planning Guidance Policy, Draft April 2023. <https://oneshoreline.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/OneShoreline-Planning-Guidance-Policy-4.19.23-Public-Draft.pdf>
Burlingame Sea Level Rise Ordinance, December 6, 2021: “Buffer zones extending 100 feet inland from the San Francisco Bay Shoreline are intended to provide an area to accommodate and maintain built and natural shoreline infrastructure for sea level rise protection, environmental enhancement, and public access trails.”
https://cms6.revize.com/revize/burlingamecity/document_center/Planning/25.12.050%20-%20Adopted.pdf

⁸ The City of Berkeley has a 500’ setback for BSL-2 labs and does not allow BSL-3 labs. “*Commercial Physical or Biological Laboratories: Commercial physical or biological laboratories using Class 3 organisms are not permitted in the MU-LI district. Use of Class 2 organisms are permitted only in locations at least 500 feet from a Residential District or a MU-R district.*” Several other cities have 500’ setbacks.

⁹ “[Residential Proximity to Environmental Hazards and Adverse Health Outcomes](#)” December 2011, National Library of Medicine, National Center for Biotechnology Information.

¹⁰ In meetings with the San Mateo County Office of Environmental Health and the Sierra Club Biosafety working group on January 9, 2023 and including San Mateo County Supervisor Pine and staff on February 2, 2023.

radiological hazards but do not include biological hazards.

10. **The federal government and the scientific community are expressing increasing concern about proliferation of privately-funded BSL-3 labs where new risky research could be conducted and which are not subject to federal regulatory oversight.**¹¹ Concern about these risks of biotechnology is also growing world-wide.¹² Allowing the proliferation of these facilities, without proper federal regulation and oversight, presents a significant risk to public safety. It is also incompatible with Redwood City's General Plan Public Safety Element.¹³

11. **Finally, this proposal will seriously exacerbate the jobs/housing imbalance.** Redwood Life will bring in about 10,000 new jobs, which will require approximately 6,000 new units of housing to maintain a rough jobs / housing balance. The proposed contribution of \$85M will fund about 100 new units at today's high costs of \$700,000 - \$1,000,000 per unit.¹⁴ Redwood Life will just exacerbate the current housing shortage on the Peninsula. Redwood City would be far better off without this huge project.

In summary, it is time for Redwood City to draft an ordinance and zoning classification that considers the unique nature of the Life Sciences industry relevant to its BioSafety Levels and prohibits potentially hazardous, high risk, high-containment labs at Biosafety levels 3 and 4 including animal research labs (ABSL-3 & 4). A Life Science facility is not a typical commercial office; it may include offices, but its core is a biotech laboratory. At the higher biosafety levels 3 and 4, these can contain a wide array of biohazardous materials and experiments posing multiple local and even possibly global threats. Therefore, it is important to recognize that they come with a broad spectrum of risk. This is a safety issue of critical concern for public safety and security, for the environment, and for residents rightly concerned for their families.

For all the reasons given above, we strongly urge you to preserve the existing Westport Specific Plan at this site and also reject the establishment of any high-containment BSL-3 and BSL-4 labs in Redwood Shores and Redwood City.

¹¹ The National Institutes of Health (NIH) formed an advisory working group, the National Science Advisory Board for Biosecurity (NSABB). Two NSABB working group meetings in 2022 and 2023 concerned Biosafety and Biosecurity. In response to concerns over the "problem" of regulatory oversight gaps in privately funded research in Silicon Valley, 2023 draft NSABB Working Group recommendations include expanding regulatory oversight to privately funded research at institutions and private companies. Similarly, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), released its report in January 2023 and repeated its recommendation from a 2009 report for Health and Human Services (HHS) to identify a single government entity to assess the risk posed by the lack of oversight of privately funded research labs.

¹² Managing the Risks of Biotechnology Innovation, Global Health Program, Council on Foreign Relations, January 20, 2023

¹³ The Public Safety Element addresses those public safety issues that affect Redwood City, and promotes prevention, public education, and emergency preparedness as the approaches that will allow the community to minimize risks to life and property in the event of a disaster.

¹⁴ In 2019, the average construction cost of new below market rate housing in the Bay Area was \$664,455 per unit...In particular, counties such as Alameda, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Napa have higher average per unit costs than the Bay Area as a whole
<http://www.bayareaeconomy.org/how-much-does-it-cost-to-produce-one-unit-of-below-market-housing-in-the-bay-area/>

Respectfully submitted,

Gita Dev, Co-Chair, Sustainable Land Use Committee, Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter
Gladwyn d'Souza, Chair, Conservation Committee, Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter
Jennifer Chang Hetterly, Campaign Coordinator, Bay Alive, Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter

Cc: James Eggers, Executive Director, Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter
Dave Pine, Chair, Board Of Supervisors, San Mateo County <dpine@smcgov.org>
Ray Mueller, Board of Supervisors District 3, San Mateo County <rmueller@smcgov.org>
Len Materman, OneShoreline, San Mateo County <Len@oneshoreline.org>

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Brian Nguyen <genguyen@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2023 10:55 AM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Alex Khojikian; MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto
Subject: We Need Redwood LIFE Evolve

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

My name is Brian Nguyen, and I live just across the street from Marlin Park and am a neighbor of the Redwood LIFE campus and support Longfellow's proposed Redwood LIFE Evolve project.

I have met with Tara and Peter over the years and believe the proposed plan would greatly revitalize the campus and our community. I've attended their Zoom and in-person workshop to provide my feedback on community needs and this was well received by their planning team.

The project will bring playgrounds and sport courts that we need for our children, as well as gardens and trails that will benefit everyone, especially the elderly who live in Redwood Shores. They are proposing events and classes in partnership with Redwood City and other organizations. They have also been a great community partner, supporting local non-profits such as OneLife, Una Vida, and many more. On a personal note, I coach my daughter's 8u softball team in the Belmont Redwood Shores Youth Softball Association. During these past few months, many of our games and practices were 'rained out'. This was not due to weather, but the ability to have playable fields since our grass fields have poor drainage and were soggy most weeks. Little league baseball has priority at Marlin Park, Sand Piper Elementary, and Belmont Sports Complex turf fields, so it was a great challenge to reserve any of these facilities for our softball, which is very unfair to the girls. We could use the additional turf fields in these cases and would greatly appreciate public amenities that the RWLE project would bring.

Sea level rise is a critical risk facing Redwood Shores and the City's budget. Longfellow's project would fund protection for 15% of our shoreline and could be a catalyst for further investment from the State and Federal governments. As a civil engineer, I urge the City to take this and the other benefits seriously and begin studying the project, starting with CEQA.

I do understand our neighbors' concern over the long term environmental impacts that the project would bring, but I also do believe this project should be studied further to provide objective information so that we, as a community, can make an informed decision. I would hate to lose out on an opportunity to better our community by considering a project dead on arrival.

Thank you,

Brian

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Dawn Jedkins <djedkins@des-ae.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2023 9:45 AM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Alex Khojikian; MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto
Subject: Supporter of Redwood LIFE Evolve

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

I live in Redwood Shores and wanted to reach out to voice my support for the Redwood LIFE Evolve project. I believe the City should begin studying the project formally and initiate CEQA as soon as possible.

The project would bring substantial benefits for Redwood City, including jobs and tax revenue - \$9.1M annually to the City's general fund alone, funds are critical to continued economic success in these uncertain times. Life sciences communities continue to grow in neighboring Cities on the Peninsula. Redwood City should strongly consider life science development opportunities that would allow existing Redwood City Life Sciences businesses to grow within our own City.

Sea level rise is an urgent concern for Redwood City and Redwood Shores. This project will privately fund protection for 15% of the Shores' shoreline to year 2100, allow the City and OneShoreline to garner more potential funding through grant matches, and offset major costs to the City and taxpayers.

This project brings with it a significant amount of beautifully designed and amenitized public open space. I have lived in Redwood Shores for 15 years, and although I love my community and the Bay front setting that we are blessed with, I also recognize that many trails and public frontages are tired and outdated and in much need of a refresh.

I believe that Longfellow has been thoughtful in the design of the project and I look forward to seeing it develop as it moves through the review and approval process. The Planning process in parallel with CEQA review is designed to ensure third-party assessment with public transparency. I believe the project has many potential benefits and the City should begin formal project review without further delay.

Thank you,

Dawn

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Tony Gapastione <tony@bravemaker.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2023 11:18 AM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Alex Khojikian; MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto
Subject: Redwood LIFE Evolve Supporter

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

My name is Tony and I am the founder of a non-profit in Redwood City called BraveMaker. Me and my family are also residents of Redwood City.

I founded [BraveMaker](#) as a non-profit film arts organization in 2018 to mentor, support and elevate brave voices through film and create space for transforming community conversations.

I'm writing to you in support of the City studying the Redwood LIFE Evolve project. Longfellow's proposed investments in affordable housing, childcare, transportation, parks, and more, will bring generational benefits to Redwood City residents in all districts.

I have worked with Longfellow on partnerships and programs and believe they are a good community partner. Please consider their application and the many benefits it could bring. I want to see Redwood City thrive and appreciate your service to our community.

Hope to see you at our fifth annual [film fest July 13-16th, 2023](#). And catch us in the Fourth of July parade. You won't want to miss it!

Thank you!

Tony Gapastione

(He/Him)

Founder | Executive Director

BraveMaker

233 Topaz St. Redwood City, Ca 94062

501c3 NonProfit EIN 82-5102678

phone: 650-701-7661

www.bravemaker.org



Brave Stories Change The World. You are the Story.

Become a DONOR and support our work at

BraveMaker.com/Donate

From: [Abhishek Ghuwalewala](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan
Date: Saturday, April 15, 2023 8:50:28 AM

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Thanks,

Abhishek Ghuwalewala

From: [Adam Inglis](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Cc: [CD-Ryan Kuchenig](#); [MGR-Alex Khojikian](#); [MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz](#); [CD-Jeff Schwob](#); [CD-Margaret Netto](#)
Subject: Redwood LIFE Evolve Project - Community Support & Feedback
Date: Saturday, April 15, 2023 7:48:01 PM

You don't often get email from inglis.adam@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To the City Council,

My name is Adam Inglis and I am a resident of Redwood Shores having moved here from downtown Redwood City about 8 years ago. I also work in Redwood City at the office complexes off Seaport Blvd.

I don't normally write to the council about local matters, but I understand that you are evaluating the Redwood LIFE Evolve project in Redwood Shores which I also understand has generated some concerns/NIMBYism among those in the area.

I am writing to you to express my *strong support* for the Redwood LIFE Evolve project and wanted to make sure you heard that support coming from the community as well. I learned more about the project at a recent Farmer's Market that the developer hosted on the site and that my daughter enjoyed immensely.

The current site of the proposed development is a bit of an industrial wasteland offering few benefits to the residents of Redwood Shores and some excessively large parking lots. From what I know of the proposed project, I believe that it would bring many benefits to our community, including:

- * Meaningful contributions to Redwood City's tax and development impact revenues
- * Infrastructure and levee improvements to protect Redwood Shores (which I do worry about with the increasing frequency of severe weather events and expected ocean level rises)
- * Good jobs that generate additional opportunities for local businesses and increased tax revenue for the community
- * Additional parks or community spaces that can be used by local families rather than parking lots.

The transformation of an old office park to new parks, amenities and employment opportunities will be a great benefit to my daughter, other families like ours, and the community as a whole. So much so that I feel it would be irresponsible not to put my support behind it and encourage you all to expedite your review of the project's details.

I look forward to the City beginning its review so the City and community can see these benefits as soon as possible.

Thank you for your time,

Adam Inglis

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: C Kuan Carlino <ckcarlino@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 9:32 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.** The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs
I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome.

Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

C Kuan Carlino

From: [Chris Tow](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan
Date: Friday, April 14, 2023 8:19:55 PM

You don't often get email from chris.tow@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to *preserve* the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses,

increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to ***preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form***. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Chris Tow
400 Whisper Ln
Redwood City, CA 94065

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Chuck Sholtz <chuck_sholtz@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 3:16 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Consider the Redwood LIFE Precise Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I am a resident of Redwood Shores and would like to voice my support for adopting the new Redwood LIFE Precise Plan. I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would add much needed vitality to the area and bring valued high-paying life sciences jobs to the region.

There is a very vocal NIMBY opposition to the Redwood LIFE Precise Plan (spearheaded by the "Save the Shores" organization) but I believe I am part of the silent majority of residents that favors a reinvestment in and redevelopment of the area. It would mean local eateries and jobs within walking distance of our homes, and a neighborhood reinvigorated with much needed hustle-and-bustle and new faces.

I urge you to favorably consider the Redwood LIFE Precise Plan. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Chuck Sholtz
1002 Salt Court
Redwood City, CA 94065

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Corey Smith <corey@housingactioncoalition.org>
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2023 4:34 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; MGR-Alex Khojikian; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: HAC re Redwood LIFE Project
Attachments: HAC Redwood LIFE_ Evolve Housing Plan Letter (2).pdf

Members of the Redwood City Council,

On behalf of the Housing Action Coalition, please see our attached letter supporting the Redwood LIFE project. The funding the project provides for affordable housing is a great opportunity for the city and region as a whole. Please do everything within your power to move this forward as fast as possible.

Respectfully,
Corey Smith
Executive Director, Housing Action Coalition

--

Corey Smith 陈锐 | Pronouns: He/Him

Executive Director | Housing Action Coalition
50 Otis Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 541-9001 | Cell: (925) 360-5290



Email: corey@housingactioncoalition.org | Web: housingactioncoalition.org
Please note the new email and website.

To opt out of all HAC emails, respond to this email with "unsubscribe all".



50 Otis Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 541.9001
info@housingactioncoalition.org
housingactioncoalition.org

April 6th, 2023

To whom it may concern,

On behalf of the Housing Action Coalition, we're pleased to share our support of the proposed Redwood LIFE plan due to the project's significant investment in affordable housing in Redwood City.

The Housing Action Coalition (HAC) is a member-funded non-profit organization whose mission is to advocate for more housing for residents of all income levels across the state of California. To that end, HAC does everything we can to help increase the amount of funding available for affordable housing. While it is not in HAC's mission to support non-housing projects, the number of new homes that will be generated from the Redwood LIFE plan presents a significant opportunity to bolster Redwood City's affordable housing supply.

The biggest issue cities face when it comes to producing subsidized affordable housing is the lack of financial resources. Longfellow's commitment of \$85 million, well beyond the required amount for affordable housing in Redwood City, will make a considerable impact on the community and surrounding area. Based on our experience and conversations with affordable builders, we believe that funding could result in 850 new subsidized affordable homes at no cost to taxpayers.

We look forward to working with Longfellow and other HAC members to ensure that the funding becomes available and leveraged as soon as possible so these homes can get built. For that reason, we respectfully request the City Council direct staff to allow the project to move forward and begin its CEQA review.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Corey Smith".

Corey Smith, *Executive Director*
Housing Action Coalition (HAC)

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Darius Wiles <darius@dariuswiles.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 5, 2023 4:26 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: The Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan is worth considering

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

The short version of this email is that I believe there are potentially enough benefits to the proposed Redwood LIFE development to outweigh the disadvantages. I believe it is worth seriously considering the proposal and being more flexible than the Westport Specific Plan allows if the council believes that's in the city's best interests. The various advocacy groups fighting the redevelopment claim to represent Redwood Shores homeowners, but don't.

Expanding on my last point, the advocacy groups seem composed of small groups of individuals who strongly oppose any development. They don't seem interested in actually hearing the views of homeowners and to my knowledge none have actually polled homeowners for their opinions. Yet these groups claim to speak on behalf of Redwood Shores residents. I urge you to realize that though these groups are making a lot of noise, they only represent the small number of people running them.

I am slightly in favor of Redwood LIFE redevelopment, providing the council believes it will not have major negative consequences, such as the release of toxic materials from the landfill under the current office park. I live in Beacon Shores, which is relatively close to the site, and I'm willing to tolerate some inconvenience as a result of a redevelopment in order to gain the benefits.

The advocacy groups have many objections that I don't think have merit, such as:

- Tall buildings - the Oracle buildings just across the slough are much taller than the proposed buildings and don't cause any major issues of which I'm aware.
- Traffic - the new elementary school and associated housing, the Oracle high tech school, and the trucks required for the wastewater plant expansion were all separately predicted to bring traffic chaos. None did, and it will be the same for the proposed redevelopment.
- Wildlife - I have seen literally no substance to the claim wildlife will be impacted by redevelopment. In fact, the proposed development aims to replace many of the current asphalt parking lots with green space, which looks like a net benefit to wildlife to me.

Release of toxic materials under the current site and dangers of businesses handling biohazardous materials are concerns I do share, but I trust the council to ensure these are adequately addressed. The proposed raising of the levees should also fit in the council's overall plans for flood protection.

Redeveloping the Redwood LIFE park is worth considering as long as all valid concerns can be addressed to the council's satisfaction.

Sincerely,
Darius Wiles

From: [Denise Brosseau](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Subject: Redwood LIFE development proposal
Date: Monday, April 17, 2023 3:05:32 PM

Dear Mayor Gee & Members of the City Council-

I live and work in Redwood Shores and I am concerned about the new Redwood LIFE development project. While I am not a NIMBY type, I already lived through the previous painful months and months of trucks, noise, traffic, etc. when they built the present structures about 20 years ago and I am not looking forward to having to go through that again. But what most concerns me is that I have read that the hardscape that was designed to cover the landfill under the present buildings is not rated for much taller structures. I am not sure if this is true or not, but if it is, then I would strongly urge you not to approve the higher proposed buildings.

The truth is that if they rip up the parking lots and put in a parking structure or two, they have plenty of room out there already for a hotel, convention center, etc. They do not need tall structures that will likely not add to the look of the Shores (do we really want to be another Foster City?) and may cause untold harm to the environment if what's under the hardscape escapes into the atmosphere. Also, there are a lot of birds that enjoy the Redwood Shores area as a sanctuary. I am concerned that additional development will chase these lovely creatures away.

Finally, there is a lot of traffic in Redwood Shores when the Oracle buildings are fully occupied. Adding additional workers will not help and will likely very much add to the traffic burdens of those of us who live here. If they want to do additional development, might they consider work/live housing so we give people a place to live as well as work in Redwood Shores and not have them leave at the end of their workday snarling the ingress and egress? That would be preferable.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Denise Brosseau
Former Chair, Housing and Human Concerns Committee, Redwood City
Redwood City Resident, Business Owner and Homeowner
62 Pelican Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
650-520-0401

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

From: [Dorra Sellami](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan
Date: Friday, April 14, 2023 8:38:20 PM

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Dorra Sellami, MD

From: baiken3033@gmail.com
To: [GRP-City Council](#); [GRP-City Clerk](#)
Cc: [CD-Ryan Kuchenig](#)
Subject: Realistic Estimate of Actual Number of Longfellow Redwood LIFE Employees
Date: Monday, April 17, 2023 12:28:55 PM

Dear Council members.

Longfellow's plan of November 22, 2022 projects 6,909 employees for 3,169,000 square feet of R&D/Office space, or 459 employees per square foot. A comparison to similar developments shows this estimate of the total number of employees to be unrealistically low.

Based on these comparisons, the total number of employees at Redwood LIFE could be as high as 13,800 (Alexandria), or MORE THAN DOUBLE Longfellow's estimate. Longfellow seems to be manipulating its employment forecast to MINIMIZE THE NEGATIVE EFFECTS of the development.

Please consider the negative impacts of up to 13,800 new employees on our housing shortage, infrastructure needs, and traffic problems.

	Development Size	Total	Square Foot	Information
	<u>Square Foot</u>	<u>Employees</u>	<u>per Employee</u>	<u>Source</u>
Redwood Life (R&D/Office only)	3,169,000	6,909	459	Application
Harbor View, Redwood City	765,000	3,060	250	RWC Pulse
Alexandria, San Carlos	1,600,000	7,000	229	PA Daily Post
Divco West, Burlingame	1,460,000	5,000	292	The Registry
777 Industrial Road, San Carlos	122,465	408	300	Official Plan

Regards,

Earl Aiken

Stop Redwood Life!

The RWS grassroots movement to stop RL redevelopment

Web site: www.stopredwoodlife.net

Phone: 650-533-9393

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: baiken3033@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 11:09 AM
To: GRP-City Council; GRP-City Clerk
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Shortcomings in Longfellow Housing Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Longfellow proposes to invest \$85 million to construct 850 housing units. The plan is creative, but misleading.

1. Longfellow will invest its \$85 million over the next 20+ years, as it completes each phase of its commercial development. Over the last 20 years, the consumer price index has increased by 64%. Because of inflation, each future investment will cost less in “real” dollars than the last investment. The true cost to Longfellow over the life of the project will be much less than it would be if Longfellow were to spend the entire \$85 million today.
2. Longfellow is relying on specific federal and state grants and tax credits for 73% of the costs of the 850 units. Longfellow’s plan assumes all these sources of funds will remain available for at least 20 years, and Longfellow can successfully compete against other applicants for the funds. HOWEVER, there is no guarantee any government program will continue indefinitely, or that Longfellow will always be the successful competitive applicant. What the government gives, the government can take away.

Conclusion: The net cost to Longfellow over 20 years, under this proposal, is probably less than Longfellow’s \$55 million obligation under the Redwood City Affordable Housing Fee. In addition, Longfellow’s long-term ability to deliver all that is promised under this plan is highly uncertain

Earl Aiken

Stop Redwood Life!

The RWS grassroots movement to stop RL redevelopment

Web site: www.stopredwoodlife.net

Phone: 650-533-9393

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: baiken3033@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2023 10:48 AM
To: GRP-City Council; GRP-City Clerk
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: LONGFELLOW REDWOOD LIFE WILL CAUSE FURTHER GENTRIFICATION IN REDWOOD CITY

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Council Member:

The average per capita (not family) income for the biotech industry in Redwood City is \$107,428, according to ZipRecruiter.

In District 4, 62% of workers make an income of \$75,000 or less, according to RC Pulse (August 29, 2022).

A new townhouse development at Vera Avenue and Adams Street in District 4 will sell for more than \$1.6 million per unit. GENTRIFICATION IS HAPPENING IN REDWOOD CITY.

The Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment will bring from 7,000, to over 13,000, highly paid biotech professionals to Redwood City. This influx will lead to the further GENTRIFICATION, as low and moderate income workers can no longer compete for housing. LONGFELLOW'S PROPOSAL FOR LOW INCOME HOUSING WILL DO VIRTUALLY NOTHING TO PROTECT LOW INCOME RESIDENTS IN REDWOOD CITY.

We urge the City Council to deny Longfellow's application to redevelop Redwood LIFE.

Regards,

Earl Aiken

Stop Redwood Life!

The RWS grassroots movement to stop RL redevelopment

Web site: www.stopredwoodlife.net

Phone: 650-533-9393

From: [Ed Chow](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan
Date: Friday, April 14, 2023 8:54:51 PM

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Edwin Chow

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Francine L Olson <francinelolson@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2023 11:19 AM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.** The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from

prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Francine L. Olson

Francine L. Olson
m. (650) 533-5166

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Gary Gfroerer <gfroerer@pacbell.net>
Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2023 8:03 AM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from gfroerer@pacbell.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
 - Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
 - Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
 - Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs
- I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive

ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.**
Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Gary and Lori Gfroerer

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Helen D'Arceuil <helendarceuil@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 7:09 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely, Helen Darceuil

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Joao Darosa](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Cc: [CD-Ryan Kuchenig](#); [MGR-Alex Khojikian](#); [MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz](#); [CD-Jeff Schwob](#); [CD-Margaret Netto](#)
Subject: Redwood LIFE Evolve proposal submitted by Longfellow Real Estate Partners
Date: Saturday, April 15, 2023 11:30:48 PM
Attachments: [PCBA letter to Redwood City.pdf](#)

[You don't often get email from johnnydarosa@sbcglobal.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

I am writing to inform you about our support of the above-subject project on behalf of the Peninsula Chinese Business Association (PCBA). I've included our attached letter explaining the nature of our support.

For any questions you may have, please do not hesitate to let me know. I can be reached at 650-270-3599 or by email.

I greatly appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely,

Johnny DaRosa
Executive Director, Peninsula Chinese Business Association



Peninsula Chinese Business Association

美國華聯商會

Leading because we care

April 6, 2023

Honorable Mayor Gee and Members of the Redwood City Council

1017 Middlefield Road

Redwood City, CA 94063

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

As the Executive Director of the Peninsula Chinese Association (PCBA), I am writing to express our support for the Redwood LIFE Evolve proposal submitted by Longfellow Real Estate Partners. Our non-profit organization is committed to enhancing education, promoting economic development, and strengthening the community by assisting those in need.

The Redwood LIFE Evolve project is an important economic development initiative to transform an aging business park into a modern life sciences destination while creating new parks and community spaces. This project will help to support the long-term economic vitality of Redwood City and San Mateo County by attracting and retaining top life science companies that will provide thousands of new local jobs available to people of diverse educational and skill levels. In addition, these businesses and employees will support the local economy by spending directly on local companies and vendors.

The Redwood LIFE Evolve project is also expected to generate increased revenue for schools, city, and county services through sales and property tax revenue. The project is estimated to inject 9.1 million dollars into the Redwood City General Fund annually. Furthermore, Longfellow will make significant direct investments in the local economy during the construction phase by purchasing construction-related materials and services and creating thousands of good union-wage jobs.

Longfellow's proposal includes millions of dollars earmarked for affordable housing, childcare, and sea level rise protections, which align with Redwood City's strategic priorities for children and youth, transportation, housing, and equity. We believe that the project has the potential to make positive and lasting changes to our community. Therefore, we urge the City Council to allow the project to advance and undergo an environmental study.

We hope you will consider our request to support this critical economic development project. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Johnny DaRosa', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Johnny DaRosa

Executive Director, Peninsula Chinese Business Association

From: [Joel D](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Cc: [CD-Ryan Kuchenig](#); [MGR-Alex Khojikian](#); [MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz](#); [CD-Jeff Schwob](#); [CD-Margaret Netto](#)
Subject: LIFE project in RC
Date: Saturday, April 15, 2023 8:40:44 PM

Dear Redwood City Council,

I am writing to express my enthusiastic support for the proposed LIFE project. As a member of the community, I believe that this project will bring much-needed benefits to our city and its residents.

First and foremost, the LIFE project will create good, professional jobs that will benefit many members of our community. With so many people struggling to find work in today's economy, this project represents an opportunity to improve the lives of many individuals and families in our area.

In addition to the job creation benefits, the LIFE project will also have a positive impact on our community in other ways. It will bring new businesses and economic activity to our area, which will stimulate growth and development.

I understand that there may be some objections to the project due to concerns about new construction and the environment. However, I believe that these objections are unfounded, given that there are already buildings on the site. Moreover, the project has been carefully planned to minimize its environmental impact, and it will comply with all relevant regulations and guidelines.

In short, I strongly urge the Redwood City Council to support the LIFE project. I believe that this project will bring much-needed benefits to our community, and that its positive impact will be felt for years to come. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Joel Dujsik

From: [Judith Kirk](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Subject: Save the Shores!!!!!!
Date: Monday, April 17, 2023 9:28:46 PM

Please do NOT allow biotech developer Longfellow to pursue its massive project. Longfellow is using double-speak in calling what will seriously damage our local wildlife and our quality-of-life in RC the *LIFE project*. We in RC desperately need nature-based adaptation and wetlands protection for sea level rise resiliency. This massive project does not belong in our sensitive wetlands, period. This is an example of pure greed and willful disregard for all that we have learned as we grapple with climate change; it sends us in the wrong direction with no way back.

How, after all we have fought for over the years, all the effort spent on preserving what is left of our bay lands, can you even consider the possibility of this project?

I had just emailed the information about your wonderful work regarding the new Navigation Center here in RC to my relatives and friends living out of state. That is life-affirming. It is wonderful. Please don't tarnish all the good work being done in RC by giving the ok to this totally inappropriate proposal.

If the Sierra Club is so strongly against this, that has to tell you something. It has always fought to protect what in nature can never be replaced once destroyed by utterly wrong projects like this.

Sincerely,
Judith Kirk
Redwood City

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Judy Borcz <judy@norquay.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 1:23 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Redwood Shores Westport Specific Plan - Oppose

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the Redwood City Council,

Please oppose the revised Westport Specific Plan, and stick with the original plan that is consistent with Redwood City's General Plan. The General Plan sets reasonable parameters for development and should not be bent to accommodate large corporate interests ahead of residents' needs.

The original plan abided by the 3 story height limit and included setbacks, and stuck to biohazard levels suitable to the surrounding multi-family residential neighborhoods. The Redwood Shores area should prioritize environmental health and safety over speculative, high-risk profiteering.

Thank you for your consideration.

Judith Borcz
75 Fox Hollow
Redwood City

(former resident of Redwood Shores)

From: [KENDRA BRONSTEIN](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Cc: [KENDRA BRONSTEIN](#)
Subject: Stay with Westport plan
Date: Friday, April 14, 2023 3:55:37 PM

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to *preserve* the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.** The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife

from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

KENDRA BRONSTEIN

Redwood Shores resident

From: [Kevin Krueger](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan
Date: Monday, April 17, 2023 9:53:51 AM

You don't often get email from kevinkrueger16@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses,

increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to ***preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form***. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Kevin

From: [Liria Larano](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan
Date: Saturday, April 15, 2023 12:54:23 AM

[You don't often get email from lirialarano@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Liria Larano

Sent from my iPhone

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: qlorraine@gmail.com
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 7:53 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan - Say NO to the Redwood Life Proposal

Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I urge you to *preserve* the Westport Specific Plan in its current form and say no to the Redwood Life massive commercial project proposal.

The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. The proposed Redwood LIFE development project would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for its residents.

The proposed massive Redwood LIFE project should not be approved due to:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs
- Thousands of additional cars driving in and out of Redwood Shores, which has only two roads for ingress and egress and very little public transportation options

I am concerned about the inability to escape in the case of natural disasters and emergencies with the addition of thousands of new cars driving daily, blocking access from the residential areas of Redwood Shores and Highway 101 in the case of an emergency. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation (since the relatively new existing buildings would need to be destroyed), gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also a problem. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that

may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases. The proposed project is not appropriate for a densely populated residential community.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without providing affordable housing. It would add significantly to the already gridlocked Highway 101 and would make getting in and out of Redwood Shores impossible during much of the day.

A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of Redwood Shores. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to ***preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.***

Sincerely,

Lori Menachof

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Marian Flores <mariangflores@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 5, 2023 4:18 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from mariangflores@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

To: council@redwoodcity.org

Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Marian Flores

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Martha cullimore <martha.cullimore@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 6:13 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from martha.cullimore@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
[Your Name]

Martha Cullimore

Martha.cullimore@gmail.com

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Mary Hicks](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan
Date: Saturday, April 15, 2023 9:23:43 AM

You don't often get email from hmlhicks@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit

harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Mary Hicks

751 Barnegat Lane

Redwood City, CA 94065

[Sent from the all new AOL app for iOS](#)

From: [Mary Miller](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan
Date: Monday, April 17, 2023 4:21:09 PM

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Mary L. Miller
Resident of Redwood Shores since 1993

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Matt Regan <mregan@bayareacouncil.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 3:46 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; MGR-Alex Khojikian; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Bay Area Council SUPPORT for Redwood LIFE project
Attachments: Redwood LIFE-SUPPORT.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from mregan@bayareacouncil.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

Please find attached the Bay Area Council's letter of support for Longfellow Real Estate Partners' Redwood LIFE project. Do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or would like any clarifications as to our position. We look forward to discussing this further with you.

Sincerely

Matt Regan



HISTORIC
KLAMATH
BAY AREA COUNCIL

Matt Regan

Senior Vice President

Phone: 415 298 0330

The Klamath Pier 9, The Embarcadero, San Francisco

www.bayareacouncil.org





April 4, 2023

Honorable Mayor Gee and Members of the Redwood City Council
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

The Bay Area Council is a 77 year-old employer sponsored public policy organization representing over 300 of the San Francisco Bay Area's largest employers. We work on our region's most pressing issues; transportation, housing affordability, climate change, social equity, and water, and our mission is to maintain this region's economic vitality in a sustainable and equitable manner.

We are writing to express support for the Redwood LIFE Evolve proposal submitted by Longfellow Real Estate Partners. This important economic development project will transform an aging business park into a 21st-century life sciences destination while turning old, outdated asphalt parking lots into acres of new parks and community space.

Redwood LIFE Evolve will continue to support the long-term economic vitality of Redwood City and San Mateo County by attracting and retaining top life science companies that will create thousands of new local jobs available to those with a wide range of education and skill levels. These businesses and employees will support the local economy through direct spending at local businesses and vendors. The project will generate increased revenue for schools, City, and County services through sales and property tax revenue. In addition, during construction, Longfellow will make substantial direct investments in the local economy through construction-related costs for materials and services and will create thousands of good union-wage jobs.

Longfellow's proposal to update its property comes with over \$85 million dollars already earmarked for affordable housing, and additional funds for childcare, and sea level rise protections, benefits that align with Redwood City's Strategic Priorities for Children and Youth, Transportation, Housing, and Equity.

It should be noted that jobs in life sciences are much "stickier" than those in other parts of the economy. During the COVID emergency we witnessed remote work eligible tech workers and those in the broader keyboard economy disperse around the state and the country. That did not happen anywhere near to the same degree in life sciences because workers in this industry need more than a wifi signal; they need actual labs. Redwood City should grasp this opportunity to further cement its position as a leader in life sciences because other cities are clamoring for these jobs and associated revenues.

Given the project's potential to make positive, lasting changes to our community, we ask that the City Council allow the project to advance and undergo environmental study. We have a real need for their contributions and would hate to see such an important economic development project delayed longer than necessary. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Matt Regan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Matt Regan
Senior Vice President Public Policy
Bay Area Council

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Michael Lofquist <mlofquist2000@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2023 8:48 AM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

[You don't often get email from mlofquist2000@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Michael Lofquist & April Lu
2 Dana Pointe Ct

Redwood City CA 94065

From: [Nancy Glaser](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Subject: Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan
Date: Saturday, April 15, 2023 4:40:30 PM

To: council@redwoodcity.org

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to *preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form***. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful

environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Nancy Glaser

54 Cape Hatteras Court,

Redwood Shores Resident since 1986

P.S. To prove the project is serious about reducing increased traffic concerns, allow only 100 parking spaces in the new development!

Nancy Glaser

"The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice"

glasernancy@gmail.com

Mobile: 650-400-2417

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/nancyglaser/>

From: [NINA BOIRE](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan
Date: Saturday, April 15, 2023 2:54:23 PM

[You don't often get email from nboire@aol.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Nina Boire

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Robert Bilbao <roberttaylorbilbao@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 5, 2023 7:13 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay With the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

As someone who holds the preservation near and dear to my heart, I'd appreciate your attention to the message below.

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.** The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
 - Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
 - Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
 - Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs
- I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.** Thank you for your time.

--

Best,

Robert Bilbao

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: rockysmouse@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 8:21 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan, from a redwood shores resident

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from rockysmouse@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Roger Haeussler <rogerhaeussler@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 7:19 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from rogerhaeussler@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present

office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Roger Haeussler
912 Governors Bay Drive
Redwood City CA 94065
rogerhaeussler@gmail.com
+1 650 556 3687

From: [Roger Haeussler](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Cc: [Ter Haeu](#)
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan
Date: Saturday, April 15, 2023 8:05:34 AM

You don't often get email from rogerhaeussler@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Roger Haeussler
House Owner in Redwood Shores

Roger Haeussler
rogerhaeussler@gmail.com
+1 650 556 3687

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: RONA GUNDRUM <ronalgundrum@mac.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 6:09 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Redwood LIFE: Stay with the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The **Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views.**

If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would **significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem** due to its proximity to the Belmont Slough and bird migration route, and sensitive and endangered wildlife in that area as well as quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community.

I also feel **Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.**

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- **Massive** 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add **significantly** to the height of buildings
- **Decades** of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about **negative infrastructure impacts**, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies due to **gridlock traffic**, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. **Harmful environmental impacts**, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I **oppose unregulated BSL3 labs** in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would **worsen the existing job-housing imbalance** around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, **the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project.** A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is unnecessary and beyond wasteful.

Redwood Shores is a quiet, peaceful bayfront community. The negative impacts of the proposed development on the surrounding community far outweighs any benefit.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.** Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Rona Gundrum

From: [Rupesh Patel](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Cc: [CD-Ryan Kuchenig](#); [MGR-Alex Khojikian](#); [MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz](#); [CD-Jeff Schwob](#); [CD-Margaret Netto](#)
Subject: Support for Redwood LIFE Evolve
Date: Sunday, April 16, 2023 10:09:23 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Mayor Gee and City Council,

I would like to urge the City to begin CEQA and study the Redwood LIFE Evolve project, and not delay the benefits of the project any longer. I believe that the many benefits Longfellow has proposed are worth urgent consideration and should not have any barriers to conduct a thorough study of feasibility and impact.

I have seen the effort Longfellow has made to open their doors to the community with their amenities and café. Since they bought this outdated business park, they have already brought events and sponsorships to the local community within the confines of what they have, many of which I was able to attend. The proposed project will allow them to create major amenities and programming that reach the wider Redwood City community and neighboring communities. They have also actively sought feedback on their proposed project and I believe they will be good community members. I have been a Peninsula native my whole life and have always thought that this part of Redwood City has always needed more activation for locals to enjoy. The use of land in this area is very under utilized and needs some densification with multiple uses.

The projects financial contributions will help our city meet its goals for affordable housing, childcare, and sea level rise improvements. Redwood LIFE will also bring tax revenues at a time where they are sorely needed.

Given the significant community benefits this project will bring, I request that the City Council direct staff to study the project and allow the environmental review to move forward. There should not be any hurdles to get past this stage as this stage will help everyone, City Officials, Longfellow, and neighbors to understand the true impact of such a project.

Regards,

Rupesh Patel | Partner

M: 650.483.9968 | E: rupesh@verakincapital.com | www.verakincapital.com



Disclaimer: The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Sabrina Leung <sabrinatzleung@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 7:08 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from sabrinatzleung@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Sabrina Leung

From: [Shiva Kamali](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Cc: [CD-Ryan Kuchenig](#); [MGR-Alex Khojikian](#); [MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz](#); [CD-Jeff Schwob](#); [CD-Margaret Netto](#)
Subject: We Need Redwood LIFE Evolve
Date: Monday, April 17, 2023 10:12:06 AM

You don't often get email from shivakamali@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

My name is Shiva Kamali, and I have been living in Redwood Shores with my family for almost 10 years. We all love Redwood Shores!

I am writing to express my strong support for the Redwood LIFE project. As a member of the community, I am proud to support this project and believe it will be an asset to our city.

First and foremost, I would like to commend Longfellow for their dedication to our community by proactively seeking community input on this project. They have listened to our concerns and incorporated our feedback to ensure that the project meets the needs of the community. This is a clear indication of their commitment to building a project that is responsive to our needs.

I've met with Tara, Peter, and others at Longfellow and believe the proposed plan would bring positive changes that deserve further study. Instead of an aging office park with acres of asphalt, their proposal could bring much-needed modernization with new parks and recreational opportunities.

Longfellow has already begun to do this with a new café and amenities and events for our community, something we are sorely lacking today. My son enjoyed the park planning activity they have done at the Farmer's Market so much that he has volunteered to help them with the activity!

Longfellow's vision for this project will bring benefits not just to the Redwood Shores community but to all of Redwood City with tax revenue, parks, childcare and affordable housing benefits, and much more.

The City's environmental review process is an important step to understanding the project's potential impacts. As a supporter of the Redwood LIFE project, I urge you to approve this development. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Shiva Kamali

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: vidyut lingamneni <vidyut_lingamneni@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2023 9:16 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Please stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from vidyut_lingamneni@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Vidyut Lingamneni

From: [Viren Patel](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Cc: [CD-Ryan Kuchenig](#); [MGR-Alex Khojikian](#); [MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz](#); [CD-Jeff Schwob](#); [CD-Margaret Netto](#)
Subject: We Need Redwood LIFE Evolve
Date: Friday, April 14, 2023 7:09:27 PM

You don't often get email from virenpatel@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

I am writing to express my support for the Redwood LIFE Evolve project and the many benefits it could bring to our community.

The current campus is underutilized. The parks and amenities that Longfellow is proposing will bring new vitality and resources to Redwood Shores and to the wider Redwood City community.

The economic development that could come from this project is critical to sustaining Redwood City and the Peninsula's small businesses. Longfellow has shown that they will make significant financial contributions that would help our city meet its goals for affordable housing, childcare, and sea level rise improvements.

I urge the City to begin the environmental review of the project.

Thank you,

Viren

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Yvonne Sun <plaoyl3@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2023 2:43 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: Patrick Lao
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Patrick & Yvonne

Sent from my iPhone

CD-Jessica Ira

From: baiken6@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, August 11, 2021 10:35 AM
To: GRP-City Council; suexline@redwoodcity.org
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; CD-Mark Muenzer
Subject: Biotech development in Redwood Shores

You don't often get email from baiken6@comcast.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi,

I am a resident of Redwood Shores for over 25 years and writing you to voice my opinion about the biotech project by GI Partner.

I am against this project since it will harm Redwood Shores residents, including traffic, noise, and possibly toxic effect.

I understand that the project will require an environmental study, among other requirements. And I would appreciate seeing the report.

Thank you,

Brigitte Aiken
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Email: baiken6@comcast.net

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Jennifer Owen <jenaowen@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2022 5:22 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; GRP-City Council; Council-Jeff Gee
Subject: Board Resolution regarding Redwood Life Development

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jenaowen@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

This is to inform you that, on April 21, 2022, The Manors at Redwood Shores Home Owners Association Board of Directors passed a resolution opposing the Redwood Life Development as it would be detrimental to residents in the area and is not needed.

Yours sincerely,

Jennifer Owen
President, Board of Directors
The Manors at Redwood Shores HOA

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Nina G <nina.goodale111@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 9, 2022 8:34 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Follow-Up & Interested Parties List Request

You don't often get email from nina.goodale111@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us recently to address our questions about the Longfellow/Redwood LIFE proposed development immediately adjacent to our home in Redwood Shores.

This confirms our request as discussed to be included on the interested parties list. We also wish to be kept updated and informed on the project proposal details, timeline and **all related events**, if the interested parties list does not already provide such information.

Regarding our informational request regarding related events in connection with the project proposal, this includes **all details of Longfellow's/Redwood LIFE's current ongoing construction for tenant improvements**, as we reside within 300 feet of the site and believe that we and other neighboring residents should be informed accordingly about such construction. This is particularly important because to date, the property owner has failed to provide any required construction notice to us nor any neighboring homes.

Additionally, Longfellow/Redwood LIFE representatives recently informed us that they are coordinating tandem efforts with the city to build affordable housing off site, to be timed with each development phase of their Westport redevelopment project, which, they added, would also be subject to market conditions. Accordingly, **we would appreciate being kept apprised of all details on this related housing development issue in connection with the applicant's current Westport office park proposal.**

Further, Longfellow's/Redwood LIFE's additional recent disclosures included **their plan for construction phasing to be modified from the originally reported 20 years to a now extended period of 25 years following approval.** Given this and other modifications to the current information about this proposal as represented on the city's website, **we request that all known proposed modifications are updated accordingly to reflect the most accurate and current public information for purposes of accuracy.**

We certainly appreciate your time and attentiveness and further look forward to your reply responsive to our requests.

Best regards,
Steve & Nina Goodale
Portwalk Place, Redwood City

CD-Jessica Ira

From: yuheng qiu <yuhengqiu@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2022 10:24 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: Council-Giselle Hale
Subject: future actions on the plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from yuhengqiu@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan,

As a resident of redwood shores, I would like to get notice from the city council of future actions on the plan related to the real estate projects on redwood shores.

Thank you.

Jessie

Stop Redwood Life!

The RWS independent grassroots movement to stop RL redevelopment

Web site: www.stopedredwoodlife.net

CD-Jessica Ira



CD-Jessica Ira
Wednesday, August 3, 2022 12:27 PM
CD-Ryan Kuchenig
FW: APPROVE - Redwood LIFE Redevelopment

Follow up
Flagged

Thank you.

Jessica Ira
Secretary
Community Development and Transportation Department
Phone: (650) 780-7291
Email: jessicaira@redwoodcity.org
www.redwoodcity.org



From: Craig Petersen <cpetersen@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 2:17 AM
To: Planning PF <planning@redwoodcity.org>
Subject: APPROVE - Redwood LIFE Redevelopment

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be APPROVED**. I am a longtime resident of Redwood Shores and I fully support moving forward with the thoughtful and innovative redevelopment plan. This is an opportunity to modernize the existing commercial facilities and keep Redwood Shores as an innovative and modern community.

I urge Redwood City to **SUPPORT THE REDWOOD LIFE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN**".

Thank you,

CRAIG PETERSEN
2404 HASTINGS SHORE LANE
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94065
cpetersen@gmail.com

CD-Jessica Ira

From: CD-James Dotson
Sent: Tuesday, July 5, 2022 3:07 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: FW: Opinions about the Redwood LIFE project...
Attachments: BSHOA Resolution opposing Redwood LIFE project.pdf; Redwood LIFE revised op-ed.pdf; Longfellow open house recap 6-29-22.pdf

From: ray fowler <rayfowler@live.com>
Sent: Friday, July 1, 2022 7:20 AM
To: CD-James Dotson <jdotson@redwoodcity.org>
Subject: Opinions about the Redwood LIFE project...

You don't often get email from rayfowler@live.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello, James

It was nice to meet you at Wednesday's open house. I have attached a March 8 HOA resolution opposing the Redwood LIFE project, a copy of my op-ed piece published on June 27 in the Daily Journal, and a recap of what I observed at the June 29 open house. Drop me a line if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Ray

CD-Jessica Ira

From: CD-Mark Muenzer
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 9:09 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; CD-Sue Exline
Subject: FW: Thanks , but Keep Reading :

-----Original Message-----

From: Barbara Reyn <breyn38@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2021 4:22 PM
To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>
Subject: Thanks , but Keep Reading :

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from breyn38@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <http://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification.>]

I appreciate your willingness to listen to Redwood Shores families whose lives will be directly impacted by the proposed changes to the Technology Park . Please note that this area is BELOW SEA LEVEL. Therefore Breaking the cap on a TOXIC WASTE area will send these chemicals DIRECTLY into the BAY . Every day ,WORLDWIDE , countries discuss the importance of our relationship to Climate Change . We send our President to make promises to other nations ! Yet, in our own backyard, literally, where the residents of our neighborhood were promised low rise development, Redwood City is seriously considering destroying our environment, & ignoring the realities of this area. ALL BUILDINGS IN THIS AREA ARE ON LAND FILL !!!! We know from San Francisco's failings to connect high rises to bedrock, that disaster happens when this does not happen. Yes, I lived here in 1989 when a huge earthquake hit this area & part of the Bay Bridge fell in . Water flew out of our swimming pools & toilets. Cans crashed on my kitchen tile. The CONTRACTORS you are listening to were not here then & they will not be here when their projects are finished. We watched buildings collapse in Florida. You will be told by those proposing the development that the height of the NEW PLANS won't have those problems. How many of these planners are going to live and work here, yes, right here, while this building is going on & when it is finished ????? Responsibility for this development is in your hands & in your votes . Sincerely, Barbara Reyn

Sent from my iPhone

CD-Jessica Ira

From: MGR-Alex Khojikian
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2023 3:12 PM
To: CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Ryan Kuchenig; CD-Margaret Netto
Subject: Fwd: Stay with the Westport Plan

FYI

Begin forwarded message:

From: Yvonne Sun <plaoyls3@yahoo.com>
Date: April 12, 2023 at 2:43:08 PM PDT
To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>
Cc: Patrick Lao <plaotec@yahoo.com>
Subject: **Stay with the Westport Plan**

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Patrick & Yvonne

Sent from my iPhone

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Mark Strathdee <mark@strathdeeinvestments.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 15, 2022 6:26 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: I support the redevelopment of Redwood Life.

[You don't often get email from mark@strathdeeinvestments.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>.]

We need continued economic development and businesses close to home.

Thanks,
Mark

Sent while on the road. Please excuse any typos or brevity.

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Rich Brazeau <richbrazeau@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2023 11:23 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Jeff Gee - Conflict of Interest re: Redwood Life Development Proposal

Categories: Red Category

I am a 15 year resident of Redwood Shores and even worked for 8 years at 1600 Bridge Parkway— currently, Redwood Life.

My wife and I are 100% opposed to the proposed re-development project. Besides it being totally unnecessary, environmentally problematic, and intrusive to our small community — there is an obvious conflict of interest when a sitting mayor and council member is an executive at a commercial construction management consulting firm.

Residents of Redwood Shores are extremely angry that this “Redwood LIFE” proposal continues to make progress and has not been rejected.

I’d like an official response from the council regarding the legality of Mr. Gee’s ability to participate in any discussions or voting on this proposal as there is a clear bias and conflict of interest.

Rich Brazeau
[650-200-5377](tel:650-200-5377)

Sent from my iPhone. Excuse any iTypos.

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Frances Szlapka <fmszlapka@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 16, 2021 12:09 PM
To: GRP-City Council; CD-Ryan Kuchenig; CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; info@bcdc.ca.gov
Subject: Large Developments in RWS

Some people who received this message don't often get email from fmszlapka@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi,

I have been a resident of Redwood Shores since 1993 and am very concerned about the large developments taking place in our community. I really do not want Redwood Shores to become another Foster City. Highway 101 could not handle the traffic as of 2019. My commute from work used to take me twice as long getting home on 101 and I was traveling against traffic. And at certain times of the day it would take me 1 hour on highway 101 to go from Redwood Shores to Foster City. Building these large developments in Redwood Shores will only add to the congestion. I realize there is less highway congestion now due to the pandemic but it will all return someday. Are you taking all the traffic concerned into consideration?

Sincerely,

Frances

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Matthew Joseph <matt.lottice@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 12:12 AM
To: GRP-City Council; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Life Development Project

Some people who received this message don't often get email from matt.lottice@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To all concerned,

I add my name to a petition rejecting the Redwood Life Development Project submission. A balance has been struck in lieu of Redwood Shores being a planned community along with a location for business parks. These parks do not overtly infringe on the residential aspect of Redwood Shores.

Quality of life is sure to be detrimentally affected with the plan for a massive building project at the current biotech office space campus. Demolishing the campus is superfluous and unnecessary in a time when remote working is more prevalent than ever. Oracle's headquarters relocation did not remove its towers. From what I read, the company still plans to use them. How many business parks are enough within a residential community? Not to mention decades of construction, environmental hazards associated with deep pile driving, and traffic congestion adjacent to a busy portion of Highway 101.

It's excessive, wasteful, and inconsiderate of a residential neighborhood. Rather than working to utilize the already plentiful space of 20 buildings, developers want taller buildings and additional square footage with the expectation thousands of employees will be inside these structures. Look beyond contracts and taxes. Consider what these kinds of questionable undertakings do to a community. If there were no current life science campus perhaps it would be more logical. This is not the case.

Act with conviction and reject a meddlesome proposal.

Sincerely,

Matthew Lottice

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Joel D <dujsik@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 15, 2023 8:41 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Alex Khojikian; MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto
Subject: LIFE project in RC

Dear Redwood City Council,

I am writing to express my enthusiastic support for the proposed LIFE project. As a member of the community, I believe that this project will bring much-needed benefits to our city and its residents.

First and foremost, the LIFE project will create good, professional jobs that will benefit many members of our community. With so many people struggling to find work in today's economy, this project represents an opportunity to improve the lives of many individuals and families in our area.

In addition to the job creation benefits, the LIFE project will also have a positive impact on our community in other ways. It will bring new businesses and economic activity to our area, which will stimulate growth and development.

I understand that there may be some objections to the project due to concerns about new construction and the environment. However, I believe that these objections are unfounded, given that there are already buildings on the site. Moreover, the project has been carefully planned to minimize its environmental impact, and it will comply with all relevant regulations and guidelines.

In short, I strongly urge the Redwood City Council to support the LIFE project. I believe that this project will bring much-needed benefits to our community, and that its positive impact will be felt for years to come. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Joel Dujsik

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Monique J. Vella <moniquevella@pacbell.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 12:20 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Longfellow Real Estate Partners/Redwood Life Development

Dear Councilman Gee:

I am a concerned constituent, writing you for the sole purpose of obtaining clarification on your position regarding the Longfellow Real Estate Partners Proposal for the Redwood Life site. Your silence on an issue that so profoundly and negatively impacts our community has been deafening.

I would appreciate a clear and honest response to my inquiry.

Thank you.

Monique



Monique J. Vella
10 Admiralty Place
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
650.520.8645 cell
moniquevella@pacbell.net

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Jinmin Rudolph <jlrudolph92@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 3:13 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline
Subject: NO to Redwood Life application approval

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jlrudolph92@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Longfellow's "Redwood LIFE" application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** for the simple fact that the rationale originally set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the Final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:^{[[[}

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments."

- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings. Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores along with the additions of two schools and a library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development then are even more relevant now.

I (we) request that the city "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and **reject the Longfellow project proposal outright**, and that any future project for the site also be held to comply with the Final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.
Sincerely,

Jinmin Rudolph

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Kacem ABIDA <mka.abida@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2021 8:12 PM
To: GRP-City Council; CD-Ryan Kuchenig; CD-Sue Exline
Subject: NO to the Redwood life project

Some people who received this message don't often get email from mka.abida@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello,

I am a Redwood Shores resident, and I am writing to express my strong opposition to the redevelopment project proposal being considered by Longfellow and PGIM in the technology park (Redwood Life). I am opposed to this project for the following reasons:

1. Release of toxic chemicals and flammable methane gas that will happen when they drill the cap that has been applied over the landfill at the time of initial development
2. Decades of construction traffic and noise
3. Increased commute traffic
4. Safety. With the increase number of workers and guests, and increased traffic, in the case of earthquake or major disaster, emergency personnel and services won't be able to reach the Shores residents in a timely manner
5. Massive buildings that are 2-3 times higher than current buildings and will be too close the peninsula landing and broadwalk residential neighborhoods.

The redwood life park as it has been designed and recently updated blends perfectly into our community and causes minor disruption to residential life and the environment. The buildings are low key on the outside (and yet perfectly designed and equipped to handle the biotech industry needs). Our community strongly opposes the redevelopment project, and we hope that as elected officials and city planners you will listen to our voice and take our concerns into consideration,

Thank you,

Kacem Abida, PhD
2121 Gossamer Ave
Redwood City

--

Kacem Abida
Cell: +1 (415) 702-0171
Email: mka.abida@gmail.com

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Stephanie Katz <stk4@lehigh.edu>
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2021 7:55 AM
To: GRP-City Council; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Opposing the Redwood Life Development Project proposal

You don't often get email from stk4@lehigh.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

As a Redwood Shores resident, having watched the proposal on Zoom and reading other residents' objections, I concur with the objections and hope you will reject the proposal.

I particularly oppose projected noise, increased traffic and large buildings. I foresee negative changes to this tranquil community. I don't want to live in a community more like busy and crowded Foster City.

Thank you.

Stephanie Katz

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Cynthia Rogers <1cynthiarogers1@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2022 7:25 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; Council-Giselle Hale
Subject: PLEASE PROVIDE US WITH ...

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Some people who received this message don't often get email from 1cynthiarogers1@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

notice from the city council of future actions on the **Redwood Life** plan.

Thank you,
Cynthia

CD-Jessica Ira

From: vidyut lingamneni <vidyut_lingamneni@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2023 9:16 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Please stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from vidyut_lingamneni@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Vidyut Lingamneni

CD-Jessica Ira

From: rockysmouse@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, November 14, 2021 2:31 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Proposed Life Sciences Massive Building Project for Redwood Shores

You don't often get email from rockysmouse@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

I would like to comment on the proposed, massive life science buildings project for Redwood Shores.

-First, tearing down perfectly good structures is not eco-friendly--we should be repurposing current buildings and materials for new uses. Re-imagining our CURRENT surroundings into future uses is practicing good stewardship of the area, the earth and the planet.

-Another major problem is the probable release of toxic chemical and flammable methane gas into the bay waters and air if larger buildings are built!

-Not to mention decades of construction traffic and noise for surrounding residents and Redwood Shores as a whole.

-Traffic, and auto/truck emissions, both on the freeway and within the Shores would be heavily increased by the thousands of new commuters and cars if these massive structures are built out.

-Finally, the now scenic, peaceful skyline at the Bay would be ugly-- with huge, massive buildings blocking the views and the Bay. Not environmentally friendly at all for people nor wildlife.

We strongly oppose this new development and all of the environmental problems it would bring. Be good stewards of the earth and beautiful Redwood Shores and re-purpose what we already have which are perfectly fine buildings.

Thank you.

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Lynn Emrick <emrick1983@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2022 5:49 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: Council-Giselle Hale
Subject: Proposed office buildings along Marine Parkway by Longfellow (RL Development)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from emrick1983@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig:

Regarding the proposed business development by RL Developers along Marine Parkway, my husband and I are greatly concerned about this proposal as we live in the Beacon Shores development located very close to the proposed development. This has always been a quiet neighborhood with many families and small children who utilize the many peaceful green spaces and walkways throughout the year. This development would greatly negatively impact the entire area, the area we all purchased for it's quiet residential charm. Additionally, the traffic impact would be a disaster. It is bad enough travelling in and out of Redwood Shores past all the Oracle buildings. Another large business park on the very same road would be a nightmare. This would be a dramatic change that none of us bargained for when we first moved here.

Please send me notices from the city council of all future actions on the plan.

Sincerely,

Mike & Lynn Emrick

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Susanne Malabey <susannemalabey@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2021 12:26 PM
To: GRP-City Council; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Ryan Kuchenig; Susanne Malabey
Subject: Proposed technology campus on Marin Parkway in Redwood Shores

You don't often get email from susannemalabey@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To whom it may concern;

After reading the recent article in the pilot I am shocked what the City of Redwood City is proposing for Redwood Shores. I strongly petition the build of the technology campus.

I am a 30 year resident of Redwood Shores. I moved to the Shores because of the community, family oriented, quite, wild life, good school district and little traffic. The last 30 years Redwood Shores has been build out to the max.

Traffic has tripled, people that work in the Shores are not following traffic rules, running stop light and the traffic is horrible on Redwood Shores and Marin Parkway. I take my 6 year old grand daughter for walks and many times at stop signs on Redwood Shore Parkway people almost run us over with the car. People speeding on both Redwood Shores and Marin Parkway.

The buildings on Marine Parkway and Shell Parkway are fairly new. Why do they need to be replaced? 6 stories tall. Wow. It is all about money for the City and County.

I strongly oppose that project for the following reason.

1. More traffic, more noise, more cars more pollution, more stress for our Shores community
2. Safety of Redwood Shores residence, especially children that bike and walk to school
3. Wild life is being disturbed
4. Worsening quality of life in the Shores that has mainly private residence.

Please don't destroy Redwood Shores even more as it already is. The Shores is a sanctuary for wild life and people. it should stay that way.

Best;

Susanne Malabey
Redwood Shores

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Redwood City City Council
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 8:49 AM
To: Denise Brosseau
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Redwood LIFE development proposal

Dear Denise,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. These comments will be provided to the applicant and included in future staff reports related to the project. You have been added to the interested parties list for project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the review when new information is available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

Respectfully,

Pamela Aguilar, CMC (she/her)
City Clerk
City of Redwood City
Phone: (650) 780-7220
www.redwoodcity.org

From: Denise Brosseau <denise@thoughtleadershiplab.com>
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2023 3:05 PM
To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>
Subject: Redwood LIFE development proposal

Dear Mayor Gee & Members of the City Council-

I live and work in Redwood Shores and I am concerned about the new Redwood LIFE development project. While I am not a NIMBY type, I already lived through the previous painful months and months of trucks, noise, traffic, etc. when they built the present structures about 20 years ago and I am not looking forward to having to go through that again. But what most concerns me is that I have read that the hardscape that was designed to cover the landfill under the present buildings is not rated for much taller structures. I am not sure if this is true or not, but if it is, then I would strongly urge you not to approve the higher proposed buildings.

The truth is that if they rip up the parking lots and put in a parking structure or two, they have plenty of room out there already for a hotel, convention center, etc. They do not need tall structures that will likely not add to the look of the Shores (do we really want to be another Foster City?) and may cause untold harm to the environment if what's under the hardscape escapes into the atmosphere. Also, there are a lot of birds that enjoy the Redwood Shores area as a sanctuary. I am concerned that additional development will chase these lovely creatures away.

Finally, there is a lot of traffic in Redwood Shores when the Oracle buildings are fully occupied. Adding additional workers will not help and will likely very much add to the traffic burdens of those of us who live here. If they want to do additional development, might they consider work/live housing so we give people a place to live as well as work in Redwood Shores and not have them leave at the end of their workday snarling the ingress and egress? That would be preferable.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Denise Brosseau

Former Chair, Housing and Human Concerns Committee, Redwood City
Redwood City Resident, Business Owner and Homeowner

62 Pelican Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065

650-520-0401

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Redwood City City Council
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 9:00 AM
To: Judith Kirk
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Save the Shores!!!!!!!

Dear Judith,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. These comments will be provided to the applicant and included in future staff reports related to the project. You have been added to the interested parties list for project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the review when new information is available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

Respectfully,

Pamela Aguilar, CMC (she/her)
City Clerk
City of Redwood City
Phone: (650) 780-7220
www.redwoodcity.org

From: Judith Kirk <edina42@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2023 9:28 PM
To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>
Subject: Save the Shores!!!!!!!

Please do NOT allow biotech developer Longfellow to pursue its massive project. Longfellow is using double-speak in calling what will seriously damage our local wildlife and our quality-of-life in RC the *LIFE project*. We in RC desperately need nature-based adaptation and wetlands protection for sea level rise resiliency. This massive project does not belong in our sensitive wetlands, period. This is an example of pure greed and willful disregard for all that we have learned as we grapple with climate change; it sends us in the wrong direction with no way back.

How, after all we have fought for over the years, all the effort spent on preserving what is left of our bay lands, can you even consider the possibility of this project?

I had just emailed the information about your wonderful work regarding the new Navigation Center here in RC to my relatives and friends living out of state. That is life-affirming. It is wonderful. Please don't tarnish all the good work being done in RC by giving the ok to this totally inappropriate proposal.

If the Sierra Club is so strongly against this, that has to tell you something. It has always fought to protect what in nature can never be replaced once destroyed by utterly wrong projects like this.

Sincerely,
Judith Kirk
Redwood City

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Redwood City City Council
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 8:58 AM
To: Mary Miller
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Stay with the Westport Plan

Dear Mary,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. These comments will be provided to the applicant and included in future staff reports related to the project. You have been added to the interested parties list for project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the review when new information is available: <https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.redwoodcity.org%2Fcity-hall%2Fcurrent-projects%2Fdevelopment-projects%3Fid%3D113&data=05%7C01%7Crkuchenig%40redwoodcity.org%7C6e1ba119974342b7a16008db4025add4%7C02eee40d6a354d7588035403096cc23e%7C0%7C0%7C638174302825941679%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=eSL58k9KBGTMdPLBYCFbve%2Fr97cbzkmTfOP6UOtSghc%3D&reserved=0>

Respectfully,

Pamela Aguilar, CMC (she/her)
City Clerk
City of Redwood City
Phone: (650) 780-7220

<https://gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.redwoodcity.org%2F&data=05%7C01%7Crkuchenig%40redwoodcity.org%7C6e1ba119974342b7a16008db4025add4%7C02eee40d6a354d7588035403096cc23e%7C0%7C0%7C638174302825941679%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWljoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=%2F0ESHlKU%2BbCwEisuZDQjBeTGTlr9oOysy8waHvmjdpU%3D&reserved=0>

-----Original Message-----

From: Mary Miller <mmworkfun@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2023 4:21 PM
To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings

- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Mary L. Miller
Resident of Redwood Shores since 1993

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Redwood City City Council
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2023 4:25 PM
To: KENDRA BRONSTEIN
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Stay with Westport plan

Dear Kendra,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. These comments will be provided to the applicant and included in future staff reports related to the project. You have been added to the interested parties list for project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the review when new information is available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

Respectfully,

Pamela Aguilar, CMC (she/her)
City Clerk
City of Redwood City
Phone: (650) 780-7220
www.redwoodcity.org

From: KENDRA BRONSTEIN <kendrabronstein@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2023 3:55 PM
To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>
Cc: KENDRA BRONSTEIN <kendrabronstein@aol.com>
Subject: Stay with Westport plan

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to *preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form***. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.**
Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

KENDRA BRONSTEIN

Redwood Shores resident

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2022 10:03 AM
To: Sarah Nagle
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE:

Dear Sarah,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: Sarah Nagle <2000srn@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2022 12:22 PM
To: BCC-Margaret Becker <mbecker@redwoodcity.org>; Docktown-Alison Madden <alisonmadden@yahoo.com>; chris@chrisforrwc.com; Kaia@kaiaeakin.org; dianehoward907@gmail.com; BCC-Jerome Madigan <jmadigan@redwoodcity.org>; GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; mail@stopredwoodlife.net
Subject:

Some people who received this message don't often get email from 2000srn@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

www.stopredwoodlife.net

Dear Redwood City Council Members and Candidates:

In its letter of August 4, 2022, the Redwood City Planning Division stated its intention of asking the City Council for direction regarding the merits of repealing the current Westport Specific Plan prior to beginning the EIR process. I urge the City Council to keep the current Westport Plan.

The alternative proposed by Longfellow Real Estate Partners will have serious negative consequences for many reasons:

- The addition of 7,000 high income employees will contribute to Redwood City's critical affordable housing shortage.
- The addition of these employees will further stress the area's transportation system.
- The massive project is not compatible with the surrounding residential developments, and violates General Plan BE 1.8.
- The location next to Belmont Slough threatens the natural environment, including wildlife and human recreation.
- There are possible environmental consequences to additional building on a former municipal landfill.

The harmful impact of this proposed redevelopment will affect not just Redwood City, but the entire Peninsula. Because the current Westport office park is compatible with the community and economically viable for the developer, I urge you to keep the current Westport plan and reject Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan.

Respectfully,
Sarah Nagle, LCSW

311 Beacon Shores Drive
Redwood City, CA. 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2022 10:24 AM
To: David Evans
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Do not repeal or replace the current Westport Specific Plan.

Dear David,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: David Evans <d@aandd.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2022 8:21 AM
To: BCC-Margaret Becker <mbecker@redwoodcity.org>; Docktown-Alison Madden <alisonmadden@yahoo.com>; chris <chris@chrisforrwc.com>; Kaia <Kaia@KaiaEakin.org>; dianehoward907 <dianehoward907@gmail.com>; BCC-Jerome Madigan <jmadigan@redwoodcity.org>; GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; mail <mail@stopredwoodlife.net>
Subject: Do not repeal or replace the current Westport Specific Plan.

Some people who received this message don't often get email from d@aandd.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Redwood City Council Members and Candidates:

In its letter of August 4, 2022, the Redwood City Planning Division stated its intention of asking the City Council for direction regarding the merits of repealing the current Westport Specific Plan prior to beginning the EIR process. I urge the City Council to keep the current Westport Plan.

The alternative proposed by Longfellow Real Estate Partners will have serious negative consequences for many reasons:

- The addition of 7,000 high income employees will contribute to Redwood City's critical affordable housing shortage.

- The addition of these employees will further stress the area’s transportation system.
- The massive project is not compatible with the surrounding residential developments, and violates General Plan BE 1.8.
- The location next to Belmont Slough threatens the natural environment, including wildlife and human recreation.
- There are possible environmental consequences to additional building on a former municipal landfill.

The harmful impact of this proposed redevelopment will affect not just Redwood City, but the entire Peninsula. Because the current Westport office park is compatible with the community and economically viable for the developer, I urge you to keep the current Westport plan and reject Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan.

Respectfully,

Name: David Evans

Address: 114 Shorebird Circle, Redwood Shores, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Brian Yu <brian.yu@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2022 10:39 AM
To: Council-Giselle Hale
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Re: I oppose Longfellow's development

You don't often get email from brian.yu@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Thank you, Giselle.

Cheers,
Brian

On Thu, Aug 25, 2022 at 10:11 AM Council-Giselle Hale <ghale@redwoodcity.org> wrote:

Dear Brian,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale

Redwood City Mayor

From: Brian Yu <brian.yu@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2022 5:45 PM
To: BCC-Margaret Becker <mbecker@redwoodcity.org>; Docktown-Alison Madden <alisonmadden@yahoo.com>; chris@chrisforrwc.com; Kaia@kaiaeakin.org; dianehoward907@gmail.com; BCC-Jerome Madigan <jmadigan@redwoodcity.org>; GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; mail@stopredwoodlife.net
Subject: I oppose Longfellow's development

Some people who received this message don't often get email from brian.yu@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Redwood City Council Members and Candidates:

I have been a Redwood Shores resident since 1990 and have worked in the office park that is currently run by Longfellow since 2010. Tearing down the current structures is a waste of resources and will cause unnecessary noise, traffic, and impact to the environment.

In its letter of August 4, 2022, the Redwood City Planning Division stated its intention of asking the City Council for direction regarding the merits of repealing the current Westport Specific Plan prior to beginning the EIR process. I urge the City Council to keep the current Westport Plan.

The alternative proposed by Longfellow Real Estate Partners will have serious negative consequences for many reasons:

- The addition of 7,000 high income employees will contribute to Redwood City's critical affordable housing shortage.
- The addition of these employees will further stress the area's transportation system.
- The massive project is not compatible with the surrounding residential developments, and violates General Plan BE 1.8.
- The location next to Belmont Slough threatens the natural environment, including wildlife and human recreation.
- There are possible environmental consequences to additional building on a former municipal landfill.

The harmful impact of this proposed redevelopment will affect not just Redwood City, but the entire Peninsula. Because the current Westport office park is compatible with the community and economically viable for the developer, I urge you to keep the current Westport plan and reject Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan.

Respectfully,

Brian Yu

32 Bremerton Circle

Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2022 10:10 AM
To: Jieli Shen
Cc: mail@stopredwoodlife.net; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Keep the current Westport Plan

Dear Jieli,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: Jieli Shen <friendjjshenusc@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2022 5:50 PM
To: BCC-Margaret Becker <mbecker@redwoodcity.org>; Docktown-Alison Madden <alisonmadden@yahoo.com>; chris@chrisforrwc.com; Kaia@kaiaeakin.org; dianehoward907@gmail.com; BCC-Jerome Madigan <jmadigan@redwoodcity.org>; GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; mail@stopredwoodlife.net
Subject: Keep the current Westport Plan

Some people who received this message don't often get email from friendjjshenusc@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Redwood City Council Members and Candidates:

In its letter of August 4, 2022, the Redwood City Planning Division stated its intention of asking the City Council for direction regarding the merits of repealing the current Westport Specific Plan prior to beginning the EIR process. I urge the City Council to keep the current Westport Plan.

The alternative proposed by Longfellow Real Estate Partners will have serious negative consequences for many reasons:

- The addition of 7,000 high income employees will contribute to Redwood City's critical affordable housing shortage.
- The addition of these employees will further stress the area's transportation system.

- The massive project is not compatible with the surrounding residential developments, and violates General Plan BE 1.8.
- The location next to Belmont Slough threatens the natural environment, including wildlife and human recreation.
- There are possible environmental consequences to additional building on a former municipal landfill.

The harmful impact of this proposed redevelopment will affect not just Redwood City, but the entire Peninsula. Because the current Westport office park is compatible with the community and economically viable for the developer, I urge you to keep the current Westport plan and reject Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan.

Respectfully,

Jieli Shen

469 Cork Harbour Cir, Apt H, Redwood City, CA, 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2022 10:07 AM
To: Shibao Feng
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Letter to RC council members and candidates

Dear Shibao,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: Shibao Feng <shibao_feng@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2022 8:52 PM
To: BCC-Margaret Becker <mbecker@redwoodcity.org>; Docktown-Alison Madden <alisonmadden@yahoo.com>; chris@chrisforrwc.com; Kaia@KaiaEakin.org; dianehoward907@gmail.com; BCC-Jerome Madigan <jmadigan@redwoodcity.org>; GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; mail@stopredwoodlife.net
Subject: Letter to RC council members and candidates

Some people who received this message don't often get email from shibao_feng@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Redwood City Council Members and Candidates:

In its letter of August 4, 2022, the Redwood City Planning Division stated its intention of asking the City Council for direction regarding the merits of repealing the current Westport Specific Plan prior to beginning the EIR process. I urge the City Council to keep the current Westport Plan.

The alternative proposed by Longfellow Real Estate Partners will have serious negative consequences for many reasons:

- The addition of 7,000 high income employees will contribute to Redwood City's critical affordable housing shortage.
- The addition of these employees will further stress the area's transportation system.

- The massive project is not compatible with the surrounding residential developments, and violates General Plan BE 1.8.
- The location next to Belmont Slough threatens the natural environment, including wildlife and human recreation.
- There are possible environmental consequences to additional building on a former municipal landfill.

The harmful impact of this proposed redevelopment will affect not just Redwood City, but the entire Peninsula. Because the current Westport office park is compatible with the community and economically viable for the developer, I urge you to keep the current Westport plan and reject Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan.

Respectfully,

Shibao Feng

5 Gimbal Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2022 10:51 AM
To: Liz Tazbaz
Cc: mail@stopredwoodlife.net; GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Deanna La Croix
Subject: RE: Letter to RC council re Aug4 RCP.pdf

Dear Liz,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood
City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of
Service. Connect With Us View Full Site
www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: Liz Tazbaz <litanet@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 8:59 PM
To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; Council-Jeff Gee <jgee@redwoodcity.org>; mail@stopredwoodlife.net
Subject: Letter to RC council re Aug4 RCP.pdf

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from litanet@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Sent from my iPhone

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2022 11:31 AM
To: Lynn Emrick
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; MGR-Deanna La Croix; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Longfellow Redwood LIFE

Dear Lynn,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: Lynn Emrick <emrick1983@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 5:11 PM
To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>
Subject: Longfellow Redwood LIFE

Some people who received this message don't often get email from emrick1983@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Please see attached

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2022 10:01 AM
To: Angelica
Cc: mail@stopredwoodlife.net; GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Opposition to Redwood Life Project

Dear Angelica,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: Angelica <gepoloncia@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2022 5:25 PM
To: BCC-Margaret Becker <mbecker@redwoodcity.org>; Docktown-Alison Madden <alisonmadden@yahoo.com>; chris@chrisforrwc.com; Kaia@kaiaeakin.org; dianehoward907@gmail.com; BCC-Jerome Madigan <jmadigan@redwoodcity.org>; GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; mail@stopredwoodlife.net
Subject: Opposition to Redwood Life Project

Some people who received this message don't often get email from gepoloncia@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Redwood City Council Members and Candidates:

In a letter dated August 4, 2022, the Redwood City Planning Division stated its intention of asking the City Council for direction regarding the merits of repealing the current Westport Specific Plan prior to beginning the EIR process. I urge the City Council to keep the current Westport Plan.

The alternative proposed by Longfellow Real Estate Partners will have serious negative consequences for many reasons:

- The addition of 7,000 high income employees will contribute to Redwood City's critical affordable housing shortage.
- The addition of these employees will further stress the area's transportation system.

- The massive project is not compatible with the surrounding residential developments, and violates General Plan BE 1.8.
- The location next to Belmont Slough threatens the natural environment, including wildlife and human recreation.
- There are possible environmental consequences to additional building on a former municipal landfill.

The harmful impact of this proposed redevelopment will affect not just Redwood City, but the entire Peninsula. Because the current Westport office park is compatible with the community and economically viable for the developer, I urge you to keep the current Westport plan and **reject** Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan.

Respectfully,

Name: Angelica Ayala

Address: Waldron Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065.

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2022 9:22 AM
To: A. Evans
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Please keep the current Westport Specific Plan for Redwood City!

Dear Andrea,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us [View Full Site](#)
www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: A. Evans <evansdoor@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2022 5:50 PM
To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>
Subject: Please keep the current Westport Specific Plan for Redwood City!

Some people who received this message don't often get email from evansdoor@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Redwood City Councillors,

In its letter of August 4, 2022, the Redwood City Planning Division stated its intention of asking the City Council for direction regarding the merits of repealing the current Westport Specific Plan prior to beginning the EIR process.

I urge the City Council to retain the current Westport Plan.

The alternative proposed by Longfellow Real Estate Partners will have serious negative consequences for many reasons:

- The addition of 7,000 high income employees will contribute to Redwood City's critical affordable housing shortage.
- The addition of these employees will further stress the area's transportation system.
- The massive project is not compatible with the surrounding residential developments, and violates General Plan BE 1.8.
- The location next to Belmont Slough threatens the natural environment, including wildlife and human recreation.
- There are possible environmental consequences to additional building on a former municipal landfill.

The harmful impact of this proposed redevelopment will affect, not just Redwood City, but the entire Peninsula. Because the current office park is compatible with the community and economically viable for the developer, I urge you to keep the current Westport plan and reject Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan.

Sincerely,

Andrea Evans,
114 Shorebird Cir,
Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2022 9:58 AM
To: Lori Menachof
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Please oppose the Redwood Life Redevelopment Proposal

Dear Lori,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us [View Full Site](#)
www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: Lori Menachof <lori.menachof@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2022 9:46 AM
To: Council-Jeff Gee <jgee@redwoodcity.org>; GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>
Subject: Please oppose the Redwood Life Redevelopment Proposal

Some people who received this message don't often get email from lori.menachof@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear City Council Members,

I'm writing to urge the City Council to retain the current Westport Plan and reject the Redwood Life massive redevelopment proposal.

The Redwood Life redevelopment proposal would have serious negative consequences for Redwood City and its residents, including:

- Adding 7,000 new employees to the region without building affordable housing for those workers will add immensely to Redwood City's critical affordable housing shortage and housing imbalance. Peninsula cities cannot continue to allow large scale commercial development without building significant affordable housing for those workers.
- The addition of 7,000 workers driving in and out of Redwood Shores will further stress the area's already inadequate transportation systems, creating even more bottlenecks on Hwy 101 and resulting in gridlock within Redwood Shores

itself. There is virtually no existing public transportation near the site. There are only two residential roads in and out of Redwood Shores that would need to accommodate an additional 7,000 new cars daily.

--The addition of 7,000 new cars between the residential neighborhoods and Hwy 101 would effectively cut off the ability to safely evacuate Redwood Shores (including the elementary schools) in the case of an emergency, such as earthquake or fire.

--The proposed massive commercial project is not compatible with the surrounding residential developments or the Redwood City General Plan.

--The project location next to Belmont Slough threatens the natural environment, including significant seabird life.

--There are significant potential environmental risks to additional building (and to the heights proposed) on a former municipal refuse landfill. The site is adjacent to a large number of residences, creating significant potential environmental contamination risks for the many residents of Redwood Shores.

I urge you to retain the current Westport Plan and reject Longfellow's Redwood Life massive and inappropriate redevelopment proposal.

Sincerely,

Lori Menachof

941 Corriente Point Drive

Redwood City, CA

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2022 10:46 AM
To: mvillanu@yahoo.com; Council-Jeff Gee; GRP-City Council
Cc: mail@stopredwoodlife.net; GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Deanna La Croix
Subject: RE: Please Reject the Redwood LIFE Development

Dear Michael,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood
City](https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of
Service. Connect With Us [View Full Site](#)
www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: mvillanu@yahoo.com <mvillanu@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 9, 2022 7:39 AM
To: Council-Jeff Gee <jgee@redwoodcity.org>; GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>
Cc: mail@stopredwoodlife.net
Subject: Please Reject the Redwood LIFE Development

Honorable Councilmembers,

As a 30-year resident of Redwood Shores, I respectfully request that you reject the onerous and exploitative redevelopment plans proposed by Longfellow Real Estate Partners for the Redwood LIFE office park, and currently under review by the Planning Commission. Please read the attached letter prepared by "STOP Redwood LIFE," a grassroots organization composed of concerned Shores residents.

Thank you,

Michael Villanueva

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2022 10:12 AM
To: ucscharpist@yahoo.com
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Please Stop Redwood Life Project

Dear Sabrina,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: ucscharpist@yahoo.com <ucscharpist@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2022 4:18 PM
To: BCC-Margaret Becker <mbecker@redwoodcity.org>; Docktown-Alison Madden <alisonmadden@yahoo.com>; chris@chrisforrwc.com; Kaia@KaiaEakin.org; dianehoward907@gmail.com; BCC-Jerome Madigan <jmadigan@redwoodcity.org>; GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; mail@stopredwoodlife.net
Subject: Please Stop Redwood Life Project

Some people who received this message don't often get email from ucscharpist@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Redwood City Council Members and Candidates:

In its letter of August 4, 2022, the Redwood City Planning Division stated its intention of asking the City Council for direction regarding the merits of repealing the current Westport Specific Plan prior to beginning the EIR process. I urge the City Council to keep the current Westport Plan.

The alternative proposed by Longfellow Real Estate Partners will have serious negative consequences for many reasons:

- The addition of 7,000 high income employees will contribute to Redwood City's critical affordable housing shortage.
- The addition of these employees will further stress the area's transportation system.

- The massive project is not compatible with the surrounding residential developments, and violates General Plan BE 1.8.
- The location next to Belmont Slough threatens the natural environment, including wildlife and human recreation.
- There are possible environmental consequences to additional building on a former municipal landfill.

The harmful impact of this proposed redevelopment will affect not just Redwood City, but the entire Peninsula. Because the current Westport office park is compatible with the community and economically viable for the developer, I urge you to keep the current Westport plan and reject Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan.

Respectfully,

Name: Sabrina Ayers

Address: 602 Island Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2022 10:07 AM
To: Dhanraj Pondicherry
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Please stop redwood life

Dear Dhanraj,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: Dhanraj Pondicherry <dpondicherry@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2022 9:30 PM
To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>
Subject: Please stop redwood life

Some people who received this message don't often get email from dpondicherry@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Redwood City Council Members and Candidates:

In its letter of August 4, 2022, the Redwood City Planning Division stated its intention of asking the City Council for direction regarding the merits of repealing the current Westport Specific Plan prior to beginning the EIR process. I urge the City Council to keep the current Westport Plan.

The alternative proposed by Longfellow Real Estate Partners will have serious negative consequences for many reasons:

- The addition of 7,000 high income employees will contribute to Redwood City's critical affordable housing shortage.
- The addition of these employees will further stress the area's transportation system.
- The massive project is not compatible with the surrounding residential developments, and violates General Plan BE 1.8.

- The location next to Belmont Slough threatens the natural environment, including wildlife and human recreation.
- There are possible environmental consequences to additional building on a former municipal landfill.

The harmful impact of this proposed redevelopment will affect not just Redwood City, but the entire Peninsula. Because the current Westport office park is compatible with the community and economically viable for the developer, I urge you to keep the current Westport plan and reject Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan.

Respectfully,

Name: Dhanraj Pondicherry

Address: 465B Cork Harbour Cir, Redwood City, Ca 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Redwood City City Council
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 9:31 AM
To: levenchy@yahoo.com
Cc: mail@stopredwoodlife.net; GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Protect Redwood Shores by keeping the current Westport plan

Dear Lisa,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,
Pamela Aguilar, City Clerk

From: Lisa Evans <levenchy@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2022 2:55 PM
To: BCC-Margaret Becker <mbecker@redwoodcity.org>; Docketown-Alison Madden <alisonmadden@yahoo.com>; chris@chrisforrwc.com; Kaia@KaiaEakin.org; dianehoward907@gmail.com; BCC-Jerome Madigan <jmadigan@redwoodcity.org>; GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; mail@stopredwoodlife.net
Subject: Protect Redwood Shores by keeping the current Westport plan

You don't often get email from levenchy@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

www.stopredwoodlife.net

Dear Redwood City Council Members and Candidates:

In its letter of August 4, 2022, the Redwood City Planning Division stated its intention of asking the City Council for direction regarding the merits of repealing the current Westport Specific Plan prior to beginning the EIR process. I urge the City Council to keep the current Westport Plan.

The alternative proposed by Longfellow Real Estate Partners will have serious negative consequences for many reasons:

- The addition of 7,000 high income employees will contribute to Redwood City's critical affordable housing shortage.
- The addition of these employees will further stress the area's transportation system.

- The massive project is not compatible with the surrounding residential developments, and violates General Plan BE 1.8.
- The location next to Belmont Slough threatens the natural environment, including wildlife and human recreation.
- There are possible environmental consequences to additional building on a former municipal landfill.

The harmful impact of this proposed redevelopment will affect not just Redwood City, but the entire Peninsula. Because the current Westport office park is compatible with the community and economically viable for the developer, I urge you to keep the current Westport plan and reject Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan.

Respectfully,

Lisa Evens

873 Portwalk Place, Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2022 10:53 AM
To: Matthew Joseph
Cc: mail@stopredwoodlife.net; GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Deanna La Croix
Subject: RE: Redwood City Council

Dear Matthew,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: Matthew Joseph <matt.lottice@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 7:47 PM
To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; Council-Jeff Gee <jgee@redwoodcity.org>; mail@stopredwoodlife.net
Subject: Redwood City Council

Some people who received this message don't often get email from matt.lottice@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Make due with what is conveniently available before you further disrupt neighborhoods.

Thank you,

Matthew Lottice

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2022 10:29 AM
To: Sean Steffen
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Redwood Life

Dear Sean,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: Sean Steffen <ssteffen83@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2022 12:13 PM
To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; Council-Jeff Gee <jgee@redwoodcity.org>; mail@stopredwoodlife.net
Subject: Redwood Life

Some people who received this message don't often get email from ssteffen83@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To whom it may concern, See attached Signature.

--
Sean Steffen

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2022 11:04 AM
To: Tomas Pfister
Cc: Sophia Pfister; GRP-City Clerk; MGR-Deanna La Croix; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Request to reject Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan

Dear Thomas and Sophia,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: Tomas Pfister <tomas.pfister@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 6:00 PM
To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; Council-Jeff Gee <jgee@redwoodcity.org>
Cc: Sophia Pfister <sophia@pfister.fi>
Subject: Request to reject Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan

Some people who received this message don't often get email from tomas.pfister@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Redwood City Council Members:

In its letter of August 4, 2022, the Redwood City Planning Division stated its intention of asking the City Council for direction regarding the merits of repealing the current Westport Specific Plan prior to beginning the EIR process. We urge the City Council to retain the current Westport Plan and reject the Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan.

The alternative proposed by Longfellow Real Estate Partners will have serious negative consequences for many reasons:

- The addition of 7,000 high income employees will contribute to Redwood City's critical affordable housing shortage.
- The addition of these employees will further stress the area's transportation system.
- The massive project is not compatible with the surrounding residential developments, and violates General Plan BE 1.8.

- The location next to Belmont Slough threatens the natural environment, including wildlife and human recreation.
- There are possible environmental consequences to additional building on a former municipal landfill.

The harmful impact of this proposed redevelopment will affect, not just Redwood City, but the entire Peninsula. Because the current office park is compatible with the community and economically viable for the developer, we urge you to keep the current Westport plan and reject Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan.

Respectfully,
Tomas Pfister, Head of AI research, Google Cloud
Sophia Pfister, Director of research science, Varian Medical Systems
8/8/2022

Address: 754 Newport Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065

Phone: 6508923715

--

Sent from my iPhone

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Tuesday, July 5, 2022 12:09 PM
To: Joel D
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; GRP-City Clerk
Subject: RE: RSCA

Joel,

Confirming receipt of your email.

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale (she/her)
Mayor, Redwood City

From: Joel D <dujsik@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 3, 2022 8:50 PM
To: Council-Giselle Hale <ghale@redwoodcity.org>
Subject: RSCA

You don't often get email from dujsik@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi,

As a resident of Redwood Shores, I find it objectionable that you would give time to an unelected, unrepresentative and illegitimate group known as the RSCA. They do not represent me or many in our community of Redwood Shores. Their motive is to cause controversy for the purpose of maintaining their membership.

I had the misfortune of working with them on their response to the Life Sciences project. It was clear that they have pre-judged the worth of this project to Redwood Shores, and my participation with them was nothing short of a farce.

I generally support the project. Most importantly, I hope you would not give this group (which is fundamentally illegitimate), any more time than you would give any single constituent.

Thanks,

-- joel dujsik

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2022 10:13 AM
To: Jenny Lee
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Stop Redwood Life Development

Dear Jenny,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: Jenny Lee <littlejennylee@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2022 4:14 PM
To: BCC-Margaret Becker <mbecker@redwoodcity.org>; Docktown-Alison Madden <alisonmadden@yahoo.com>; chris@chrisforrwc.com; Kaia@kaiaeakin.org <Kaia@KaiaEakin.org>; dianehoward907@gmail.com; BCC-Jerome Madigan <jmadigan@redwoodcity.org>; GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; mail@stopredwoodlife.net
Subject: Stop Redwood Life Development

Some people who received this message don't often get email from littlejennylee@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

www.stopredwoodlife.net

Dear Redwood City Council Members and Candidates:

In its letter of August 4, 2022, the Redwood City Planning Division stated its intention of asking the City Council for direction regarding the merits of repealing the current Westport Specific Plan prior to beginning the EIR process. I urge the City Council to keep the current Westport Plan.

The alternative proposed by Longfellow Real Estate Partners will have serious negative consequences for many reasons:

- The addition of 7,000 high income employees will contribute to Redwood City's critical affordable housing shortage.
- The addition of these employees will further stress the area's transportation system.
- The massive project is not compatible with the surrounding residential developments, and violates General Plan BE 1.8.
- The location next to Belmont Slough threatens the natural environment, including wildlife and human recreation.
- There are possible environmental consequences to additional building on a former municipal landfill.

The harmful impact of this proposed redevelopment will affect not just Redwood City, but the entire Peninsula. Because the current Westport office park is compatible with the community and economically viable for the developer, I urge you to keep the current Westport plan and reject Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan.

Respectfully,

Name: Jenny Figueredo

Address: 806 Bay Harbour Dr Redwood City CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2022 9:31 AM
To: Janet Dahlberg
Cc: mail@stopredwoodlife.net; GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: STOP Redwood Life!

Dear Janet,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: Janet Dahlberg <jdwahoo@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2022 10:51 AM
To: BCC-Margaret Becker <mbecker@redwoodcity.org>; Docktown-Alison Madden <alisonmadden@yahoo.com>; chris@chrisforrwc.com; Kaia@KaiaEakin.org; dianehoward907@gmail.com; BCC-Jerome Madigan <jmadigan@redwoodcity.org>; GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; mail@stopredwoodlife.net
Subject: STOP Redwood Life!

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jdwahoo@comcast.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Redwood City Council Members and Candidates:

In its letter of August 4, 2022, the Redwood City Planning Division stated its intention of asking the City Council for direction regarding the merits of repealing the current Westport Specific Plan prior to beginning the EIR process. **I urge the City Council to keep the current Westport Plan.**

The alternative proposed by Longfellow Real Estate Partners will have serious negative consequences for many reasons:

- The addition of 7,000 high income employees will contribute to Redwood City's critical affordable housing shortage.

- The addition of these employees will further stress the area's transportation system.
- The massive project is not compatible with the surrounding residential developments, and violates General Plan BE 1.8.
- The location next to Belmont Slough threatens the natural environment, including wildlife and human recreation.
- There are possible environmental consequences to additional building on a former municipal landfill.

The harmful impact of this proposed redevelopment will affect not just Redwood City, but the entire Peninsula. Because the current Westport office park is compatible with the community and economically viable for the developer, **I urge you to keep the current Westport plan and reject Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan.**

Respectfully,

Janet Dahlberg
835 Corriente Pointe Drive
Redwood City CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2022 10:05 AM
To: Debi
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: STOP REDWOOD LIFE

Dear Debi,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: Debi <tropicaldream@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2022 10:34 PM
To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>
Subject: Fwd: STOP REDWOOD LIFE

Some people who received this message don't often get email from tropicaldream@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

www.stopredwoodlife.net

Dear Redwood City Council Members and Candidates:

In its letter of August 4, 2022, the Redwood City Planning Division stated its intention of asking the City Council for direction regarding the merits of repealing the current Westport Specific Plan prior to beginning the EIR process. I urge the City Council to keep the current Westport Plan.

The alternative proposed by Longfellow Real Estate Partners will have serious negative consequences for many reasons:

- The addition of 7,000 high income employees will contribute to Redwood City's critical affordable housing shortage.
- The addition of these employees will further stress the area's transportation system.
- The massive project is not compatible with the surrounding residential developments, and violates General Plan BE 1.8.
- The location next to Belmont Slough threatens the natural environment, including wildlife and human recreation.
- There are possible environmental consequences to additional building on a former municipal landfill.

The harmful impact of this proposed redevelopment will affect not just Redwood City, but the entire Peninsula. Because the current Westport office park is compatible with the community and economically viable for the developer, I urge you to keep the current Westport plan and reject Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan.

Respectfully,

Debra Carrubba

405H Cork Harbour Circle

Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Sent from my iPhone

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2022 10:54 AM
To: Susie Berl
Cc: GRP-City Clerk; La Croix (dlacroix@redwoodcity.org); CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Stop redwoodlife

Dear Susie,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

-----Original Message-----

From: Susie Berl <susie.berl1@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 7:24 PM
To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>
Cc: Council-Jeff Gee <jgee@redwoodcity.org>
Subject: Stop redwoodlife

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from susie.berl1@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Sent from my iPhone

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Council-Giselle Hale
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2022 11:30 AM
To: suspiration
Cc: mail@stopredwoodlife.net; GRP-City Clerk; MGR-Deanna La Croix; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: RE: Support Westport plan and Reject Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan

Dear Alan,

Thank you for providing your comments and concerns related to the Redwood Life project at 800-3400 Bridge Parkway. You have been added to the interested parties list for new project updates and future public meeting notifications. The project development page (linked below) will be updated periodically throughout the City's review as new information becomes available:

<https://www.redwoodcity.org/city-hall/current-projects/development-projects?id=113>

[Development Projects | City of Redwood City](#)

© 2022 City of Redwood City. All Rights Reserved. Terms of Service. Connect With Us View Full Site

www.redwoodcity.org

Respectfully,

Giselle Hale
Redwood City Mayor

From: suspiration <suspiration@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2022 5:30 PM
To: GRP-City Council <council@redwoodcity.org>; Council-Jeff Gee <jgee@redwoodcity.org>; mail@stopredwoodlife.net
Subject: Support Westport plan and Reject Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan

Some people who received this message don't often get email from suspiration@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Redwood City Council Members:

In its letter of August 4, 2022, the Redwood City Planning Division stated its intention of asking the City Council for direction regarding the merits of repealing the current Westport Specific Plan prior to beginning the EIR process. I urge the City Council to retain the current Westport Plan.

The alternative proposed by Longfellow Real Estate Partners will have serious negative consequences for many reasons:

- The addition of 7,000 high income employees will contribute to Redwood City's critical affordable housing shortage.
- The addition of these employees will further stress the area's transportation system.
- The massive project is not compatible with the surrounding residential developments, and violates General Plan BE 1.8.
- The location next to Belmont Slough threatens the natural environment, including wildlife and human recreation.

- There are possible environmental consequences to additional building on a former municipal landfill.

The harmful impact of this proposed redevelopment will affect, not just Redwood City, but the entire Peninsula. Because the current office park is compatible with the community and economically viable for the developer, I urge you to keep the current Westport plan and reject Longfellow

Respectfully,
Alan Mak

CD-Jessica Ira

From: baiken3033@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2023 12:29 PM
To: GRP-City Council; GRP-City Clerk
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Realistic Estimate of Actual Number of Longfellow Redwood LIFE Employees

Dear Council members.

Longfellow's plan of November 22, 2022 projects 6,909 employees for 3,169,000 square feet of R&D/Office space, or 459 employees per square foot. A comparison to similar developments shows this estimate of the total number of employees to be unrealistically low.

Based on these comparisons, the total number of employees at Redwood LIFE could be as high as 13,800 (Alexandria), or MORE THAN DOUBLE Longfellow's estimate. Longfellow seems to be manipulating its employment forecast to MINIMIZE THE NEGATIVE EFFECTS of the development.

Please consider the negative impacts of up to 13,800 new employees on our housing shortage, infrastructure needs, and traffic problems.

	Development Size	Total	Square Foot	Information
	<u>Square Foot</u>	<u>Employees</u>	<u>per Employee</u>	<u>Source</u>
Redwood Life (R&D/Office only)	3,169,000	6,909	459	Application
Harbor View, Redwood City	765,000	3,060	250	RWC Pulse
Alexandria, San Carlos	1,600,000	7,000	229	PA Daily Post
Divco West, Burlingame	1,460,000	5,000	292	The Registry
777 Industrial Road, San Carlos	122,465	408	300	Official Plan

Regards,

Earl Aiken

Stop Redwood Life!

The RWS grassroots movement to stop RL redevelopment

Web site: www.stopredwoodlife.net

Phone: 650-533-9393

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Tammy Fischetti <tammyfischetti@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 4:53 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: Council-Giselle Hale
Subject: Redwood Life

Some people who received this message don't often get email from tammyfischetti@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Please keep me informed of future actions on the Redwood Life Redevelopment plan of Longfellow Real Estate Partners.

Thanks,
Tammy Fischetti
Redwood Shore resident

CD-Jessica Ira

From: claudia sarconi <claudiasarconi@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 2, 2022 4:19 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; Council-Giselle Hale; GRP-City Council
Subject: Redwood LIFE

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Some people who received this message don't often get email from claudiasarconi@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Hale, Councilmember Gee, and Mr. Kuchenig,

I am writing to voice my strong opposition to Redwood LIFE. As a resident of Redwood Shores for over 22 years, I have loved its natural beauty, how quiet it is, and the small-town feeling it offers. If Redwood LIFE is allowed to move forward, this will drastically change. I am concerned about exposure to toxic materials, which would be harmful to both animal and human life in the Shores. I am concerned about the noise, dust, and increased traffic both during the construction phase as well as the more than 6,000 employees who would be entering and exiting Redwood Shores each day once the project is completed. If this project is allowed to move forward, my property value, and that of everyone else with property on Marine World Parkway, will sharply decline. No one will want to buy property anywhere near all of that construction, noise, and dust. Having so many thousands of people working in Redwood Shores will put a strain on our roads, and substantially increase water usage. With only two ways in and out of Redwood Shores, the increased population that Redwood LIFE would bring would make it dangerous in an emergency. Moreover, it is environmentally irresponsible to demolish the existing buildings at the proposed site when they are only approximately twenty years old.

Please let me know if you agree with my position on Redwood LIFE. I am interested in learning what I can do to oppose Redwood LIFE moving forward.

Sincerely,
Claudia Sarconi
19 Cove Lane
Redwood City

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Adam Inglis <inglis.adam@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 15, 2023 7:48 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Alex Khojikian; MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto
Subject: Redwood LIFE Evolve Project - Community Support & Feedback

To the City Council,

My name is Adam Inglis and I am a resident of Redwood Shores having moved here from downtown Redwood City about 8 years ago. I also work in Redwood City at the office complexes off Seaport Blvd.

I don't normally write to the council about local matters, but I understand that you are evaluating the Redwood LIFE Evolve project in Redwood Shores which I also understand has generated some concerns/NIMBYism among those in the area.

I am writing to you to express my **strong support** for the Redwood LIFE Evolve project and wanted to make sure you heard that support coming from the community as well. I learned more about the project at a recent Farmer's Market that the developer hosted on the site and that my daughter enjoyed immensely.

The current site of the proposed development is a bit of an industrial wasteland offering few benefits to the residents of Redwood Shores and some excessively large parking lots. From what I know of the proposed project, I believe that it would bring many benefits to our community, including:

- * Meaningful contributions to Redwood City's tax and development impact revenues
- * Infrastructure and levee improvements to protect Redwood Shores (which I do worry about with the increasing frequency of severe weather events and expected ocean level rises)
- * Good jobs that generate additional opportunities for local businesses and increased tax revenue for the community
- * Additional parks or community spaces that can be used by local families rather than parking lots.

The transformation of an old office park to new parks, amenities and employment opportunities will be a great benefit to my daughter, other families like ours, and the community as a whole. So much so that I feel it would be irresponsible not to put my support behind it and encourage you all to expedite your review of the project's details.

I look forward to the City beginning its review so the City and community can see these benefits as soon as possible.

Thank you for your time,

Adam Inglis

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Joao Darosa <johnnydarosa@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Saturday, April 15, 2023 11:30 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Alex Khojikian; MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto
Subject: Redwood LIFE Evolve proposal submitted by Longfellow Real Estate Partners
Attachments: PCBA letter to Redwood City.pdf

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

I am writing to inform you about our support of the above-subject project on behalf of the Peninsula Chinese Business Association (PCBA). I've included our attached letter explaining the nature of our support.

For any questions you may have, please do not hesitate to let me know. I can be reached at 650-270-3599 or by email.

I greatly appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely,

Johnny DaRosa
Executive Director, Peninsula Chinese Business Association

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Chris MacIntosh <chrismac@alumni.upenn.edu>
Sent: Thursday, February 10, 2022 7:26 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Redwood Life project

You don't often get email from chrismac@alumni.upenn.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello,

I am interested in being added as an "interested party" for the Redwood Life project.

I am especially concerned that light pollution will be taken into account in the planning and approval process, particularly as it would affect the birds and other wildlife immediately adjacent to these buildings. I hope the plan will follow IDA guidelines. <https://www.darksky.org/our-work/lighting/lighting-for-citizens/lighting-basics/>

Thank you.

Chris MacIntosh
Chrismac@alumni.upenn.edu

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Adelaide Nye <nyeadelaide@gmail.com> on behalf of Adelaide Nye <adelaide@life.net>
Sent: Monday, January 3, 2022 5:08 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Redwood Life Project - request to be put on mailing list for all public notices relating to project

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

You don't often get email from adelaide@life.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

Greetings Ryan,

First, Happy New Year to you. May 2022 be a fruitful, healthy, and successful year for you and yours.

I am a Redwood Shores resident of 18 years who is closely tracking developments in the Redwood Life Project.

Please add me to the mailing list you maintain for those members of the public who wish to be regularly updated on this project.

I am seeking to be well informed about all Redwood City public meetings, and invitations to offer input, regarding this project.

Thank you very much for confirming receipt of this email and letting me know my name has been added to that list.

If I perhaps incorrectly understand the process of keeping the public informed, or I need to address this to someone else, I trust you will link me to the correct information.

Kind regards,

Adelaide Nye
842 Portwalk Pl.
Redwood City, CA
650-924-0553 mobile

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Stefania Giudici <stefygiudici@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2021 4:04 PM
To: GRP-City Council; CD-Ryan Kuchenig; CD-Sue Exline
Subject: Redwood life project

Some people who received this message don't often get email from stefygiudici@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi,

I am a longtime Redwood Shores resident, and I am writing to express my strong opposition to the redevelopment project proposal being considered by Longfellow and PGIM in the technology park (Redwood Life). I am opposed to this project for the following reasons:

1. Release of toxic chemicals and flammable methane gas that will happen when they drill the cap that has been applied over the landfill at the time of initial development
2. Decades of construction traffic and noise
3. Increased commute traffic
4. Safety. With the increase number of workers and guests, and increased traffic, in the case of earthquake or major disaster, emergency personnel and services won't be able to reach the Shores residents in a timely manner
5. Massive buildings that are 2-3 times higher than current buildings and will be too close the peninsula landing and broadwalk residential neighborhoods.

The redwood life park as it has been designed and recently updated blends perfectly into our community and causes minor disruption to residential life and the environment. The buildings are low key on the outside (and yet perfectly designed and equipped to handle the biotech industry needs). Our community strongly opposes the redevelopment project, and we hope that as elected officials and city planners you will listen to our voice and take our concerns into consideration.

Thank you,
Stefania Giudici
366 Genoa Dr
Redwood City, 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Dorra Sellami <dsellami2002@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2021 8:37 AM
To: GRP-City Council; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Redwood life project

[You don't often get email from dsellami2002@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important at <http://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>.]

Hi,

I am a longtime Redwood Shores resident, and I am writing to express my strong opposition to the redevelopment project proposal being considered by Longfellow and PGIM in the technology park (Redwood Life). I am opposed to this project for the following reasons:

1. Release of toxic chemicals and flammable methane gas that will happen when they drill the cap that has been applied over the landfill at the time of initial development
2. Decades of construction traffic and noise
3. Increased commute traffic
4. Safety. With the increase number of workers and guests, and increased traffic, in the case of earthquake or major disaster, emergency personnel and services won't be able to reach the Shores residents in a timely manner
5. Massive buildings that are 2-3 times higher than current buildings and will be too close the peninsula landing and broadwalk residential neighborhoods.

The redwood life park as it has been designed and recently updated blends perfectly into our community and causes minor disruption to residential life and the environment. The buildings are low key on the outside (and yet perfectly designed and equipped to handle the biotech industry needs). Our community strongly opposes the redevelopment project, and we hope that as elected officials and city planners you will listen to our voice and take our concerns into consideration, Thank you,

Dorra Sellami, MD
4 Manhattan Ct
Redwood City, 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Wilson Chan <wilsonchan@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2022 5:31 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; Council-Giselle Hale
Subject: Redwood Life Redevelopment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Some people who received this message don't often get email from wilsonchan@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi there! I hope you are doing well. I hereby request that I receive notices from the city council for all future actions on the Redwood Life Redevelopment Plan. Can you please reply to this email and confirm my request? Thank you very much!

Best regards,
Wilson Chan
Resident of Redwood Shores

CD-Jessica Ira

From: stoprlrs@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 3:43 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: REDWOOD LIFE WILL CAUSE MORE GENTRIFICATION

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Council Member:

The average per capita (not family) income for the biotech industry in Redwood City is \$107,428, according to ZipRecruiter.

In District 4, 62% of workers make an income of \$75,000 or less, according to RC Pulse (August 29, 2022).

A new townhouse development at Vera Avenue and Adams Street in District 4 will sell for more than \$1.6 million per unit. GENTRIFICATION IS HAPPENING IN REDWOOD CITY.

The Longfellow Redwood LIFE redevelopment will bring 7,000, or more, highly paid biotech professionals to Redwood City. This influx will lead to the further GENTRIFICATION, as low and moderate income workers can no longer compete for housing. A few hundred subsidized housing units will do little to alleviate the jobs/housing imbalance.

We urge the City Council to deny Longfellow's application to redevelop Redwood LIFE.

Regards,

Earl and Brigitte Aiken

Stop Redwood Life!

The RWS grassroots movement to stop RL redevelopment

Web site: www.stopredwoodlife.net

Phone: 650-533-9393

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Joel D <dujsik@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2022 5:04 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Redwood Life

You don't often get email from dujsik@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi Ryan,

I strongly SUPPORT the redevelopment of Redwood Life.
I live at 125 Shorebird Circle, less than a block away.

Thanks,

-- joel dujsik
125 shorebird circle,
redwood shores, ca

CD-Jessica Ira

From: p <nscheppler@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 1, 2022 4:32 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Redwood Shores Development Plan

You don't often get email from nscheppler@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Please let me know when the next hearing will be concerning the proposed new development plan off of Marine Parkway in Redwood Shores.

Thank you,
Nancy Scheppler

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Joseph Kuspa <jkuspa@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2021 5:55 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Save Our Shores

You don't often get email from jkuspa@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

I am opposed to the proposed development by the Longfellow & PGIM developers to be located on Marine Parkway for the following reasons:

1. Release of toxic chemicals & flammable methane gas.
2. Decades of construction traffic & noise
3. Commute traffic
4. Safety - in the event of an emergency or earthquake, vital services will not be able to reach the Shores due to traffic gridlock from the development
5. Massive buildings - a development of this size is not compatible w/ our community in the Shores

Joe Kuspa



Virus-free. www.avast.com

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Xiaoyu Shi <shixiaoyu.zju@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2021 4:22 PM
To: GRP-City Council; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Save Redwood Shores from Longfellow/Redwood life development project

Some people who received this message don't often get email from shixiaoyu.zju@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi dear council members,

As a Redwood Shores resident, I would like to express my concerns on the upcoming longfellow/redwood life project. If there are any petitions I could sign and bring these concerns, please let me know!

Thanks,
Xiaoyu

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Helen D'Arceuil <helendarceuil@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 7:09 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely, Helen Darceuil

Sent from my iPhone

CD-Jessica Ira

From: rockysmouse@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 8:21 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan, from a redwood shores resident

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from rockysmouse@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Roger Haeussler <rogerhaeussler@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 7:19 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from rogerhaeussler@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present

office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Roger Haeussler
912 Governors Bay Drive
Redwood City CA 94065
rogerhaeussler@gmail.com
+1 650 556 3687

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Carol Taylor <jetmaid1970@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2022 4:06 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; Council-Giselle Hale; GRP-City Council; Council-Jeff Gee
Subject: Stop Redwood Life!

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jetmaid1970@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

To whom it may concern,

I have been a resident of Redwood Shores since 1973. We have watched the area grow and develop over those years. I have walked the levies and enjoyed the wildlife they contain. It makes me sad to think that a company could come in and put all of that and the residents here at risk for profit.

Prior to the pandemic, traffic was already an issue and I can't imagine it with an additional 6000 people coming in and going out each day. The existing buildings fit into the landscape and still have many years of use left in them. There is no reason to demolish them, especially based on the risk of pollutants that would be released doing so.

As our city officials, I would expect you to do what is in the best interest of the population affected rather than the bottom line of some out of state company.

Please STOP Redwood Life!

Sincerely,

Carol Taylor
509 Neptune Dr.
Redwood City, Ca. 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: C Kuan Carlino <ckcarlino@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 9:32 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to *preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form***. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from

prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.**
Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

C Kuan Carlino

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Rupesh Patel <rupesh@verakincapital.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 16, 2023 10:09 AM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Alex Khojikian; MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto
Subject: Support for Redwood LIFE Evolve

Mayor Gee and City Council,

I would like to urge the City to begin CEQA and study the Redwood LIFE Evolve project, and not delay the benefits of the project any longer. I believe that the many benefits Longfellow has proposed are worth urgent consideration and should not have any barriers to conduct a thorough study of feasibility and impact.

I have seen the effort Longfellow has made to open their doors to the community with their amenities and café. Since they bought this outdated business park, they have already brought events and sponsorships to the local community within the confines of what they have, many of which I was able to attend. The proposed project will allow them to create major amenities and programming that reach the wider Redwood City community and neighboring communities. They have also actively sought feedback on their proposed project and I believe they will be good community members. I have been a Peninsula native my whole life and have always thought that this part of Redwood City has always needed more activation for locals to enjoy. The use of land in this area is very under utilized and needs some densification with multiple uses.

The projects financial contributions will help our city meet its goals for affordable housing, childcare, and sea level rise improvements. Redwood LIFE will also bring tax revenues at a time where they are sorely needed.

Given the significant community benefits this project will bring, I request that the City Council direct staff to study the project and allow the environmental review to move forward. There should not be any hurdles to get past this stage as this stage will help everyone, City Officials, Longfellow, and neighbors to understand the true impact of such a project.

Regards,

Rupesh Patel | Partner

M: 650.483.9968 | E: rupesh@verakincapital.com | www.verakincapital.com



Disclaimer: The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Darius Wiles <darius@dariuswiles.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 5, 2023 4:26 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: The Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan is worth considering

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

The short version of this email is that I believe there are potentially enough benefits to the proposed Redwood LIFE development to outweigh the disadvantages. I believe it is worth seriously considering the proposal and being more flexible than the Westport Specific Plan allows if the council believes that's in the city's best interests. The various advocacy groups fighting the redevelopment claim to represent Redwood Shores homeowners, but don't.

Expanding on my last point, the advocacy groups seem composed of small groups of individuals who strongly oppose any development. They don't seem interested in actually hearing the views of homeowners and to my knowledge none have actually polled homeowners for their opinions. Yet these groups claim to speak on behalf of Redwood Shores residents. I urge you to realize that though these groups are making a lot of noise, they only represent the small number of people running them.

I am slightly in favor of Redwood LIFE redevelopment, providing the council believes it will not have major negative consequences, such as the release of toxic materials from the landfill under the current office park. I live in Beacon Shores, which is relatively close to the site, and I'm willing to tolerate some inconvenience as a result of a redevelopment in order to gain the benefits.

The advocacy groups have many objections that I don't think have merit, such as:

- Tall buildings - the Oracle buildings just across the slough are much taller than the proposed buildings and don't cause any major issues of which I'm aware.
- Traffic - the new elementary school and associated housing, the Oracle high tech school, and the trucks required for the wastewater plant expansion were all separately predicted to bring traffic chaos. None did, and it will be the same for the proposed redevelopment.
- Wildlife - I have seen literally no substance to the claim wildlife will be impacted by redevelopment. In fact, the proposed development aims to replace many of the current asphalt parking lots with green space, which looks like a net benefit to wildlife to me.

Release of toxic materials under the current site and dangers of businesses handling biohazardous materials are concerns I do share, but I trust the council to ensure these are adequately addressed. The proposed raising of the levees should also fit in the council's overall plans for flood protection.

Redeveloping the Redwood LIFE park is worth considering as long as all valid concerns can be addressed to the council's satisfaction.

Sincerely,
Darius Wiles

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Chris Tow <chris.tow@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 28, 2022 5:50 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: Council-Giselle Hale
Subject: Updates on Redwood Life

Some people who received this message don't often get email from chris.tow@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi -

As a Redwood Shores resident I would like to receive notice of any future actions on the Redwood Life plan. I am strongly against this project as are many of my neighbors. Thank you.

Chris

Chris Tow
400 Whisper Ln
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
chris.tow@gmail.com

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 4:07 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Robert Highsmith
bobhighsmith@gmail.com
720 Portwalk Place Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 3:48 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Linda Slezak
lslezak@aol.com
576 Island Place Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 3:19 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- karl leslie
karl86@yahoo.com
211 Canoe ct redwood city, ca 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 2:48 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- David Woodward
woodwarddc@aol.com
329 Quay Lane Redwood Shores, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 2:26 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Kevin Krueger
kevinmkruenger@hotmail.com
589 Keelson Circle REDWOOD CITY, California 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 2:17 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Flora Viray
fviray@gmail.com
267 nice court Redwood city, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 2:17 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Chloe Lahham
lahhamchloe@gmail.com
247 Nice court Redwood City, Ca 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 2:15 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Imad Lahham
ilahham@aol.com
247 Nice court Redwood city 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 2:13 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Xiaoping Hu
x_sylvia_hu@yahoo.com
Nice ct Redwood city, Ca 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 2:11 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Faryal Saiidnia
fsaiidnia23@gmail.com
200 Baltic Circle Unit 238 Redwood City, California 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 2:05 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Marielle Bundukin
marsipan7@gmail.com
Seastorm Drive Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 1:59 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Andrea Levin
galev94061@sbcglobal.net
Cork Harbour Circle Redwood City, CA

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 1:32 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- tracie banuelos
td3477@yahoo.com
524 ANCHOR CIR REDWOOD CITY, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 1:21 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Harvey Radin
hmradin@comcast.net
24 Spinnaker Place Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 1:17 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Vidya Gadamasetti
vg0621@aol.com
469 Cork Harbor circle Apt A Redwood city, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 1:15 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Alan Mak
suspuration@gmail.com
433 Cork Harbour Cir Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 1:03 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Leyla Ozgur
leylaozgur@gmail.com
208 Mendocino Way, Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 12:46 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Steven Seamount
e_evlanova@yahoo.com
3 Mandalay Ct Redwood City , CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 12:40 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Dennis Dehne
ddehne@hotmail.com
52 Eddystone Court Redwood City, Ca 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 12:34 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Rebecca Millward
becky_millward09@yahoo.com
10 Avocet Drive, #10-206 Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 12:28 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Rina Kolotinsky
rkoloti07@gmail.com
449 cork harbor cir apt D Redwood City , Ca 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 12:18 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- emma tcheau
emmatcheau@gmail.com
223 Nice Court Redwood City, California 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 12:17 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Peter Hwang
ph_513@yahoo.com
552 Seastorm Dr Redwood City, Ca 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 12:00 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Annie Hopkins
annie.hopkins@yahoo.com
351 Mindanao Dr Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 12:00 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Annie Hopkins
annie.hopkins@yahoo.com
351 Mindanao Dr Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 11:54 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Rick Schulze
rickschulze@comcast.net
Island Pl Redwood City , CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 11:54 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Steve Gimnichner
gimnichner@aol.com
703 Mendocino Way Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 11:49 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Gayle Blucher
wildcap@comcast.net
104 Monaco Drive Redwood City, California 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 11:18 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Marmabani Basu
marmabani@yahoo.com
520 Compass Circle Redwood City , CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 11:02 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Grace Zhang
gracezy@gmail.com
525 Osprey Dr Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 11:00 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Mary Miller
mmworkfun@gmail.com
871 PORTWALK PL Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 10:58 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Jenny Zheng
jennyzhengjh@gmail.com
259 Nice act

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 10:46 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Michael Axelrod
axelrod@gmail.com
121 Monaco Dr. Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 10:43 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- David Yih
davidyih@yahoo.com
808 Nantucket Dr Redwood City, Ca 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 10:38 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Elaine Chan
elainechan94706@gmail.com
35 Dockside Cir Redwood City, California 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 10:33 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Avikk Ghose
avikkgh@hotmail.com
35 Dockside Cir Redwood City, California 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 10:25 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Ondrea Roces
rocesmanuel56@gmail.com
1 Tidewater Dr Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 10:23 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Alice Roces
alicegroces@gmail.com
1 Tidewater Drive Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 10:22 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Manuel Rocas
rocesmanuel@gmail.com
1 Tidewater Drive Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 10:19 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Liz Tazbaz
litanet@aol.com
247 Nice

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 10:18 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Chai Siah Ku
chaiku@gmail.com
631 Teredo Drive Redwood City , CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 10:17 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Allison Don
allisonddon@hotmail.com
1036 Rockport Ave Redwood City, CA 94065-2870

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 10:16 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Bradley Gao
bgao@spd-svbank.com
259 Nice Ct Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 10:07 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Ramesh Lingamneni
vidyutus@yahoo.com
255 Nice Court Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 10:06 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Judy Lewis
judylewis150@gmail.com
790 Mediterranean Lane Redwood City, Noca 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 10:02 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Weizheng Wang
wxw151@hotmail.com
20 Admiralty Place Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 9:55 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Tariq Nagpurwala
tariqn@gmail.com
3 Tidewater Dr. Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 9:55 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Jackie Cheung
cheungt226@yahoo.com
226 Nice Ct. Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 9:50 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Michael Lassoff
mlassoff@paclightingresources.com
310 Whidbey Ln Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 9:50 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Michael Lassoff
mlassoff@paclightingresources.com
310 Whidbey Ln Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 9:40 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Paul Williams
paulshome@comcast.net
452 BARNEGAT LN REDWOOD CITY, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 9:29 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Willy Wang
wwwang01@aol.com
775 Mediterranean Ln Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 9:27 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- jiayue Li
252247547@qq.com
94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 9:23 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Susan Fanai
skfanai@comcast.net
646 Island PI REDWOOD CITY, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 9:13 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Yannei Zhang
z_yannei@yahoo.com

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 9:09 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Renee Hubert
mrs.hubert@gmail.com
238 Nice Ct Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 9:02 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Grace Wang
grace.htwang@gmail.com
829 sovereign way Redwood City , Ca 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 8:32 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Peter Budelov
pbudelov@yahoo.com
21 Admiralty Pl Redwood City, California 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 8:07 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Vidyut Lingamneni
vidyut_lingamneni@yahoo.com
255 Nice Court Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 7:53 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Anne Miltimore
parfaitmom@comcast.net
933 Corriente Point Drive, Redwood City, California 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 7:37 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Mao Geng
gengmao@gmail.com
525 Osprey Dr Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 7:35 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Lucas Robinson
lmrobinson38@gmail.com
590 Avocet Drive, Apr 7311 Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 7:31 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Guoguang Ma
julieggma@gmail.com

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 7:21 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Amir Fanai
amirfanai@yahoo.com
646 Island Place Redwood City , CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 7:11 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Zhaojun Mu
lola4476@gmail.com
429 cork harbour cir, apt G Redwood city, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 6:59 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Chia Yiaw Chong
chiayiaw@gmail.com
631 Teredo Drive Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 6:49 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Colleen Cassity
colleen.cassity@gmail.com
232 Shorebird Circle Redwood Shores, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 6:39 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Jeffery McHenry
JCM774@AOL.COM
821 PortWalk Pl. Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 5:36 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Abhishek Ghuwalewala
abhishek.ghuwalewala@gmail.com
702 Portwalk PI Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 4:40 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Christopher Tan
ctan121@yahoo.com
436 Compass Drive Redwood City, Ca 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 4:29 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Ana-Paula Martins-Fernandes
anapaulamfernandes@gmail.com
705 Mendocino Way Redwood City, CA 94065-1796

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 4:29 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Tonia Hashimoto
tonia_hashimoto@hotmail.com
651 Island Place Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 4:15 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Jessica Tang
jessj_tang@yahoo.com
Pickleweed Redwood Shores, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 4:15 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Jessica Tang
jessj_tang@yahoo.com
Pickleweed Redwood Shores, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 4:04 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Maria Tetesa Palma
tesspalma519@yahoo.com
209 Monaco Dr Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 3:36 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Holly Christensen
hollychristensen530@gmail.com
4 Dana Pointe Ct Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 2:37 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Manique Wijewardena Bloom
maniquewbloom@gmail.com
820 Seal Pointe Drive Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 1:18 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Carolina Pasos
cpasos@yahoo.com
612 Lanyard Drive Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 1:18 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Janine Nguyen
jnean.nuwin@gmail.com
Cork Harbour Cir Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 12:50 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Roger Haeussler
rogerhaeussler@gmail.com
912 Governors Bay Drive Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 12:46 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Greg Hargrove
greg.hargrove1@gmail.com
536 Shorebird Circle Unit 5201 Redwood City, Ca 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 12:22 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Ruzzel Ronquillo
ruzzelronq@gmail.com
3002 Whisperwave Circle Redwood City, Ca 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 12:04 AM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Pristine Mn
p_mn@hotmail.com
600 oracle pkwy Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 11:31 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Neha Patel
nehdee_2000@yahoo.com
2017 Seabrook Court Redwood city, California 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 11:19 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Rebecca Zhang
yzhangrebecca@gmail.com
426 luff lane redwood city, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 11:18 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Raymond Ng
raymondng8@hotmail.com
394, Mindanao Drive Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 10:57 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Alfred Ding
ading007@gmail.com
242 Biarritz Court Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 10:50 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Carmen Tan
carmentan@gmail.com
436 Compass Drive Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 10:41 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Carolyn and Ronald Beaman
clqclq05@gmail.com
534 Shorebird Circle #17201 Redwood City , Ca. 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 10:40 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Michael Koifman
mkoifman@yahoo.com
54 Dockside Cir. Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 10:34 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Thomas and Mary De Vries
twdevries@earthlink.net
849 Columbia Circle Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 10:32 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Carol Wong
carol8wong@hotmail.com
319 Treasure Island Dr Belmont , CA 94002

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 10:32 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Jing Hong
jinglehong@yahoo.com
Kraken Ln Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 10:30 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Sue Kim-Ahn
skimmilk01@yahoo.com
133 Monaco Drive Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 10:29 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Leslie Jin
leslie.yj.jin@gmail.com

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 10:21 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Anna Lyapis
lyapis@gmail.com
850 Columbia Cir Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 6:06 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Adrian Percer
adrian.percer@gmail.com
972 Governors Bay Dr Redwood Shores , CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 6:05 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Frank Zhang
frankz650@gmail.com
426 Luff Ln Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 6:04 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Todd Irwin
todd_irwin@yahoo.com
558 Compass Circle Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 6:03 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Edwin Chow
ed_chow@yahoo.com
235 Nice Ct Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 6:01 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Aaron Kantor
aaronbkantor@aol.com
841 Columbia Circle Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 5:59 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Andrey Iगतov
andrewi@corrigo.com
111 Shorebird Cir. Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 5:56 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Anna Dowling
Annadowl@gmail.com
Redwood, California 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 5:55 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- David Evans
d@aandd.org
114 Shorebird Cricle Redwood Shores, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 5:53 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Janet Dahlberg
jdwahoo@comcast.net
835 Corriente Pointe Drive Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 5:51 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Diane Fong
swfong4@comcast.net
809 Bay Harbour Dr Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 5:51 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Cherise Lau
cheriselau@gmail.com

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 5:48 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Todd Weinfield
tweinfield@gmail.com
Rockport Ave Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 5:46 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Liliya Sarokina
liliya.sarokina@gmail.com
9 Avocet Dr Apt 203 Redwood City, California 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 5:45 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Joe Kuspa
jkuspa@hotmail.com
2017 Rockport Avenue Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 5:43 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Victoria Gonzalez
vickiegonzalez@gmail.com
106 Waldron Drive Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 5:42 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Vajid Jafri
vajid.jafri@gmail.com
592 dory ln redwood shores, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 5:40 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- DARICE BLUMENFELD
dbbs@prodigy.net
510 Neptune Dr Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 5:38 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Mark Domingo
mkdomingo@gmail.com
480 FATHOM CT REDWOOD CITY, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 5:38 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to **"Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!"** and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Adam Abelkop
aabelkop@usfca.edu
824 Portwalk PI Redwood City, CA 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Save the Shores <info@saverws.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 4:08 PM
To: CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Cc: CD-Mark Muenzer; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Lindy Chan
Subject: URGENT: Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from info@saverws.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Ryan Kuchenig,

I am writing to express that Longfellow's Redwood LIFE redevelopment application to create a new Precise Plan for the Westport office park **should be outright rejected** because the rationale initially set forth at that time is even more relevant today. In 1995, the city carefully established rules and limits in the final Westport Specific Plan so that the commercial park would minimally impact residential neighborhoods, as evidenced below:

- PG14: "Building profiles have also been significantly lowered from the 1985 specific plan and view corridors maintained, **to minimize the visual impact of the R and D development on the existing residential developments.**"
- PG14: "The Specific Plan shall permit buildings no higher than 3 stories (53 ft) as long as they are located in Zone 2 in order **to minimize the visual impact of these taller buildings.** Two story buildings shall be set back at least 175 feet from the southeasterly property line."

Today, many more people live in Redwood Shores, along with the addition of an elementary school and a public library along Marine and Shearwater Parkways. In other words, the reasons the city determined when limiting development are even more relevant now.

I urge Redwood City to "**Stay with the Westport Specific Plan!**" and reject the Longfellow project proposal outright, and any future project for the site must also comply with the final Westport Precise Plan guidelines.

Thank you for your time and service.

-- Thomas Wong
tmwong83@yahoo.com
243 Nice Court Redwood City, California 94065

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Shiva Kamali <shivakamali@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2023 10:12 AM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Alex Khojikian; MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto
Subject: We Need Redwood LIFE Evolve

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

My name is Shiva Kamali, and I have been living in Redwood Shores with my family for almost 10 years. We all love Redwood Shores!

I am writing to express my strong support for the Redwood LIFE project. As a member of the community, I am proud to support this project and believe it will be an asset to our city.

First and foremost, I would like to commend Longfellow for their dedication to our community by proactively seeking community input on this project. They have listened to our concerns and incorporated our feedback to ensure that the project meets the needs of the community. This is a clear indication of their commitment to building a project that is responsive to our needs.

I've met with Tara, Peter, and others at Longfellow and believe the proposed plan would bring positive changes that deserve further study. Instead of an aging office park with acres of asphalt, their proposal could bring much-needed modernization with new parks and recreational opportunities.

Longfellow has already begun to do this with a new café and amenities and events for our community, something we are sorely lacking today. My son enjoyed the park planning activity they have done at the Farmer's Market so much that he has volunteered to help them with the activity!

Longfellow's vision for this project will bring benefits not just to the Redwood Shores community but to all of Redwood City with tax revenue, parks, childcare and affordable housing benefits, and much more.

The City's environmental review process is an important step to understanding the project's potential impacts. As a supporter of the Redwood LIFE project, I urge you to approve this development. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Shiva Kamali

CD-Jessica Ira

From: Viren Patel <virenpatel@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2023 7:09 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: CD-Ryan Kuchenig; MGR-Alex Khojikian; MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto
Subject: We Need Redwood LIFE Evolve

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

I am writing to express my support for the Redwood LIFE Evolve project and the many benefits it could bring to our community.

The current campus is underutilized. The parks and amenities that Longfellow is proposing will bring new vitality and resources to Redwood Shores and to the wider Redwood City community.

The economic development that could come from this project is critical to sustaining Redwood City and the Peninsula's small businesses. Longfellow has shown that they will make significant financial contributions that would help our city meet its goals for affordable housing, childcare, and sea level rise improvements.

I urge the City to begin the environmental review of the project.

Thank you,

Viren

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
3/28/2022 9:02	Maureen O'Donnell	717 Newport Circle, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
3/28/2022 17:15	David C Woodward	329 Quay Lane, Redwood Shores. CA 94065
3/29/2022 8:08	Susanne Burrill	740 Newport Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/29/2022 13:27	Sandra Nyholm Goncalves	316 Capstan Ct, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
3/29/2022 16:15	Patricia Michon	319 Quay Lane
3/29/2022 16:17	Roy Michon	319 Quay Lane
3/29/2022 16:19	Wilma Sekely	319 Quay Lane
3/29/2022 17:26	gregory trenkner	318 quay ln redwood city
3/30/2022 8:12	Cheryl kenney	330 quay lane
3/31/2022 15:12	Carole Woodward	329 Quay Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/1/2022 16:33	Jenny Wang	334 Turkshead Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/3/2022 14:38	Brian Sugano	710 Newport Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/3/2022 14:42	Ginny Hom	710 Newport Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/3/2022 18:39	Feyza Ostroff	60 Eddystone Ct, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/3/2022 20:20	Seyyed Vahid Hashemian	437 Lanyard Dr., Redwood City, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
4/4/2022 21:34	URI Rosenberg	941 Corriente Point drive Redwood City 94065
4/5/2022 15:33	Nick Kaufman	121 Positano Circle Redwood Shores ca 94065
4/5/2022 17:59	Sema Tosun	112 Amalfi Way Redwood Shores CA 94065
4/5/2022 18:01	Steve Tosun	116 Amalfi Way Redwood Shores CA 94065
4/5/2022 18:58	James Wong	319 Turkshead Ln RWC CA 94065
4/6/2022 10:54	Zhaojun Mu	341 TURKSHEAD LN, redwood city, CA, 94065
4/6/2022 11:25	Xi Cheng	147 Positano Cir Redwood City California
4/6/2022 15:26	Sandra Karinja	326 Genoa Dr, Redwood City, Ca 94065
4/9/2022 11:46	Chelsie Stanford	30 Eddystone Court Redwood City, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
4/12/2022 19:35	Smita Venkateswaran	552 Shirebird circle-1101, redwood shores, CA 94065
4/12/2022 20:37	junchao wu	21 spinnaker pl
4/12/2022 20:47	Ou Liu	21 Spinnaker Pl, Redwood City, CA, 94065
4/13/2022 14:11	Walter Guevara	589 Anchor Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/13/2022 19:21	Laura Aden	350 Turkshead Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/13/2022 19:39	Gary Aden	350 Turkshead Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/14/2022 11:54	Jacqueline Claybaugh	260 Monaco Dr., Redwood City, CA 94065
4/14/2022 11:56	Allen Claybaugh	260 Monaco Dr., Redwood City, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
4/18/2022 6:31	Payal Vaish	923 Corriente Point Drive
4/21/2022 18:44	Steve Blandino	357 Quay Lane, Redwood city, ca 94065
4/27/2022 10:55	Yuezi Zhang	309 Treedust Street, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/27/2022 11:08	Manuel Roces	1 tidewater dr Redwood City ca 94065
4/27/2022 11:10	Yu Guo	469 cork harbour cir, Redwood City, 94065
4/27/2022 11:12	Lakshmi Maya Paratian	129 Positano Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/27/2022 11:13	Rosa Silvestri	2038 Quintara Street, SF, CA
4/27/2022 11:15	Xavier Carbonnet	8 MANDALAY COURT, Redwood City California 94065
4/27/2022 11:15	Marie Crouch	2626 Carlmont Drive Belmont CA 94002
4/27/2022 11:16	Peilee Liu	214 Preserve Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/27/2022 11:25	Xinyue Ji	845 Newport Cir, Redwood City, CA, 94065
4/27/2022 11:29	Lixin Zhao	845 Newport Cir, Redwood City, 94065, CA
4/27/2022 11:36	Zhengyi Le	810 Constellation Ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
4/27/2022 11:45	Leroy Rosing	437 Cork Harbor Circle Apt E Redwood City, CA 94065
4/27/2022 12:10	Yue gao	5631 ravenna Ct, San Jose , CA 95118
4/27/2022 14:44	Lee Neidle	1 Passage Lane Redwood City, CA 94065
4/27/2022 14:48	Sachin Pansuria	3 Dana Point Ct. Redwood City, CA 94065
4/27/2022 15:03	Dennis Gioffre	6 Gimbal Lane I, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/27/2022 15:08	Anna Gioffre	6 Gimbal lane Redwood City ca 94065
4/27/2022 16:01	Elsie Y. Woo	827 Bay Harbour Drive
4/27/2022 16:06	Julian Gioffre	6 gimbal Lane
4/27/2022 18:33	Jodie Bowen	927 Corriente Pointe Drive
4/27/2022 19:10	Cassandra Kurmis	4 gimbal lane redwood shores ca 94065
4/27/2022 19:28	Barbara Qin	274 Redwood Shores Pkwy #320, CA 94065
4/27/2022 23:15	Miguel Goncalves	316 Capstan Ct, Redwood City, CA, 94065
4/28/2022 14:45	Brad Hart	8 Spinnaker Place Redwood City, CA 94065
4/28/2022 20:53	Sunil Tandel	4 Buccaneer lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/29/2022 17:27	Ellen Alberstat	5)7 lanyard dr redwood shores ca
4/29/2022 18:32	Vasundhara Padmanabhan	802 Newport Circle Redwood Shores
4/29/2022 18:34	Holenarasipur Padmanabhan	802 Newport Circle Redwood Shores
4/29/2022 18:48	Patricia Roth	819 Mediterranean Lane Redwood City, CA 94065
4/29/2022 21:34	Sebastian eccleshall	429 Biscayne avenue
4/30/2022 0:40	John Cheung	237 Monaco Dr., Redwood City, CA 94065
4/30/2022 1:40	Michelle Cheung	237 Monaco Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/30/2022 2:03	mabel cheung	237 Monaco Drive, RWS, 94065
4/30/2022 12:49	Sulina Cheung	237 Monaco Drive, Redwood City, CA94065
4/30/2022 13:29	Susan Feledy	35 Shelford Ave., San Carlos CA 94070
4/30/2022 19:05	Mary Willms	2828 Brittan Ave.
5/1/2022 8:15	Katherine Urrutia	1110 Polynesia Dr. Foster city CA 94404
5/1/2022 8:18	Carol Wilner	720 Promontory Point Apt 2107
5/1/2022 8:50	Lynn porcedda	2279 Cobblehill pl San Mateo ca 94402
5/1/2022 12:37	Marijana Krizmanic	2603 Hastings Shore Ln, Redwood City, CA, 94065
5/1/2022 15:55	Alex Skurikhin	1 Oceanside Way, redwood city, ca, 94065
5/1/2022 17:37	R J Nice	PO Box 1351 San Mateo
5/1/2022 22:02	David Lilienfeld	399 Port Royal Avenue, Foster City, CA 94404
5/1/2022 22:46	Suzette Gulsen	3029 Seabrook Ct
5/1/2022 23:00	Lapi D	648 Spar Drive Redwood City

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
8/1/2022 13:40	Lauren Dodge	601 Baltic Cir, #623, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/1/2022 14:27	Carol Wong	319 Treasure Island Dr Belmont CA 94002
8/1/2022 15:29	Wayne Chow	357 Saint Martin Drive
8/1/2022 15:30	Kim Widarczyk	75 Pelican Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/1/2022 16:58	Patricia Becker	359 Montserrat Drive, Redwood City, CA
8/1/2022 17:17	Kristen tomita	585 keelson circle Redwood City CA 94065
8/1/2022 17:21	Carolyn Wilbur	569 Marlin Ct, Redwood City, Ca
8/1/2022 17:33	Maureen Jamasbi	523 Shoal Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/1/2022 18:51	Lisa Hora	508 Arlington Road, Redwood City, CA 94062
8/1/2022 20:49	Melissa Bunac	3805 Martin Dr
8/1/2022 21:05	Grace Law	#410 400 Baltic Circle, Redwood City, Ca 94065
8/2/2022 0:25	Yi-Shiuan Yu	435 Bark Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/2/2022 6:44	Aaron Dodge	1668 Taylor Street, San Mateo
8/2/2022 7:37	Michael Craig	496 Marine View Ave Belmont CA 94002
8/2/2022 7:55	Kathryn Anderson	400 Baltic Circle #402, Redwood City
8/2/2022 9:33	Ramon Quesada	804 Corriente Pointe Drive 94065
8/2/2022 9:53	Susan Hoffman	601 Harvard Rd. San Mateo 94402
8/2/2022 10:06	Jeff Cleland	225 Aberdeen Drive, San Carlos
8/2/2022 10:47	Shannon Seeberan	2303 Hastings shore lane
8/2/2022 11:30	Katherine Cleland	225 Aberdeen Dr San Carlos, CA 94070
8/2/2022 12:47	Colleen Kaiser	539 South Rd Belmont CA
8/2/2022 13:31	Christine Peyton	150 Monaco Drive
8/2/2022 17:08	Cecilia Schoenstein	1141 Whipple Ave. #106
8/2/2022 17:33	Christoph Schoenstein	1503 Madison Ave., Redwood City, CA 94061
8/3/2022 9:08	Suzanne DeSelover Sallie	400 Terrace Ave. Moss Beach, Ca.
8/3/2022 12:05	Monica craig	1749 alameda
8/3/2022 12:07	Leslie Howard	34 Cadiz Circle Redwood City CA 94065
8/3/2022 12:07	Margot Diltz	458 Trident Drive, Redwood City 94065
8/3/2022 12:16	Evangeline McNeil	1621 Maddux Drive Redwood City CA 94061
8/3/2022 12:48	Juan carlos mora	912 bay rd e palo alto
8/3/2022 12:52	judith sullivan	1532 Whipple Ave
8/3/2022 13:23	D'Ann Burns	25 Mariani Court Emerald Hills, Ca. 94062
8/3/2022 13:31	Darlene West	1203 Truman St., Redwood City, CA 94061
8/3/2022 13:33	Ekaterina stomakhina	3864 Jefferson ave, Emerald Hills, CA 94062
8/3/2022 13:44	Theresa Markiewicz	900 E. Hillsdale Blvd # 103, Foster City, CA 94404
8/3/2022 13:49	Nicole byer	999 Edgewood Road Redwood City, Ca 94062
8/3/2022 14:54	Ronald J Puccinelli	3609 Highland Ave Redwood City Ca. 94062

8/3/2022 15:46	Arlene Storm	879 BLANDfORD BLVD, Redwood City, CA 94062
8/3/2022 16:40	Ronda Hoxsie	786 Hillcrest Way, Emerald Hills CA 94062
8/3/2022 17:17	Brandi Robertson	1350 Norman St, Redwood City
8/3/2022 17:40	Julie Griffith	153 Inner Circle Redwood City 94062
8/3/2022 22:44	Karin Heller	302 Beacon Shores Drive
8/4/2022 9:47	Linnea Wong	6 Breaker Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/4/2022 9:48	Alan C. Wong	6 Breaker Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/4/2022 11:01	Kimberly Wilcox	786 Hillcrest Way, Emerald Hills, CA 94062
8/5/2022 6:18	Cynthia Johnson	24 Cadiz Circle
8/5/2022 8:14	Deidre Sparks	818 Lakeshore Drive Redwood City CA 940
8/5/2022 21:25	Queenie Wu	804 Columbia Cir, Redwood City
8/6/2022 9:41	Jehane Jones	151 Stratford Street, Redwood City, ca 94062
8/6/2022 20:47	Violeta Alcantara	75 Carmel Avenue, Daly City, CA 94015
8/7/2022 7:55	Eleanor Eberhard	51 Pelican Lane Redwood City CA 94065
8/7/2022 9:07	Brielle Charmasson	107 Wharf Row
8/7/2022 17:48	David Gabel	484 Sequoia Avenue, Redwood City, California

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: C Kuan Carlino <ckcarlino@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 9:32 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to *preserve* the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.** The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs
I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome.

Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

C Kuan Carlino

From: [Carolyn Beaman](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan
Date: Sunday, April 9, 2023 11:00:18 AM

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet

Get [BlueMail for Android](#)

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Corey Smith <corey@housingactioncoalition.org>
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2023 4:34 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; MGR-Alex Khojikian; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: HAC re Redwood LIFE Project
Attachments: HAC Redwood LIFE_ Evolve Housing Plan Letter (2).pdf

Members of the Redwood City Council,

On behalf of the Housing Action Coalition, please see our attached letter supporting the Redwood LIFE project. The funding the project provides for affordable housing is a great opportunity for the city and region as a whole. Please do everything within your power to move this forward as fast as possible.

Respectfully,
Corey Smith
Executive Director, Housing Action Coalition

--

Corey Smith 陈锐 | Pronouns: He/Him

Executive Director | Housing Action Coalition
50 Otis Street, San Francisco, CA 94103
Office: (415) 541-9001 | Cell: (925) 360-5290



Email: corey@housingactioncoalition.org | Web: housingactioncoalition.org
Please note the new email and website.

To opt out of all HAC emails, respond to this email with "unsubscribe all".



50 Otis Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 541.9001
info@housingactioncoalition.org
housingactioncoalition.org

April 6th, 2023

To whom it may concern,

On behalf of the Housing Action Coalition, we're pleased to share our support of the proposed Redwood LIFE plan due to the project's significant investment in affordable housing in Redwood City.

The Housing Action Coalition (HAC) is a member-funded non-profit organization whose mission is to advocate for more housing for residents of all income levels across the state of California. To that end, HAC does everything we can to help increase the amount of funding available for affordable housing. While it is not in HAC's mission to support non-housing projects, the number of new homes that will be generated from the Redwood LIFE plan presents a significant opportunity to bolster Redwood City's affordable housing supply.

The biggest issue cities face when it comes to producing subsidized affordable housing is the lack of financial resources. Longfellow's commitment of \$85 million, well beyond the required amount for affordable housing in Redwood City, will make a considerable impact on the community and surrounding area. Based on our experience and conversations with affordable builders, we believe that funding could result in 850 new subsidized affordable homes at no cost to taxpayers.

We look forward to working with Longfellow and other HAC members to ensure that the funding becomes available and leveraged as soon as possible so these homes can get built. For that reason, we respectfully request the City Council direct staff to allow the project to move forward and begin its CEQA review.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Corey Smith".

Corey Smith, *Executive Director*
Housing Action Coalition (HAC)

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Darius Wiles <darius@dariuswiles.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 5, 2023 4:26 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: The Redwood LIFE redevelopment plan is worth considering

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

The short version of this email is that I believe there are potentially enough benefits to the proposed Redwood LIFE development to outweigh the disadvantages. I believe it is worth seriously considering the proposal and being more flexible than the Westport Specific Plan allows if the council believes that's in the city's best interests. The various advocacy groups fighting the redevelopment claim to represent Redwood Shores homeowners, but don't.

Expanding on my last point, the advocacy groups seem composed of small groups of individuals who strongly oppose any development. They don't seem interested in actually hearing the views of homeowners and to my knowledge none have actually polled homeowners for their opinions. Yet these groups claim to speak on behalf of Redwood Shores residents. I urge you to realize that though these groups are making a lot of noise, they only represent the small number of people running them.

I am slightly in favor of Redwood LIFE redevelopment, providing the council believes it will not have major negative consequences, such as the release of toxic materials from the landfill under the current office park. I live in Beacon Shores, which is relatively close to the site, and I'm willing to tolerate some inconvenience as a result of a redevelopment in order to gain the benefits.

The advocacy groups have many objections that I don't think have merit, such as:

- Tall buildings - the Oracle buildings just across the slough are much taller than the proposed buildings and don't cause any major issues of which I'm aware.
- Traffic - the new elementary school and associated housing, the Oracle high tech school, and the trucks required for the wastewater plant expansion were all separately predicted to bring traffic chaos. None did, and it will be the same for the proposed redevelopment.
- Wildlife - I have seen literally no substance to the claim wildlife will be impacted by redevelopment. In fact, the proposed development aims to replace many of the current asphalt parking lots with green space, which looks like a net benefit to wildlife to me.

Release of toxic materials under the current site and dangers of businesses handling biohazardous materials are concerns I do share, but I trust the council to ensure these are adequately addressed. The proposed raising of the levees should also fit in the council's overall plans for flood protection.

Redeveloping the Redwood LIFE park is worth considering as long as all valid concerns can be addressed to the council's satisfaction.

Sincerely,
Darius Wiles

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
1/31/2022 6:41	Dhanraj Pondicherry	577 Keelson Cir., Redwood City, Ca 94065
1/31/2022 10:03	Nicole Quasney	421 D Cork Harbour Circle Redwood City CA 94065
1/31/2022 11:03	Markus Baur	808 Portwalk Pl., Redwood City, CA94065
1/31/2022 18:08	Darrell Koltsov	546 Shorebird Circle Unit #26202
2/1/2022 9:12	Wuming Zhang	22 Bremerton Cir
2/1/2022 9:49	Mark Caraballo	311 Seattle lane, Redwood City, 94065
2/1/2022 15:43	Nadie Lee Matthews	758 Newport Cir, RWS 94065
2/1/2022 16:19	Tanvi Sahni	6 Bremerton Cir, Redwood City
2/2/2022 9:26	Sanny Weber	552 Shorebird Circle Unit 1202, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/2/2022 9:27	Ingomar Weber	552 Shorebird Circle Unit 1202, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/2/2022 14:08	Lu Fan	315 Beacon Shores Dr. Redwood City 94065
2/2/2022 15:04	Claire Chen	797 Mediterranean Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/2/2022 15:32	Wenli Zhou	317 Saint Martin Dr, Redwood City
2/2/2022 15:40	Cong wang	12 Oceanside way, Redwood City
2/2/2022 16:01	Chen Xu	546 Shorebird Cir
2/2/2022 16:19	Qiao Liang	317 Saint Martin Dr Redwood City CA 94065
2/2/2022 16:29	Yisi Liu	819 Columbia Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/2/2022 16:40	Christy Hu	300 Baltic Cir Redwood City
2/2/2022 18:09	Ruokun Ren	710 Lacewing Ln, Redwood City 94065
2/2/2022 19:06	Jun Zhu	2208 Hastings Shore Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/2/2022 19:10	Xu wu	539 marlin Dr, redwood city
2/2/2022 19:55	Zhengyi Le	810 constellation ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
2/2/2022 20:23	Yiqun Li	546 Shorebird Cir
2/2/2022 21:36	Jenny Li	600 Seabrook Ln, Redwood City, CA, 94065
2/3/2022 9:08	Yating Ou	819 Columbia Circle, Redwood City, 94065
2/3/2022 13:37	Sarah Nagle	311 Beacon Shores Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/3/2022 22:50	Yu Qin	857 Boardwalk Pl., Redwood City, CA 94065
2/5/2022 16:59	pat Dianda	837Newport circle
2/5/2022 16:59	Mavis Dianda	837Newport circle
2/5/2022 17:29	Adrienne Crusick	24 Pelican Lane
2/5/2022 19:42	Zelda Elcin	60 Cove Lane Redwood City CA 94065
2/5/2022 22:44	Qinqin Zhang	116 Northampton Ln
2/5/2022 23:14	Bradley Gao	259 Nice Ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
2/6/2022 11:41	Lo Yang	228 Monaco Drive, Redwood City, CA
2/6/2022 12:59	Roxana Heppner	13 Cove Lane, Redwood City, CA
2/6/2022 16:25	DILIP GUNAWARDENA	872 Newport Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/6/2022 20:17	Dmitry Nizhegorodov	843 Newport Circle Redwood Shores CA 94065
2/6/2022 20:43	Sowmya Padmanabhan	802 Newport Circle Redwood Shores CA
2/6/2022 21:00	Jeanne Sartor	835 Newport Circle

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Francine L Olson <francinelolson@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2023 11:19 AM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.** The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from

prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Francine L. Olson

Francine L. Olson
m. (650) 533-5166

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Helen D'Arceuil <helendarceuil@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 7:09 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely, Helen Darceuil

Sent from my iPhone

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
1/3/22 15:43	Susanne Malabey	651 Teredo Drive. Redwood Shores, CA 94065
1/3/22 15:44	Angelique Malabey	651 Teredo Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
1/3/22 16:18	Roxann Albiani	640 Teredo dr, Redwood City, Ca 94065
1/3/22 19:04	Adriana V Vaughan	6 PORTOFINO CIRCLE
1/4/22 18:20	Susan mendiara	581 Anchor Crcl
1/5/22 8:47	Joni Roake	558 Seahorse Ln Redwood Shores 94065
1/5/22 19:51	Carol- Jean Meddaugh	46 Cape Hatteras Court, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/9/22 22:21	Matthew Lottice	218 Shorebird Circle
1/10/22 12:58	Colleen Cassity	232 Shorebird Circle, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
1/10/22 15:31	Tianyi Zhao	603 Mendocino Way, Redwood City, CA
1/10/22 15:32	Yuhan Wu	603 Mendocino Way, Redwood City, CA
1/10/22 16:32	Katherine Sullivan	806 Mendocino Way
1/10/22 17:15	Inbal Lupesko	706 Mendocino Way, Redwood Shores
1/11/22 10:49	Richard Mayer	704 Mendocino Way
1/11/22 10:58	Stan Tan	935 Corriente Pointe
1/11/22 18:25	Irene Jaffe	205 Mendocino Way, Redwood City, CA
1/11/22 18:28	chantal cox	207 Mendocino Way
1/13/22 7:30	Raphael Mehrbians	101 Mendocino Way, Redwood Cit CA 94065
1/14/22 15:39	Donald Chang	803 Southport Drive, Redwood City 94065
1/15/2022 11:33	Min Li	823 Bay Harbour Dr, Redwood City CA 94065
1/15/2022 12:27	Jenny Figueredo	806 Bay Harbour Dr Redwood City CA 94065
1/15/2022 12:27	Mary Stofega	837 Portwalk Place Redwood City, CA 94065
1/15/2022 13:13	Limei Mizota	733 port walk place Redwood City
1/15/2022 13:30	Katherine Lee	811 portwalk place, redwood city
1/15/2022 14:26	Lisa Evens	873 Portwalk Place
1/15/2022 14:38	Anahid Kocharians	811 Bay Harbour Dr Redwood City, Ca 94065
1/15/2022 16:59	Gordon Harvey	810 Bay Harbour Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/15/2022 20:28	William Smith	102 Wharf Row, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/16/2022 9:49	Linda Cashion	725 Portwalk Place
1/16/2022 11:03	Lynne Mok	808 Sea Chase Drive, Redwood City, Ca. 94065
1/16/2022 11:04	Paul Mok	808 Sea Chase Drive, Redwood City, Ca. 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
1/24/2022 15:09	Barbara Reyn	732 Port Walk Place, Redwood City CA
1/24/2022 18:53	Radha Kamdar	501 Baltic Circle , #505, RWC, CA 94065
1/25/2022 10:59	Jackie Moore	109 Shorebird Cir
1/26/2022 16:38	Marjean Reynolds	755 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/26/2022 17:29	Sasha Kibler	529 Osprey Dr
1/26/2022 18:45	Gary Kibler	529 Osprey Dr Redwood City, CA 94065
1/26/2022 19:13	Andre Malabey	651 Teredo Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
1/26/2022 19:13	Kathey Tam	824 Boardwalk Place Redwood City CA 94065
1/26/2022 19:14	Timothy Katrina	824 Boardwalk Place Redwood City CA 94065
1/26/2022 19:15	Linda Tam	824 Boardwalk Place Redwood City CA 94065
1/26/2022 19:16	Alexa Tam	824 Boardwalk Place Redwood City CA 94065
1/26/2022 19:16	Anthony Hills	922 Governors Bay Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
1/26/2022 19:16	Katie Tam	705 Boardwalk Place Redwood City CA 94065
1/26/2022 20:13	Suzanne Sullivan	906 Governors Bay Drive, Redwood Shores
1/26/2022 22:54	Xiaoping hu	266 nice ct, redwood shores, ca, 94065
1/27/2022 10:13	Deanna Albiani	640 Teredo Dr Redwood City CA 94065
1/27/2022 11:04	Candace Kirsch	913 Governors Bay Drive RWC CA 94065
1/27/2022 11:04	Charles Faulk	913 Governors Bay Drive RWC CA 94065
1/27/2022 14:33	Anton Heras	208 Puget Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/27/2022 14:33	Irene Heras	208 Puget Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/27/2022 14:34	Patrick Hollister	Hartstene Drive
1/27/2022 15:13	Lizete Santos	306 Bethel lane
1/28/2022 5:08	Stephanie Erickson	110 Waldron Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/29/2022 4:04	Jean Dow	77 waterside circle Redwood City ca
1/29/2022 10:52	Mohit Mittal	6 Bremerton Cir, Redwood City
1/29/2022 16:32	David Parrent	765 Portwalk Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/29/2022 16:33	Olin Palmer	718 Portwalk Place
1/29/2022 17:16	Jacob Tao	729 Newport Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/29/2022 17:42	Tianyi Yang	405 Cork Harbour Cir, Apt A
1/30/2022 0:10	Jie Zhu	401 Cork Harbour Cir. #C, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/30/22 14:08	Guang Yang	315 Beacon Shores Dr, Redwoods City CA, 94065
1/30/2022 14:25	Pamela Quasney	421 D Cork Harbour Circle Redwood City CA 94065
1/30/2022 23:19	Maggie Tang	413 Cork Harbour Cir

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
3/7/2022 15:53	Ian Whitmore	500 Baltic Circle Unit 500
3/9/2022 17:31	Michael J Fitzgerald	842 Lakeshore Drive Redwood City Ca 94065
3/9/2022 17:34	Marian Wong	842 Lakeshore Drive Redwood City Ca 94065
3/10/2022 9:13	Ramona Raybin	50 Mounds Road, San Mateo, CA 94402
3/10/2022 9:14	Tomas Pfister	754 Newport circle, redwood shores
3/10/2022 9:15	Sophia pfister	754 Newport circle, redwood shores
3/10/2022 9:32	Sheila Ferguson	Owner of 307 Commander Ln in Redwood Shores, 94065
3/11/2022 16:40	Tina Yang	4 Channel Dr., Redwood City, CA 94065
3/11/2022 17:45	Manuel Rocas	1 Tidewater Dr. Redwood Shores Ca 94065
3/12/2022 8:55	Honglin Su	420 Windfield Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/12/2022 9:00	Lan Huang	420 Windfield Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/12/2022 10:33	Maria Ong	75 Waterside Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/12/2022 16:39	Patricia Toy	202 Mendocino Way Redwood City 94065
3/12/2022 18:52	Shuting Zhao	540 Shorebird Cir
3/13/2022 14:00	Darja Cvetkova	501 Canoe Ct

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
3/14/2022 0:07	Jun Zhou	37 Waterside Cir, Redwood City
3/14/2022 10:05	Kathryn Shen	536 Skiff Circle, Redwood City CA
3/14/2022 10:14	Nausheen Qureshi	2 Cove Ln Redwood City, CA 94065
3/14/2022 14:20	Marina Chang	10 Tidewater Drive Redwood Shores CA94065
3/15/2022 12:55	Risa Tapales	603 Rockingham Lane, RWS
3/15/2022 17:46	Sally Spangenberg	739 Port Walk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/15/2022 17:50	Jill Archer	52 Cape Hatteras Court, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
3/15/2022 18:05	Daniel Gordon	739 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/16/2022 10:07	Keren Hamer	86 Eddystone Ct
3/16/2022 11:00	Kathleen Outman	14 Cape Hatteras Ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
3/16/2022 17:31	Sharon Ann Grignon Smith	980 Governors Bay Dr
3/16/2022 18:28	Eduardo Boetsch	36 Eddystone Ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
3/16/2022 19:40	Adrian Percer	972 Governors Bay Dr
3/17/2022 11:16	Roger Haeussler	912 Governors Bay Drive Redwood City CA 94065
3/17/2022 17:01	Patricia Owen	2 Eddystone Court
3/17/2022 18:39	Teresa B Skinner	764 Newport Circle, Redwood City 94065
3/18/2022 9:22	Szu-yu lin	458 Barnegat lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/19/2022 11:49	Tom Ostroff	60 Eddystone Ct Redwood Shores CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
3/21/2022 19:23	Talia Lamb	765 Barnegat Lane
3/22/2022 4:51	Jill Lin	22 Cape Hatteras Ct
3/22/2022 4:55	Dan Feil	22 Cape Hatteras Court
3/23/2022 19:28	Betty Chen	806 Boardwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94965
3/24/2022 18:44	Laura Banazek	812 Boardwalk Place, Redwood City
3/27/2022 18:08	Victoria Molinelli	718 Newport Circle
3/27/2022 21:18	haorui wang	716 newport cir

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Marian Flores <mariangflores@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 5, 2023 4:18 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from mariangflores@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

To: council@redwoodcity.org

Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Marian Flores

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Martha cullimore <martha.cullimore@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 6:13 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from martha.cullimore@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
[Your Name]

Martha Cullimore

Martha.cullimore@gmail.com

Sent from my iPhone

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Matt Regan <mregan@bayareacouncil.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 3:46 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: MGR-Melissa Stevenson Diaz; MGR-Alex Khojikian; CD-Jeff Schwob; CD-Margaret Netto; CD-Ryan Kuchenig
Subject: Bay Area Council SUPPORT for Redwood LIFE project
Attachments: Redwood LIFE-SUPPORT.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from mregan@bayareacouncil.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

Please find attached the Bay Area Council's letter of support for Longfellow Real Estate Partners' Redwood LIFE project. Do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or would like any clarifications as to our position. We look forward to discussing this further with you.

Sincerely

Matt Regan



HISTORIC
KLAMATH
BAY AREA COUNCIL

Matt Regan

Senior Vice President

Phone: 415 298 0330

The Klamath Pier 9, The Embarcadero, San Francisco

www.bayareacouncil.org





April 4, 2023

Honorable Mayor Gee and Members of the Redwood City Council
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

The Bay Area Council is a 77 year-old employer sponsored public policy organization representing over 300 of the San Francisco Bay Area's largest employers. We work on our region's most pressing issues; transportation, housing affordability, climate change, social equity, and water, and our mission is to maintain this region's economic vitality in a sustainable and equitable manner.

We are writing to express support for the Redwood LIFE Evolve proposal submitted by Longfellow Real Estate Partners. This important economic development project will transform an aging business park into a 21st-century life sciences destination while turning old, outdated asphalt parking lots into acres of new parks and community space.

Redwood LIFE Evolve will continue to support the long-term economic vitality of Redwood City and San Mateo County by attracting and retaining top life science companies that will create thousands of new local jobs available to those with a wide range of education and skill levels. These businesses and employees will support the local economy through direct spending at local businesses and vendors. The project will generate increased revenue for schools, City, and County services through sales and property tax revenue. In addition, during construction, Longfellow will make substantial direct investments in the local economy through construction-related costs for materials and services and will create thousands of good union-wage jobs.

Longfellow's proposal to update its property comes with over \$85 million dollars already earmarked for affordable housing, and additional funds for childcare, and sea level rise protections, benefits that align with Redwood City's Strategic Priorities for Children and Youth, Transportation, Housing, and Equity.

It should be noted that jobs in life sciences are much "stickier" than those in other parts of the economy. During the COVID emergency we witnessed remote work eligible tech workers and those in the broader keyboard economy disperse around the state and the country. That did not happen anywhere near to the same degree in life sciences because workers in this industry need more than a wifi signal; they need actual labs. Redwood City should grasp this opportunity to further cement its position as a leader in life sciences because other cities are clamoring for these jobs and associated revenues.

Given the project's potential to make positive, lasting changes to our community, we ask that the City Council allow the project to advance and undergo environmental study. We have a real need for their contributions and would hate to see such an important economic development project delayed longer than necessary. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Matt Regan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Matt Regan
Senior Vice President Public Policy
Bay Area Council

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
5/2/2022 8:39	James Groenke	282 C St Redwood City CA 94063
5/2/2022 9:36	Libbie Frank	141 Central Ave Redwood city
5/2/2022 16:36	Ling Shee	579 Seastorm Drive, RWS
5/2/2022 18:11	Nahid Ziaee	2108 Lyon Ave, Belmont CA 94002
5/3/2022 7:55	Kenneth Pizzi	2018 Fairmont Dr. San Mateo, CA 94402
5/3/2022 7:57	Nancy Shideler	11 Murphy Place, San Mateo, CA 94402
5/3/2022 16:04	Anna Pleikis	560 keelson cir, redwood city ca 94065
5/3/2022 21:52	Peti Arunamata	364 Montserrat Drive, Redwood City, CA
5/4/2022 17:01	Charlene Ho	202 Demi Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/4/2022 23:12	Xiaoyuan Hu	37 Waterside Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/6/2022 10:53	Paula Coe	741 Aries Lane, Foster City CA 94404
5/6/2022 11:17	Craig Holland	602 Harbor Colony Ct., Redwood City, CA, 94065
5/6/2022 11:42	Dennis Collins	618 Harbor Colony Ct Redwood City Ca 94065
5/6/2022 12:01	Cynthia Collins	618 Harbor Colony Ct Redwood City Ca 94065
5/6/2022 19:36	Julien Vaughan	789 Mediterranean Ln, redwood shores, ca 94065
5/6/2022 19:38	Michael Abell	789 Mediterranean LANE, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
5/6/2022 20:26	Marsha Sims	519 Cringle Dr, Redwood City CA 94065
5/7/2022 17:15	Teresa Baxter	358 Turkshead Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/7/2022 18:14	Judith Lewis	790 Mediterranean Lane Redwood City ca
5/8/2022 12:46	Gary Wong	546 Skiff Cir., Redwood City CA 94065
5/8/2022 12:46	Winnie Wong	546 Skiff Cir., Redwood City CA 94065
5/8/2022 17:30	Carol Taylor	509 Neptune dr.
5/8/2022 20:06	Scott Taylor	509 Neptune Dr. Redwood City, CA 94065
5/8/2022 22:07	Cecilia Hugon	815 Lakeshore Drive,Redwood City,Ca.94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
5/9/2022 11:18	Heng Li	829 Lakeshore Dr. Redwood City, CA 94065
5/9/2022 11:26	Chuyun Zhang	829 Lakeshore Dr Redwood City California 94065
5/9/2022 12:13	Mike gilbert	552 skiff circle,redwood city 94065
5/9/2022 12:15	Laurie gilbert	552 skiff circle,redwood city94065
5/9/2022 21:09	Liliane Saadeh	459 Neptune dr., Redwood City, CA 94065
5/10/2022 11:32	Mary Hicks	751 Barnegat Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/10/2022 11:40	Lynn Kunesh	751 Barnegat Lane, Redwood City CA 94065
5/10/2022 14:05	Hedy Lu	823 Lakeshore Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/10/2022 16:55	Falguni Sonawala	408 Compass Dr
5/10/2022 17:16	Gary Hastings	423 Keel Lane, Redwood City,Ca 94065
5/10/2022 17:20	Leslie Rea	411 Bark Drive
5/11/2022 14:57	Donald Reid	554 Compass Circle Redwood City, CA 94065
5/11/2022 20:47	Mohamed Higgy	548 Skiff Circle, Redwood Shores CA 94065
5/11/2022 20:53	Zhao Lou	531 Skiff Cir,Redwood City, CA
5/11/2022 21:25	Caroline Villegas	1000 Davit Lane Redwood City, CA
5/13/2022 12:02	LeAndra Quijano	2111, Hastings Shore Lane Redwood City 94065
5/13/2022 12:18	Sarah Kwong	2115 Hastings Shore Lane
5/13/2022 18:33	grace huang	Hastings Shore Lane 2008
5/13/2022 21:12	Qinghuai Kong	418 Tiller Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/14/2022 7:57	Justin Sterling	2107 Hastings Shore Ln Redwood City, CA 94065
5/14/2022 8:09	Sinziana Sterling	2107 Hastings Shore Ln, Redwood City CA 94065
5/14/2022 17:16	Michele Brenner	461 Trident Drive
5/14/2022 18:48	Arthur Thomas	530 Becket Dr. Redwood City CA 94065
5/14/2022 19:09	Eileen Deasy	530 becket drive redwood shores ca 94065
5/14/2022 20:16	Aria Li	829 Lakeshore Dr. Redwood City, CA 94065
5/15/2022 6:36	Clarissa Louie	601 Baltic Cir, 613, Redwood Shores, California
5/15/2022 9:23	Olga Danilevitch	741 Portwalk Place, Redwood Shores, 94065
5/15/2022 11:44	Eugene Voznesensky	32 Cadiz cir Redwood City ca 94065
5/15/2022 12:07	Karen Hall	18 Cadiz Circle, Redwood City Ca 94065
5/15/2022 13:48	Dan Young	481 Barkentine Lane
5/15/2022 16:54	Jane Hennessy	3021 Seabrook ct. Redwood City ca 94065
5/15/2022 20:41	Julie Shieh	24 Lido Circle Redwood City Ca 94065
5/15/2022 20:51	Will Chong	24 Lido Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/15/2022 22:28	Joan Lindecker	677 Martinique Drive, Redwood City, Ca 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
5/16/2022 10:01	Isabel Sadsad	18 lido circle redwood city 94065
5/16/2022 10:30	Nancy Sadsad	18 Lido Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/16/2022 16:09	Kimberley Meints	609 Spar Drive, redwood shores CA 94066
5/16/2022 17:04	Marcia A Sklar	783 Mediterranean Lane
5/16/2022 19:13	Paul carlino	660 Spar Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/17/2022 9:06	Demmi Santana	597 Teredo Drive redwood shores, ca 94065
5/17/2022 9:52	Kuan Carlino	660 Spar Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/17/2022 12:29	Andong Zhan	420 compass dr, Redwood City, 94065
5/17/2022 13:43	Melanie Teepronpirut	2502 Hastings Shore Ln, Redwood City
5/17/2022 16:39	kaveh Dowlatshahi	34 Barcelona Circle Redwood City CA 94065
5/18/2022 20:28	SUCHITA RAO	832 lakeshore dr Redwood City
5/19/2022 18:55	Alex de Crespigny	419 Compass Dr, Redwood City
5/19/2022 18:57	Helen Darceuil	419 Compass Drive, Redwood City CA 94065
5/21/2022 14:07	Laura Liao	763 Mediterranean Ln
5/21/2022 15:00	Taisen Lin	57 dockside cir, Redwood City, ca 94065
5/21/2022 16:39	Elizabeth Henderson	519 Cringle Dr, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/21/2022 18:29	Rajat Shroff	19 Waterside Circle, 94065
5/21/2022 22:03	Grace Wang	2 Tidewater dr, redwood city, CA 94065
5/21/2022 23:34	Chong Zhang	47 Waterside CIR, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/22/2022 0:06	Stephen Chang	10 Tidewater Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/22/2022 9:06	Cayde jackson	83 waterside circle
5/22/2022 14:47	Benjamin Fong	40 Dockside Circle, Redwood Shores, CA
5/22/2022 21:11	Nilay Banker	65 Waterside Circle, CA 94065

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
11/15/2021 7:08	Ramon S Quesada	804 Corriente Pointe Drive, Redwood City 94065
11/15/2021 8:16	Denise Kohlmann	562 Keelson Circle , Redwood Shores
11/15/2021 19:05	Hitomi Ohsawa	643 Island Place
11/15/2021 21:39	Carolyn Schwartzbord	572 Seahorse Lane
11/16/2021 10:11	Anthea Pang	323 Turkshead Lane, Redwood City, CA94065
11/16/2021 10:12	Kurt Kwok	323 Turkshead Lane
11/16/2021 20:48	Susan Thorne	331 Turkshead Lane
11/17/2021 12:28	Linda Colloran	146 Shorebird Circle RWC
11/17/2021 12:32	Lisa Valkenaar	534 SHOREBIRD CIRCLE, #17101
11/17/2021 20:41	Aviva Cohen	544 Shorebird Circle unit 25102, Un
11/18/2021 11:29	Dolores Schriever	812 Sovereign Way
11/20/2021 19:05	Mirella Stefan	363 Mindanao Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
11/21/2021 16:07	Michael Handley	832 Lakeshore Drive

Date	Name	Address
27-Oct	Rita Quan	883 Boardwalk Place, RWS
1-Nov	Connie Lambert	885 Boardwalk Place, RWS 94065
20-Oct	Julie Bekson	5 Pilot Circle RWS
20-Oct	Todd Welch	5 Pilot Circle RWS
22-Oct	Linda Badal	300 Meridian Drive
21-Oct	Naomi Hernandez	7 Pilot Circle RWS
22-Oct	Kim Jettas	415 Compass Dr RWS
22-Oct	Irene Jettas	415 Compass Dr RWS
22-Oct	Lorrie Jettas	415 Compass Dr RWS
25-Oct	Adam Abelkop	824 Portwalk Place RWS
2-Nov	Sandra Karinja	326 Genoa Drive RWS

Petition to Stop Redwood Life!

Say "NO" to the Redwood Life Development Project

We, the undersigned, concerned residents of Redwood Shores are petitioning the Redwood City Planning Commission and City Council to act now and reject the Redwood Life Development Project proposal.

Print Name & Signature	Address	Date
1 <i>Rita Quan Fitch</i>	883 Boardwalk KPL RWS	10/27/21
2 <i>Connie Lambert</i> <i>Connie Lambert</i>	885 Boardwalk Pl 94065	11-01-2021
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		

Petition to Stop Redwood Life!

Say "NO" to the Redwood Life Development Project

We, the undersigned, concerned residents of Redwood Shores are petitioning the Redwood City Planning Commission and City Council to act now and reject the Redwood Life Development Project proposal.


Print Name & Signature	Address	Date
1 Julie Berkson <i>Julie Berkson</i>	5 Pilot Circle Redwood Shores, CA 94065	10/20/21
2 TODD WELCH <i>Todd Welch</i>	5 Pilot Circle Redwood Shores, CA 94065	10/20/21
3 <i>Anna Bagdal</i> <i>Anna Bagdal</i>	300 Meridian Drive RWC 94065	10/20/21
4 <i>Michael Jettas</i>	7 Pilot RWS	10/21/21
5 Kim Jettas <i>Kim Jettas</i>	415 Compass Dr. RWC 94065	10/22/21
6 IRENE JETTAS <i>Irene Jettas</i>	415 Compass Dr RWC 94065	10/22/21
7 Horrie Jettas <i>Horrie Jettas</i>	415 Compass Dr. RWC 94065	10/22/21
8 Adam Abelkop <i>Adam Abelkop</i>	824 Portwalk Place, RWC, 94065	10/25/21
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		

Petition to Stop Redwood Life!

Say "NO" to the Redwood Life Development Project

We, the undersigned, concerned residents and owners of Peninsula Landing in Redwood Shores, are petitioning the Redwood City Planning Commission and City Council to act now and reject the Redwood Life Development Project proposal.

(Use blue or black ink)

Print Name & Signature	Address	Date
1 Sandra Karinja 	326 Genoa Dr Redwood City CA 94065	11/2/21
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
11/22/2021 18:10	ann pocapalia	632 marlin court
11/22/2021 18:34	Leyla Ozgur Alhassen	208 Mendocino Way
11/22/2021 18:48	Lisa Sweeney	419 Bark Dr
11/22/2021 19:37	Dita Naik	357 Bowsprit Dr
11/25/2021 10:53	Fares Alhassen	208 Mendocino Way
11/28/2021 16:43	Dorothy Yang	434 Barnegat Lane, Redwood City, CA 94064
11/29/2021 11:50	Rumika Chaudhry	822 Boardwalk Place
11/29/2021 15:26	Ellen Boelens	814 Constellation Ct., Redwood Shores
11/30/2021 9:16	Setu Anand	806 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA-94065
11/30/2021 19:02	Lu Chen	822 Portwalk Pl, Redwood shore
12/1/2021 10:50	Svetlana Krishtop	735 Portwalk Pl
12/1/2021 15:42	Barb Cordery	584 Dory Lane
12/2/2021 11:14	Minal Brahmhbhatt	591 Shoal Circle
12/3/2021 11:58	Osrish Arya	352 Mindanao Dr
12/3/2021 12:00	Ria arya	352 Mindanao Dr
12/3/2021 16:08	Wei Xian Lu	403 Promenade Ln
12/3/2021 23:17	Arnau Ramisa	546 Compass Circle
12/4/2021 13:38	John Baker	854 Corriente Point Dr., Redwood Shores 94065
12/4/2021 21:23	Cheryl Brennan	371 Ensign Lane
12/4/2021 21:37	Jan Craig	409A Cork Harbour Circle
12/4/2021 21:52	Moddy Wong	602 Seasons Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
12/5/2021 7:14	Vera Cianciolo	823 Southport Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
12/5/2021 7:17	Bob Cianciolo	823 Southport Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
12/5/2021 13:49	David Wang	857 Boardwalk Pl
12/5/2021 17:30	Jennifer Willin	917 Corriente pointe
12/5/2021 21:31	Ember Pickands	807 Portman Dr
12/5/2021 22:13	Jun Tan	2057 Rockport Ave
12/5/2021 22:18	Shin Tan	935 Corriente Pointe



April 4, 2023

Honorable Mayor Gee and Members of the Redwood City Council
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063

Dear Mayor Gee and members of the City Council,

The Bay Area Council is a 77 year-old employer sponsored public policy organization representing over 300 of the San Francisco Bay Area's largest employers. We work on our region's most pressing issues; transportation, housing affordability, climate change, social equity, and water, and our mission is to maintain this region's economic vitality in a sustainable and equitable manner.

We are writing to express support for the Redwood LIFE Evolve proposal submitted by Longfellow Real Estate Partners. This important economic development project will transform an aging business park into a 21st-century life sciences destination while turning old, outdated asphalt parking lots into acres of new parks and community space.

Redwood LIFE Evolve will continue to support the long-term economic vitality of Redwood City and San Mateo County by attracting and retaining top life science companies that will create thousands of new local jobs available to those with a wide range of education and skill levels. These businesses and employees will support the local economy through direct spending at local businesses and vendors. The project will generate increased revenue for schools, City, and County services through sales and property tax revenue. In addition, during construction, Longfellow will make substantial direct investments in the local economy through construction-related costs for materials and services and will create thousands of good union-wage jobs.

Longfellow's proposal to update its property comes with over \$85 million dollars already earmarked for affordable housing, and additional funds for childcare, and sea level rise protections, benefits that align with Redwood City's Strategic Priorities for Children and Youth, Transportation, Housing, and Equity.

It should be noted that jobs in life sciences are much "stickier" than those in other parts of the economy. During the COVID emergency we witnessed remote work eligible tech workers and those in the broader keyboard economy disperse around the state and the country. That did not happen anywhere near to the same degree in life sciences because workers in this industry need more than a wifi signal; they need actual labs. Redwood City should grasp this opportunity to further cement its position as a leader in life sciences because other cities are clamoring for these jobs and associated revenues.

Given the project's potential to make positive, lasting changes to our community, we ask that the City Council allow the project to advance and undergo environmental study. We have a real need for their contributions and would hate to see such an important economic development project delayed longer than necessary. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Matt Regan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Matt Regan
Senior Vice President Public Policy
Bay Area Council

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Robert Bilbao <roberttaylorbilbao@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 5, 2023 7:13 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay With the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

As someone who holds the preservation near and dear to my heart, I'd appreciate your attention to the message below.

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.** The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
 - Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
 - Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
 - Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs
- I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.** Thank you for your time.

--

Best,

Robert Bilbao

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: rockysmouse@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 8:21 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan, from a redwood shores resident

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from rockysmouse@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Roger Haeussler <rogerhaeussler@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 7:19 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from rogerhaeussler@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present

office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Roger Haeussler
912 Governors Bay Drive
Redwood City CA 94065
rogerhaeussler@gmail.com
+1 650 556 3687

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
12/6/2021 8:16	Chris Neves	11 Barcelona Circle
12/6/2021 9:08	Nancy Glaser	54 Cape Hatteras Court
12/6/2021 11:39	Laurence DeWitt	950 Redwood Shores Pkwy
12/6/2021 11:48	Kevin Ulisse Consani	568 Harbor Colony Court
12/6/2021 11:59	Laura Castro	701 Baltic Circle #725
12/6/2021 13:45	Willi Huang	3 Manhattan Ct., Redwood City
12/6/2021 13:52	Erica Attard	528 Anchor Circle, Redwood Shores
12/6/2021 15:19	Kris Binasik	546 Shorebird Circle #26102
12/7/2021 14:41	Allen Pogorzelski	10 Cove Lane
12/7/2021 23:15	Mark Castro	2051 Seabrook Ct
12/8/2021 8:47	Serina Wong	507 Osprey Ct, Redwood City, CA 94065
12/8/2021 8:59	Ivan lotchenko	26 Cape Hatteras
12/8/2021 19:04	Kevin Joe	51 Osprey Dr. Redwood City, CA 94065
12/8/2021 22:16	Yuheng Qiu	399 mindanao dr, redwood city
12/9/2021 15:32	Jannot Ross	10 Cove Lane
12/9/2021 15:36	Angela Yip	125 Wharf Row, Redwood City, 94065
12/9/2021 15:48	Kaelyn Katrina	705 Boardwalk Place Redwood City CA 94065
12/9/2021 16:47	Jean Munson	74 Cape Hatteras Ct.
12/9/2021 17:00	Dennis Dehne	52 Eddystone Court
12/9/2021 17:17	Sheng Jie Xi	425 Cork Harbour Circle Unit H Redwood City CA 94065
12/9/2021 22:58	Jinen Kamdar	807 Bay Harbor Drive, Redwood Shores
12/10/2021 7:29	Albert albiani	640 Teredo Dr
12/10/2021 13:57	xi chen	31 Pelican Lane
12/11/2021 7:30	Melissa Fard	5 avocet drive #5-207 Redwood City, ca 94065
12/11/2021 7:32	Kevin Gomez	5 Avocet Drive
12/11/2021 11:22	Yoko Ogawa	305 Treedust Street
12/11/2021 21:13	Janet Tipper	327 Alameda De Las Pulgas, Redwood City, CA
12/12/2021 9:48	Brian Yu	32 Bremerton Circle, Redwood Shores

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Sabrina Leung <sabrinatzleung@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 7:08 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from sabrinatzleung@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Sabrina Leung

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
11/7/2022 17:40	Richard Mirowski	824 Lakeshore Drive Redwood Shores
11/10/2022 19:47	Inna Magner	1074 Tiller Lane
11/11/2022 16:54	John O'Sullivan	306 Beacon Shores Drive, Redwood City CA 94065
11/11/2022 23:37	Natasha Chaturvedi	648 Spar Drive, Redwood City, 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
3/27/2023 6:12	L Dixit	648 Spar Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
3/27/2023 11:54	Beth Ann Filippi	222 King Street, Redwood City, CA 94062
3/27/2023 12:51	Annaloy Nickum	821 Beech St, Redwood city
3/27/2023 18:08	Kristin Fabianski	545 Cringle Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/28/2023 8:54	Cynthia Fabianski	545 Cringle Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
3/28/2023 8:57	Robert Fabianski	545 Cringle Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
3/28/2023 9:55	Tara Bradley	977 Rose Avenue Redwood City CA 94063
3/28/2023 14:13	Carol Lopez-Alfaro	736 Maple St. Redwood City, CA 94063
3/28/2023 20:53	Carmel Pariseau	3015 East Bayshore Road, Redwood City
3/29/2023 15:57	Tony Hanni	218 D Street Redwood City, CA 94063
3/29/2023 16:10	Judy DiStasio	1280 Veterans Blvd Apt 501 Redwood City , CA 94063
3/29/2023 19:02	Sari Hamman	432 compass drive
3/30/2023 16:03	Lim Chen	3109 Hoover Street Unit A Redwood City, CA 94063
3/31/2023 18:12	Elizabeth Hall	507 Seastorm Dr., Redwood City CA 94065
3/31/2023 18:24	Liliya Sarokina	328 Meridian Dr Redwood City CA 94065
4/1/2023 16:56	Liyun Ni	920 Corriente Point drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/1/2023 22:47	Anna Lyapis	850 Columbia Cir
4/2/2023 7:41	Filipp Brunshteyn	850 Columbia Cir Redwood Shores CA 94065
4/2/2023 9:20	Liza Percer	972 Governors Bay Drive, Redwood City, CA94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
4/3/2023 19:10	Evelyn Barrera	1085 15th Ave Redwood City CA 94063
4/3/2023 19:11	Veronica Barrera	1085 15th Ave Redwood City ca 94063
4/3/2023 19:12	Karina Barrera	1085 15th Ave Redwood City CA 94063
4/3/2023 19:14	Fatima Barrera	1085 15th Ave Redwood City CA 94063
4/3/2023 19:15	Rogelio Barrera	1085 15th Ave Redwood City CA 94063
4/4/2023 14:20	Jade Margolis	320 Mindanao Dr, Redwood City, CA, 94065
4/5/2023 17:06	Megan Halbrook	526 Shorebird Circle #16102, Redwood City, CA
4/6/2023 15:11	Jenny Jia	569 Anchor Circle, Redwood City, Ca 94569
4/6/2023 15:25	Carina Qi	271 Nice Court, Redwood City
4/6/2023 17:47	Wei Hai	271 Nice Ct, Redwood City
4/6/2023 19:04	Ester Souza	968 haven ave Redwood City ca 94063
4/6/2023 19:40	Ruizhi wu	801 cape cod drive, Redwood City
4/6/2023 20:33	Yunyan Zhang	1000 Davit Lane, Redwood City 94065
4/6/2023 21:30	Xinyan Tang	2008 Hastings Shore Ln
4/6/2023 22:47	Chunling Wang	727 Portwalk Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/6/2023 22:56	Adam Yang	Lido Cir
4/6/2023 23:01	Grace Tseng	Tidewater Dr, Redwood City, CA94065
4/6/2023 23:12	Kathie tang	88 pelican lane, Redwood City, ca, 94065
4/8/2023 14:02	Hong Tan	652 Sea Anchor Dr Unit 2202, Redwood City, CA 94063

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
8/8/2022 9:00	Karla Villanueva	308 Demi Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/8/2022 9:25	Viana Hagani	341 Bowsprit Drive Redwood City
8/8/2022 16:21	Alyssa Sanchez	602 Lanyard Drive
8/8/2022 16:32	Brad Nelson	734 Newport Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/8/2022 16:52	Morris Loya	730 Newport Circle, Redwood City, Ca 94065
8/8/2022 16:55	Edmond Loya	730 Newport Circle, Redwood City. Ca 94065
8/8/2022 16:56	Henry Loya	730 Newport Circle, Redwood City, Ca 94065
8/8/2022 17:51	Dave Webb	590 Avocet Dr
8/8/2022 20:28	Soumik Sarkar	520 Compass Dr
8/9/2022 7:30	Tom Lease	3906 Edison Street San Mateo, Ca 94403
8/9/2022 8:06	Rebecca Matthias	303 Beacon Shores Dr. Redwood City ca 94065
8/9/2022 14:54	Robert Faust	527 Compass Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
8/9/2022 15:52	Ashley faust	527 compass drive Redwood City ca 94064
8/9/2022 17:20	Celine roces	1 tidewater drive
8/9/2022 22:56	Sandra J Sullivan	690 Bradford St #4 Redwood City, CA 94063
8/11/2022 10:35	Deborah Hull	36 Cove Lane Redwood City CA 94065
8/11/2022 14:42	Isabelle Cotto	709 Clinton Street
8/11/2022 16:44	Prashant Khandelwal	814 Sea Chase Dr, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/11/2022 16:46	Poonam Gorakshakar	814 Sea Chase Dr, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/11/2022 19:35	Roma Olvera	458 Quartz Street, 94062
8/11/2022 21:32	Bibo Wang	208 Waldron Dr
8/11/2022 23:25	Juexin lin	302 Whidbey Ln, ca, 94065
8/12/2022 10:26	Victor Yeung	507 Osprey Ct, Redwood City
8/12/2022 17:23	Noel Shen	933 Governors Bay Drive, Redwood City
8/12/2022 20:50	Erin Simpson	1212 Whipple Ave, Redwood City, CA 94062
8/12/2022 21:05	Daniel McGowan	1212 Whipple Ave, Redwood City, CA 94062
8/13/2022 10:48	Angelica Michelle Ocampo	64 Grand Street, Redwood City, CA 94062
8/13/2022 12:14	Nancy Sheinbaum	1723 Kansas St, 94061
8/13/2022 16:56	Rena Dugish	3705 Laurel Way Redwood City CA 94062
8/13/2022 23:00	Vanessa To	601 Landmark Ln Redwood City, CA 94065
8/13/2022 23:19	Sandy Saunders	1244 Crompton Road, Redwood City
8/14/2022 9:22	Katherine Alward	735 Mediterranean Ln Redwood City CA 94065
8/14/2022 15:53	Katherine Koenig	299 Franklin Street, Redwood City, CA

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
8/15/2022 9:33	Angelica Fields	2100 Gossamer Ave.
8/15/2022 11:16	Jo Ann Arneson	506 Crest View Ave. Belmont, CA 94002
8/15/2022 18:47	Lavanya Adusumilli	205 Pender lane
8/16/2022 14:16	Justin Loye	3 Vera Ct. Redwood City, CA
8/17/2022 17:03	YIngfei Zhao	566 Compass Circle, Redwood City, 94065
8/17/2022 18:01	Jamie Trimble	1634 Whipple Avenue Redwood City
8/17/2022 20:23	Troy Stopera	3 Avocet Drive #104, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/17/2022 21:02	Tuba Senbabaoglu	322 Meridian Dr Redwood City CA 94065
8/18/2022 10:41	Rachael Stopera	3 Avocet Drive #104 Redwood City CA 94065
8/19/2022 8:59	Angela Salafia	1004 Rockport Ave, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/19/2022 9:20	Michael Salafia	1004 Rockport Ave, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/19/2022 11:25	Richard Chen	457 Cork Harbour Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/19/2022 13:10	Matthew Debski	1910 Oak Knoll Dr, Belmont, CA 94002
8/20/2022 2:43	Mary Ann Murphy	3729 Laurel Way Redwood City Ca 94062
8/20/2022 9:52	Carol Li	274 redwood shores pkwy. Redwood City CA 94065
8/21/2022 8:59	Jennifer Baker	602 Hopkins Avenue
8/21/2022 12:33	Nina Goodale	825 Portwalk Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/21/2022 13:14	Natasha Cook	200 Baltic Circle, Unit 214, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/21/2022 13:35	Linda Popky	10 Portofino Circle, Redwood City, CA
8/21/2022 19:32	Debbie mangone	551 Skiff Circle redwood shores, ca 94065
8/21/2022 22:34	Jill McHale	794 Sequoia Avenue San Mateo CA 94403

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
8/22/2022 9:34	Robin Carlier	5 Oceanside Way Redwood City,CA 94065
8/23/2022 10:25	Gina VanDusen	965 Valota Rd Redwood City, Ca. 94061
8/23/2022 12:28	Francine Taylor	271 Alameda de las Pulgas
8/24/2022 15:43	Faryal Saiidnia	200 Baltic Circle, Unit 238, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/25/2022 19:56	Robert S Whitmore	836 Alameda, Belmont, CA 94002
8/25/2022 21:32	Yen Tochimoto	1016 Gull ave. Foster city, cA 94404
8/26/2022 10:01	Lisa Recker	353; Altamont Way Redwood City CA 94062
8/26/2022 12:48	Sabine Sahyoun	3031 Hopkins Ave
8/26/2022 14:02	Lon Pini	15 finger avenue
8/26/2022 15:04	Lisa Schofield	3103 Goodwin Ave, RWC 94061

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
11/26/2022 9:25	Martina Speight	4048 Martin Dr
11/27/2022 19:45	Maureen Dermenjian	19 Haydon Court, Belmont, CA 94002
11/30/2022 8:36	Nicole Ovadia	408 Quadrant Lane
11/30/2022 16:32	Gil John Rodriguez	619 Canoe Court
12/1/2022 11:10	Robin Van Why	2406 Buena Vista Ave Belmont Ca 94002
12/1/2022 18:41	Judy Gilbertson	2606 Prindle Rd, Belmont, CA 94002
12/3/2022 12:57	Marisa Ramos	338 St. Martin Drive Redwood City 94065
12/3/2022 19:06	Brian Hanson	864 Boardwalk Place
12/3/2022 22:56	Sandeep Pyapali	16 Dockside Cir Redwood City 94065
12/4/2022 9:20	Susan Berl	158 Positano Circle
12/4/2022 9:51	min wang	569 Anchor Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
12/4/2022 17:29	David Sapper	10 Admiralty Place, Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
12/5/2022 21:33	Mary Spangler	1115 Edgewood Rd. Redwood City 94062
12/6/2022 23:54	Maria nelson	546 lanyard drive Redwood City
12/7/2022 13:07	Michelle Cabral	987 Laguna Circle, Foster City
12/9/2022 16:14	Chris Davis	622 Marlin Court Redwood City 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
12/21/2022 19:04	Michelle Boire	1605 Redwood Avenue, Redwood City 94061
12/30/2022 10:42	Elizabeth Carey	2600 Isabelle Ave San Mateo, CA 94403
12/31/2022 17:51	Alana Barrett	465 Cork Harbour Circle, C, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/1/2023 10:22	Mary Venturoni	2717 Monserat Avenue, Belmont, CA

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
2/7/2022 7:51	Iori spiegl	760 Newport Circle
2/7/2022 12:05	Gary Gfroerer	320 Sea Cliff Lane Redwood City CA 94065
2/7/2022 12:08	Tammy Fischetti	313 Sea Cliff Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/7/2022 13:31	Shannon S. Moon	711 Lacewing Ln, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/7/2022 13:32	Avery Moon	711 Lacewing Ln, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/7/2022 13:54	Arthur Faro	540 Shorebird Circle #21202, Redwood Shores, CA 97540
2/7/2022 17:09	Hohyun Shim	921 Corriente Point Dr. Redwood City, CA 94065
2/7/2022 17:29	Eduardo Gonzalez	106 Waldron dr redwood city CA 94065
2/7/2022 18:12	Anthony Fischetti	313 Sea Cliff Lane Redwood City, CA 94065
2/7/2022 18:16	Denise Comer	324 Commander Lane
2/7/2022 18:49	HE SHAO	845 Newport Circle
2/7/2022 18:49	Carolee Stabno	311 Beacon Shores Drive
2/7/2022 19:39	Natalie Hill	807 Corriente point drive Redwood City, CA
2/8/2022 9:50	Holly Christensen	4 Dana Pointe Court, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/8/2022 11:00	Elena Sapozhnikova	1 Oceanside Way
2/8/2022 11:25	Nancy Scheppler	750 Newport Circle
2/8/2022 16:44	Darlene Turturici	304 Sea Cliff Ln. Redwood City, CA 94065
2/8/2022 16:46	Ben Turturici	304 Sea Cliff Ln. Redwood City, CA 94065
2/8/2022 18:03	Justa Quesada	804 Corriente Pointe Drive, Redwood city, CA 94065
2/8/2022 20:08	Steve Martino	544 Shorebird Circle #25204, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/9/2022 11:07	Michael Comstock	512 Keelson Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/9/2022 12:07	Eileen Cassidy	540 Shorebird Circle, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/9/2022 12:10	edward cassidy	343 hudson st, redwood city, ca 94062
2/9/2022 13:13	joan courtney	509 anchor circle
2/9/2022 15:21	James soncuya	303 Satuma dr Redwood City ca 94065
2/9/2022 16:36	Sara Eckles	469 Barkentine Ln, Redwood Shores
2/10/2022 8:15	Yasmina Abdiche	853 Boardwalk Place
2/10/2022 11:22	Victoria Gonzalez	106 Waldron drive, redwood city, ca 94065
2/10/2022 14:23	Ray Fowler	871 Newport Circle
2/10/2022 15:30	Ms Cassidy (Kathlene)	343 Hudson, Redwood city, ca
2/10/2022 17:04	Lynn Emrick	319 Starfish Lane, Redwood Shores, CA
2/10/2022 17:07	Mike Emrick	319 Starfish Lane, Redwood City, CA
2/11/2022 8:55	Yi Li	519 Anchor Circle, Redwood City CA94065
2/11/2022 9:00	Dorothea Bunk	315 Starfish Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/11/2022 11:24	Lori Clerkin	216 Shorebird Circle Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/11/2022 17:02	Veronica Chico Rickson	315 Starfish Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/11/2022 17:16	Lori Menachof	941 Corriente Point Drive
2/11/2022 18:24	Alex Botvinik	808 Corriente Point Dr, Redwood City CA 94065
2/11/2022 21:51	Kristy Tsadick	319 Starfish Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/12/2022 13:02	Ashley Baxter	124 Monaco Drive, Redwood City, CA
2/12/2022 17:02	Vinnan Rangarajan	314 Beacon Shores Dr, Redwood City, 94065
2/13/2022 7:41	Cesar Rojas	312 Demi Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/13/2022 11:45	Sidharath Jain	820 , Corriente Point dr, Redwood City, CA-94065
2/13/2022 11:47	Vishakha Mahajan	820 , Corriente Point dr, Redwood City, CA-94065
2/13/2022 12:05	Ashley Baxter	124 Monaco Drive, Redwood City, CA
2/13/2022 13:38	Jeff Ashworth	126 Shorebird Cir, Redwood City, CA, 94065
2/13/2022 16:14	Leland Lai	721 Newport Circle, Redwood City CA 94065
2/13/2022 16:15	Serena Lai	721 Newport Circle, Redwood City CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
2/14/2022 8:40	HIROAKI TANAKA	532 Shorebird cir. #6203
2/14/2022 8:55	Louise Bennett	10 Mandalay Court Redwood City 94065
2/14/2022 9:06	Ashley Bennett	10 Mandalay Ct, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/14/2022 11:22	Mandy Zhang	729 Newport Cir.
2/14/2022 11:59	Broc Kanaday	540 Shorebird #21202, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/14/2022 12:02	Jana Boracini	540 Shorebird Cir. #21202, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/14/2022 12:38	Mary Graves	230 Shorebird Circle, Redwood Shores CA
2/14/2022 12:48	Trish Novak	950 Redwood Shores Pkwy, C101
2/14/2022 21:16	Anne Miltimore	933 Corriente Point Dr., Redwood Shores
2/15/2022 9:05	Adrian Botvinik	808 Corriente Point Dr, Redwood City CA, 94065
2/15/2022 17:05	Li Chan	309 Sea Cliff Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/15/2022 17:06	Joseph Kim	309 Sea Cliff Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/15/2022 19:20	Galina Rozenblyum	540 Anchor Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/16/2022 11:41	Anna Pleikis	560 Keelson Cir, Redwood city CA 94065
2/16/2022 13:03	Jincong Wang	27 Bremerton Cir, Redwood City, 94065, CA
2/16/2022 16:35	Amir Fanai	646 Island Place, Redwood City CA94065-1556
2/16/2022 16:53	Susan Fanai	646 Island Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/16/2022 17:53	Rick Schulze	561 Island Place, Redwood City
2/16/2022 18:01	Catherine Schulze	561 Island Place
2/16/2022 20:40	Mary Kaufman	537 Becket Dr
2/17/2022 8:08	Debra Weiner	610 Island Place, Redwood City, CA
2/19/2022 10:45	Olena Gutsalova	843 Newport Circle, Redwood City, CA, 94065
2/19/2022 16:13	Keyvan Keyhan	532 Shorebird Circle #6204
2/20/2022 12:23	Wilvin Szeto	372 Montserrat Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/20/2022 18:10	Fang Chen	336 Montserrat Dr
2/20/2022 19:52	Imad Lahham	247 Nice Court

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
2/21/22 11:39	Raymond Ng	394, Mindanao Drive
2/21/22 11:45	Hannah Hwang	394 Mindanao Drive, Redwood City, CA94065
2/21/22 13:14	Nitin Gaglani	400 krystallos lane, redwood city, CA 94065
2/21/22 13:19	Brian Huynh	2043 Seabrook Court
2/21/22 15:43	Helen Doneux	429 D Cork Harbour Circle Redwood City 94065
2/21/22 17:37	Jiefang Zhang	300 Commander Ln
2/21/22 17:41	Bin Qian	309 Treedust street
2/21/22 20:01	Chloe Lahham	247 Nice Court, Redwood City CA 94065
2/21/22 20:01	Luke Zheng	3010 Whisperwave Cir. Redwood City 94065 CA
2/21/22 22:06	Nanfei Yan	3010 Whisperwave Cir. Redwood City, CA 94065
2/22/22 14:22	Patricia Murdock	3001 Seabrook Ct Redwood City, CA 94065
2/26/22 10:59	Kelly Ann Matsuoka	97pelican Lane Redwood City Ca 94065
2/26/22 15:48	Keith Matsuoka	97 Pelican Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/26/22 16:05	Kelly Matsuoka	99 Pelican In
2/26/22 17:29	Luther Mok	368 Montserrat Drive Redwood city CA 94065
2/26/22 20:19	Ping Chan	376 Montserrat drive, redwood city, CA 94065
2/26/22 21:29	Jinshu Niu	137 Monaco Dr, Redwood City CA 94065
2/26/22 21:30	Kairan Zhu	137 Monaco Dr
2/27/22 13:05	Jacki Graf	745 Port Walk Pl
2/27/22 15:44	Mark DeSouza	59 Cove Lane Redwood City CA 94065
2/27/22 17:20	Colleen Rodriguez	743 Port Walk Place

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
1/30/2023 10:36	Braden Andersen	125 Shorebird Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/30/2023 16:02	Sophia Andruha	888 Boardwalk PL, RWS 94065
1/30/2023 19:44	Charu Anchia	318 bethel lane redwood city CA 94065
1/30/2023 22:33	Gerry Kuller	50 Eddystone Ct
1/31/2023 13:05	Brian Ascher	225 Monaco Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/31/2023 13:13	Michael Mogan	1057 Continentals Way #11, Belmont
1/31/2023 21:30	Tracy Banuelos	524 anchor cr redwood city ca 94065
2/1/2023 11:42	Gareth Baron	950 Redwood Shores Pkwy, redwood City, 94065
2/1/2023 16:32	Francisco Banuelos	524 Anchor Circle, Redwood City CA. 94065
2/4/2023 17:07	Adrian Carpio	408 Whisper Ln Redwood City CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
2/8/2023 8:31	Austin Gundry	825 Marshall St, Redwood City, CA
2/9/2023 13:51	Patricia Chiang	42 Dockside Cir Redwood City 94065
2/9/2023 14:21	Rajiv Chopra	937 Corriente Point Dr.
2/9/2023 15:54	Deniz Bolbol	15 Wakefield Ct Belmont CA 94002
2/10/2023 6:13	Silvia Antonelli	612 Jefferson Ave #204, Redwood City
2/10/2023 9:11	Antonio Martinez Alcantara	331 Turkshead Ln
2/10/2023 13:48	Lori Castagno	315 Turkshead Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/10/2023 13:49	Joe Castagno	315 Turkshead Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/10/2023 16:43	Ellen Swift	381 Ensign Lane Redeood City Ca 94065
2/10/2023 21:42	Pamela Jeung	35 Verbalee Ln Burlingame CA 94010
2/11/2023 9:12	Hong Lu	312 Whidbey Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/11/2023 9:15	Yekun Wang	312 Whidbey Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/11/2023 13:01	Ronald Clark	809 Salt Court Redwood City, Ca. 94065
2/12/2023 6:22	Marta He	202 , Shorebird Cir Redwood City
2/12/2023 15:40	Ed Swift	381 Ensign Lane

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
2/14/2023 20:29	Kendra Bronstein	737 Portwalk Place
2/16/2023 10:22	Amy Plante	620 Veterans BLVD
2/16/2023 10:31	Jonathan smith	620 Veterans Boulevard
2/17/2023 19:09	carol bartlett	924 warren st, redwood city CA 94063
2/18/2023 23:03	Abhishek Ghuwalewala	702 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA
2/19/2023 7:24	Cindy Gonzalez	299 Franklin St Apt 710 Redwood City CA 94063
2/19/2023 10:14	Ana-Paula Martins-Fernandes	705 Mendocino Way, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/19/2023 10:35	Almond Loh	228 Monaco Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/19/2023 10:37	Craig Montgomery	243 C St Redwood City, 94063
2/19/2023 10:39	Kaitlyn Kwan	307 Turkshead Lane
2/19/2023 12:22	Zoe Byun	2111 Hastings Shore Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/19/2023 16:24	Allison Don	1036 Rockport Ave, Redwood City, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
2/20/2023 9:48	Anoop Menon	117 Hartstene Dr, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/20/2023 10:04	Arvind Sharma	110 Amalfi Way Redwood City CA 94065
2/20/2023 10:36	Ashok Nambiar	807 Southport Drive Redwood City 94065
2/20/2023 16:09	Alex Zvenigorodsky	315 Quay Lane Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/20/2023 18:40	Avikk Ghose	35 Dockside Circle, Redwood Shores 94065
2/20/2023 19:07	Ann Saylor	822 Mediterranean Lane, Redwood Shores 94065
2/20/2023 20:19	Jennifer Freitas	38 Cape Hatteras Court, Redwood Shores, ca 94065
2/20/2023 20:53	Amanda Icasiano	700 Baltic Circle, Redwood City, 94065
2/20/2023 21:26	Peter Dy	400 Uccelli Dr, Apt 4304, Redwood City, CA 94063
2/20/2023 21:32	Alyssa Herrera-Set	311 Quay Ln. Redwood City, CA 94065
2/21/2023 6:26	Adele Cox	45 Fulton Street Redwood City CA 94062
2/21/2023 8:43	Beth Fenwick	1000 Davit Ln, Unit 128
2/21/2023 13:49	Akosua Grant	921 Salt Court
2/21/2023 18:25	Britney Fong	809 Bay Harbour Drive
2/21/2023 19:32	Brad Friedman	207 Shorebird Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/21/2023 21:11	Emma Fuller	1405 El Camino Real, Apt 548, Redwood City, CA 94063
2/23/2023 16:03	Javidan Guliyev	620 Veterans Blvd, Unit 344
2/23/2023 16:44	Jenny Deng	240 Monaco Dr. Redwood City, CA 94065
2/23/2023 16:55	Scott Chau	240 Monaco Dr. RWS, CA 94065
2/23/2023 17:53	Robert Sun	205 Pickleweed Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/24/2023 8:03	Joanne Liu	500 Baltic Circle Unit 502, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/25/2023 10:05	Ales Plsek	834 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/25/2023 10:53	Charles Tan	943 Corriente Point Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/25/2023 20:37	David Moon	600 Baltic Cir #604, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/25/2023 20:37	Kathleen Moon	600 Baltic Cir #604, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/26/2023 6:13	David Poon	359 Turkshead lane Redwood city California 94065
2/26/2023 14:44	David Shannon	804 Cape Cod Dr Redwood City, CA 94065
2/26/2023 15:00	Doris Singer	70 Waterside Circle
2/26/2023 16:40	Cheng-yeh Yen	819 Southport Dr., Redwood City, CA 94065

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
12/13/21 11:21 AM	Erika Osteraas	1315 James Ave, Redwood City, CA
12/13/21 11:34 AM	Alexander Wong	602 Seasons Lane, Redwood City, 94065
12/13/21 8:21 PM	Allen Thrasher	157 Positano Circle, Redwood City
12/13/21 11:44 PM	Gail Gannon	560 Elm St 94070
12/14/21 1:04 PM	Kelly Lamb	874 Newport Circle
12/16/21 1:41 PM	Lars Porsmose	21 Waterside Circle, Redwood City, CA 94080
12/16/21 1:42 PM	Jasmine Gao	21 Waterside Circle, Redwood City, CA 94080
12/20/21 11:35 PM	Jordana Simon	372 Genoa Drive, Redwood Shores. CA 94065
12/21/21 4:58 PM	Michael Hall	610 Island Place
12/21/21 10:02 PM	Yelena Vayn	6 Avocet Dr 6206 Redwood City Ca 94065
12/23/21 7:40 PM	Karen Turner	137 Lexington Ave. , Redwood City, CA
12/26/21 12:08 PM	James Chen	134 Positano Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
12/31/21 5:26 PM	Sherry Jamali	120 Shorebird Circle, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
1/1/22 10:17 AM	Cynthia Rogers	215 Shorebird Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
1/6/2023 16:51	Kristine Smith	5 Barcelona Cir Redwood Shores CA 94065
1/6/2023 21:41	Maria Meka	540 Shorebird Cir
1/6/2023 22:20	Alex Gonikman	8 Cadiz Circle Redwood City
1/6/2023 23:19	Barbara Rothe	331 Staysail Court, Foster City, CA 94404
1/6/2023 23:50	Kenna Seagrist	552 Shorebird Cir, Unit 1201, Redwood City 94065
1/6/2023 23:52	Jackson Seagrist	552 Shorebird Cir, Unit 1201, Redwood City 94065
1/7/2023 4:53	Craig Seim	145 Eyelet Lane
1/7/2023 23:36	Farzana Perwad	426 Bark Drive Redwood City CA 94065
1/8/2023 8:50	Catherine Wilkes	446 Barnegat Lane Redwood City, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
1/9/2023 19:56	Claire Mailhot	509 Starboard Drive, Redwood Shores, Ca 94065
1/11/2023 11:41	Katrina Crawford	Po Box 6515 San Mateo Ca 94002
1/11/2023 18:34	Christopher chow	2065 rockport ave, redwood shores, ca 94065
1/14/2023 17:40	henry loya	747 martinique dr redwood city ca 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
1/20/2023 16:01	Sandy Rosa	548 Shorebird Circle Unit 3201 Redwood City CA 94065
1/29/2023 13:15	Vikas Aggarwal	100 Baltic Circle, #104 Redwood City, CA-94065
1/29/2023 16:49	Robert Aboyme	3065 Whisperwave Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
6/27/2022 8:48	Joe Cheung	140 Northampton Lane, Belmont CA 94002
6/27/2022 9:21	Marcos Gutierrez	364 Ensign Lane
6/27/22 11:51	James Coffman	1109 Virginia Avenue, Redwood City, CA 9401
6/27/2022 19:04	Angie Wong	981 Governors Bay Drive
6/27/2022 19:08	Jackson Stodgel	266 41st Avenue, San Mateo CA, 94403
6/27/2022 21:35	Karen Hart	8 Spinnaker Place
6/27/2022 21:55	Ronda Crenshaw	36 Cove Ln
6/27/2022 22:56	Angelo Delcampo	786 Mediterranean lane, Redwood City CA
6/27/2022 23:02	Sonya Heerema	106 Wharf Row
6/28/2022 11:35	suzanne tschaekofske	75 duane st #15 redwood city, ca 94062
6/28/2022 13:15	cindy kasali	927 woodland ave san carlos,ca 94070
6/28/2022 15:34	Ramesh Lingamneni	255 Nice Ct, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/28/2022 18:46	Michael Sakayeda	976 Governors Bay Drive
6/28/2022 19:49	yan chen	63 cove ln, redwood city, CA94065
6/28/2022 19:55	Yaroslav Babych	57 Cove Ln
6/28/2022 20:48	AbdulHamed Mohammed	63 Pelican Ln, Redwood city, 94065
6/29/2022 14:32	Veena Khattak	799 Mediterranean Avenue, Redwood City, 94065
6/29/2022 14:32	Chandra Khattak	799 Mediterranean Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/29/2022 18:16	Debsubhra Roy	401 Baltic Cir #419 Redwood City
6/29/2022 23:41	Rich Brazeau	719 Newport Cir
6/30/2022 14:12	Lori Gfroerer	320 Sea Cliff Lane
6/30/2022 19:28	Gloria Velez	5 Cadiz circle
7/1/2022 1:32	Eric Set	311 Quay Lane Redwood City Ca 94065
7/1/2022 1:36	Julita Set	563 Shoal Circle Redwood City CA 94065
7/1/2022 7:59	Chris rae	470 barkentine ln
7/1/2022 9:31	Calona Paiko	802 Constellation Ct, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/1/2022 9:47	ivan yeung	808 sovereign way, redwood city, ca 94065
7/1/2022 10:12	Manique Wijewardena Bloom	820 , Seal Pointe Drive
7/1/2022 10:59	Hichem Sellami	4 Manhattan Ct, Redwood City CA
7/1/2022 12:10	Gaith Kawar	827 Columbia Cir
7/1/2022 18:07	james jim	210 Canoe Ct
7/1/2022 21:36	Mike Keehin	1081 Beach Park Blvd., Foster City
7/1/2022 21:36	Marilyn Canadas	1634 Peck Ave, San Mateo, CA. 94401
7/1/2022 22:14	April Lu	2 Dana pointe Court
7/2/2022 2:50	Marina Afanasieff	390 Bodega Street Foster City
7/2/2022 6:16	Judy Wu	887 Boardwalk Pl, redwood shores ca94065
7/2/2022 7:47	Danielle Enderson	610 Chesterton Ave, Belmont
7/2/2022 8:22	Dario Bortolotto	1113 Tanglewood way
7/2/2022 9:05	Sara Shayesteh	2514 S Norfolk St, San Mateo, CA 94403
7/2/2022 9:05	Michael Scott Chang	9 Mandalay Ct
7/2/2022 9:15	Betty Frase	135 Hillcrest Road, San Carlos, CA 94070
7/2/2022 9:34	Ila Patel	835 Portwalk Place, Redwood city, Ca 94065

7/2/2022 10:05	Deborah Hart	861 Columbia Circle, Redwood Shores, CA. 94065
7/2/2022 10:43	Cathleen Yedinak	2715 Victoria Manor San Carlos CA 94070
7/2/2022 10:53	Ayanna Carey	1410 Monroe Ave, San Mateo
7/2/2022 10:53	Paula Shea	2400 CARLMONT DR APT 308E Belmont ca
7/2/2022 11:56	Peter Cheung	55 Dockside Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/2/2022 11:59	Cynthia Wilson	115 Alameda De Las Pulgas, Redwood City, CA 94062
7/2/2022 12:00	James White	2603 Graceland Ave. San Carlos, CA 94070
7/2/2022 13:06	kimbery shern	57 w. 39th avenue san mateo, ca 94403
7/2/2022 13:48	Kimberly Wendt	102 Central Ave, Redwood City, 94061
7/2/2022 14:40	Herb Mesler	1549 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070
7/2/2022 15:02	David Skinner	764 Newport Circle
7/2/2022 15:25	Marta Lombana	1910 Arbor Avenue, Belmont, CA 94002
7/2/2022 15:46	Ilona Gabor	394 Menhaden Ct Foster City Ca.94404
7/2/2022 15:57	Carolyn MacKenzie	3384 Shasta Drive, San Mateo, Calif. 94403
7/2/2022 16:02	Pamela Segale	706 Temescal Way, Emerald Hills, CA 94062
7/2/2022 16:43	Nicholas Lamb	765 Barnegat Lane, Redwood City, 94065
7/2/2022 18:20	Chia-Hsiang Hsueh	46 Eddystone Ct. Redwood City, CA 94065
7/2/2022 18:37	Valerie Castillo	553 Dory lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/2/2022 19:11	Michael Kelso	2231 Carmelita Dr. San Carlos, Ca. 94070
7/2/2022 19:19	Scott Dolan	905 Crane Ave Foster City CA 94404
7/2/2022 19:47	Ben sangi	1326 skiff dr
7/3/2022 6:45	Christina Kidd	817 Southport Drive
7/3/2022 9:13	Gwen Thomas	813 Canyon Road, Redwood City
7/3/2022 12:30	Celia Driscoll	358 D Street Redwood City, Ca. 94063
7/3/2022 14:53	Marcelene Luna	10 Garden St Redwood City 94063
7/3/2022 16:13	Ms Cassidy	343 Hudson Street
7/3/2022 17:18	George Hubbard	161 Blossom Circle Unit 2K, San Mateo CA 94403
7/3/2022 21:26	Linda Modica	135 Rockridge Rd San Carlos, CA 94070
7/3/2022 21:55	Aileen Thompson	3705 Martin Drive San Mateo, ca 94403
7/3/2022 22:05	Kristina Ho	915 Buckland Ave, San Carlos

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
7/4/2022 0:29	Andrew Wu	31 Admiralty Place
7/4/2022 0:48	Max Guo	18 pelican In, Redwood City, ca 94065
7/4/2022 10:11	Sonia Strom	3 Antique Forest Ln, Belmont, CA 94002
7/4/2022 10:35	Vivian El Shawa	701 Freeport Lane Redwood Shores 94065
7/4/2022 15:08	Ann C Harrison	405 Cork Harbour Circle, Unit C, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/4/2022 15:38	John Tran	931 Governors Bay Drive, Redwood Shores, CA
7/4/2022 16:04	Jean Tran	931 Governors Bay Drive, Redwood Shores, CA
7/4/2022 16:31	Keith Silver	2760 Marlborough Ave Redwood City CA 94063
7/4/2022 16:32	Oscar Mace	1054 Galley Lane, Foster City, CA 94404
7/4/2022 16:52	Chris Robell	1261 Crompton Rd Redwood City
7/4/2022 17:49	Susan Kelly	1915 Kentucky St, Redwood City, Ca
7/4/2022 20:44	Minal Patel	469 Trident Drive
7/4/2022 21:47	Jiawen Zhu	586 Seahorse Lane, Redwood City 94065
7/5/2022 0:26	Bharath Sekar	303 Starfish Ln Redwood City CA 94065
7/5/2022 9:30	Ingrid Falk	480 Quartz Street, Redwood City, CA 94062
7/5/2022 9:50	Karen Coutant	633 Highland Avenue, 3, San Mateo, CA 94401
7/5/2022 11:21	Inger Bischofberger	983 Barroilhet Ave
7/5/2022 14:46	Ann Watters	233 Sonora Dr, San Mateo, CA 94402
7/5/2022 22:25	Betty Chandler	529 Breakwater Dr. Redwood City
7/6/2022 7:28	Francine Olson	300 Sea Cliff Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/6/2022 10:42	Peter Fleming	5 Cadiz circle. Redwood City ca 94065
7/6/2022 11:24	Tarah Haslett	115 Alameda de las puulgas, redwood city CA 94062
7/6/2022 11:27	June Sarchett	550 Shannon Way # 6110 Redwood City, ca 94065
7/6/2022 12:19	Sydney Dellinger	529 Breakwater Dr
7/6/2022 21:09	Shannon Dellinger	121 Shorebird Cir. Redwood City CA 94065
7/7/2022 11:48	Melissa Holder	2053 E Bayshore Rd #86, Redwood City, CA 94063
7/8/2022 6:54	David Barth	790 Lakeshore DR, Redwood City, CA. 94065
7/8/2022 9:47	Marie Comer	1815 Maddux drive, redwood city, can 94061
7/8/2022 10:10	Alexey Petrenko	11 Channel Dr
7/8/2022 10:48	Judith Anderson	108 Farallon Drive, Belmont, CA 94002
7/8/2022 11:50	Ketan Kittur	811 ,Sun Blossom Lane
7/8/2022 12:14	Shankar Subramaniam	135 Eyelet Ln
7/8/2022 14:13	Deborah Parker	2606 Hastings Shore Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/8/2022 14:42	Frank Casale	2425 Casa Bona Belmont, CA 94002
7/8/2022 17:33	Sherri Collins	809 Cape Cod Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
7/8/2022 17:34	Justin Ling	807 Intrepid Ln, Redwood Shores CA 94065
7/8/2022 19:04	Barbara McCormick	2700 Hacienda St # 324 San Mateo CA 94403

7/8/2022 20:39	Jacqueline Shen	933 Governors Bay Drive, Redwood City, 94065
7/8/2022 20:40	Erin Walsh	150 Duane St, Apt 5
7/8/2022 20:42	Vincent Conner	150 Duane St, RWC CA
7/8/2022 20:50	Kelly Tranter	354 Camille Court, Mountain View, CA 94040
7/10/2022 10:20	Laura Borden	1142 Rainier Ave, Pacifica CA 94044
7/10/2022 16:48	Dian Barth	790 Lakeshore Drive Redwood City, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
7/11/2022 9:07	Laurie Keit	135 Hillcrest Road, San Carlos, CA 94070
7/11/2022 14:33	Shayla Villarreal	1101 Salt Court Redwood City CA 94065
7/11/2022 14:34	Deborah Villarreal	1101 Salt Court Redwood City CA 94065
7/12/2022 8:18	Sandra Stoecker	740 16th Avenue, Menlo Park CA 94025
7/12/2022 17:32	Stella Loh	528 Shorebird Circle, Unit 3203, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
7/12/2022 20:34	Thahiyya Syeda	15 Cove Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/13/2022 12:05	Andreas Wolf	955 Pleasant Hill Rd. Redwood City CA 94061
7/13/2022 13:13	Susanne Marcellais	12 Alameda De Las Pulgas, Redwood City,CA
7/13/2022 13:37	Karen Lutke	2701 Hastings Shore Lane Redwood City
7/13/2022 16:44	Bonnie Courtney-Rodriguez	835 6th Avenue, Redwood City, CA 94063
7/13/2022 18:49	Jill Fraser	80 Eddystone Court Redwood City, CA
7/13/2022 19:02	Stacie Wong	3612 Santiago Street, San Mateo, CA 94403
7/14/2022 6:23	Robin Suzuki	54 Cove Lane
7/14/2022 14:28	Kimberly Schofield	91 Pelican Lane
7/15/2022 7:34	michelle sheehan	25 Pelican Lane, Redwood City CA 94065
7/15/2022 8:54	Teresa Power	36 Pelican Lane Redwood City 94065
7/15/2022 9:59	Zoe Chien	19 Cove Lane, redwood shores CA 94065
7/16/2022 9:44	ho ng	23 cove ln
7/16/2022 13:41	Connie dunham	49 Pelican Lane Redwood City ca
7/16/2022 21:41	Lisa Brody	516 Shoal Circle
7/17/2022 8:00	Olivia Austen	1090 Main Street Redwood City Ca 94063
7/17/2022 10:08	Hidetaka Kojima	56 Pelican Ln, Redwood City CA 94065
7/17/2022 14:43	Nanzhi Zang	68 pelican Lane
7/17/2022 15:38	Christine Kenny	65 Cove Lane, Redwood City 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
7/18/2022 8:01	Joyce Leung	59 Pelican Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/18/2022 8:49	Paul Chun	49 cove lane redwood city ca 94065
7/18/2022 11:54	Robert Colangelo	72 Pelican Lane Redwood City 94065
7/18/2022 18:25	Monte Mansir	48 Pelican Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/20/2022 15:19	Yu Li	9 Cove Ln, Redwood City, CA, 94065
7/21/2022 9:44	Pamela DeVoy	125 Eyelet Lane Redwood City, CA 94065
7/22/2022 6:12	John Johnson	143 G St Redwood City, CA 94063
7/22/2022 13:16	Juliet Griffith	153 Inner Circle, Redwood City, CA 94062
7/24/2022 20:43	Melissa Diaz	875 Woodside rd, Redwood City 94061

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Nam	Home Address
7/26/2022 9:20	Parine Fowler	590 Keelson Circle Redwood City CA 94065
7/27/2022 12:05	Lynne Torunian	125 King Street, Redwood City, CA 94062
7/27/2022 12:06	Joclyn Castor	822 Beech Street, RWC, 94063
7/27/2022 12:10	Toni Ann Secrest	576 Marlin Court
7/27/2022 12:12	Janice Diridoni	368 Nimitz Ave Redwood City
7/27/2022 12:13	Julie Kaus	400 Baltic Circle Redwood Shores CA
7/27/2022 12:14	Jeanie Cotton	1458 Hudson St. #306
7/27/2022 12:25	Jeffrey Krosse	3646 Highland Ave, Redwood City, CA 94062
7/27/2022 12:33	Patty Cullen	146 Iris St
7/27/2022 12:43	Mayra Cervantes	530 Shannon Way Redwood City, CA 94065
7/27/2022 12:52	Karla oliveira	237 highland terrace, Woodside, CA 94062
7/27/2022 13:46	Andrea Kehe	119 Highland Terrace Woodside
7/27/2022 14:40	Jodi Murphy	4040 Jefferson Ave
7/27/2022 16:30	Diana S. Hallesy	1238 Crompton Road Redwood City CA 94061
7/27/2022 17:08	Sonni Doran	180 Atherwood Ave Redwood City
7/27/2022 20:14	Karen Keefer	1720 Valota Road, Redwood City 94061
7/28/2022 8:40	Donna Wright	3430 Crestmoor dr San Bruno, ca. 94066
7/28/2022 20:46	Marina Chabg	10 Tidewater Drive, Redwood City CA94065
7/29/2022 9:38	Helen Meyer	2777 Bristol Way Redwood City CA 94061
7/30/2022 16:50	Gurpreet hazra	2068 Rockport Redwood City CA 94065
7/30/2022 21:11	Justine Yu	32 Bremerton Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
5/30/2022 9:55	Michael Garrison	516 Breakwater Drive
5/30/2022 10:18	Tianmin Jung	536 Shoal Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/30/2022 11:43	Siu Hong	512 Jetty Way
5/30/2022 11:44	Kei Tung	512 Jetty Way
5/30/2022 18:23	Mao Geng	525 Osprey Dr, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/30/2022 21:24	Burbank Jung	536 Shoal Circle
5/31/2022 10:47	SUNDANCE FRIEDRICH	802 Boardwalk Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/31/2022 12:13	Chetna sureka	2807 Hastings Shore Ln Redwood City 94065
6/1/2022 8:08	Ala Aviosnava	573 Osprey Drive, Redwood City
6/1/2022 10:56	Sasha Elzey	532 Seastorm Dr
6/1/2022 12:02	Devika Watkins	507 Starboard Drive, Redwood City 94065
6/2/2022 14:49	Anahi McKane	562 Shoal Circle, Redwood City CA 94065
6/2/2022 16:38	Dolores Salvi Schriever	812 SOVEREIGN WAY
6/2/2022 17:18	Nachuan Ouyang	804 Columbia Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/2/2022 17:36	Meilan Chen	810 constellation ct., redwood city, ca 94065
6/2/2022 19:17	Victor Jin	763 Mediterranean Ln
6/2/2022 22:49	Mo Zhu	815 Columbia Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/3/2022 0:05	Li Li	807 Columbia circle, Redwood City, 94065
6/3/2022 14:30	Pojaman Pojaman	821 Columbia Cir Redwood City CA 94065
6/3/2022 16:59	Jacqueline Parr	830 Sovereign Way Redwood City, CA 94065
6/4/2022 14:13	Mary English	5 Admiralty Place, RWC
6/4/2022 15:02	Richard Saunders	596 Marlin Ct.
6/4/2022 15:12	Joan Anway	19 Admiralty Place Redwood City, CA 94065
6/4/2022 16:26	Kimberly Dubin	639 Marlin Ct
6/4/2022 18:00	Hang Qu	819 Constellation Ct, Redwood City, 94065
6/4/2022 18:16	Cristi Summers	33 Admiralty Place
6/4/2022 18:40	Oleg Musteata	828 Columbia Cir, Hayward, CA
6/5/2022 7:56	Natasha Beilin	20 admiralty place Redwood City
6/5/2022 9:32	Olga Strongin	502 Barkentine Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/5/2022 10:02	Ron Herz	28 admiralty pl redwood shores
6/5/2022 11:08	Taninnan Thiptanakitchot	600 Marlin Court, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/5/2022 12:00	Seyed shafaatian	586 Marlin Ct
6/5/2022 14:53	Peter Budelov	21 Admiralty Place Redwood City, CA 94065
6/5/2022 15:07	Thomas De Vries	849 Columbia Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/5/2022 15:09	Mary De Vries	849 Columbia Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/5/2022 16:37	Marilyn Budevov	21 Admiralty Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/5/2022 18:44	Harold Zhang	815 Intrepid Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
6/6/2022 9:24	Phil Solk	817 Sovereign Way, Redwood Shores 94065
6/6/2022 11:24	Qianxun Wu	804 Columbia Cir
6/6/2022 11:55	Linda Manes Goodwin	817 Sovereign Way, Redwood Shores, CA
6/6/2022 19:03	Pamela M Burton PhD	806 Columbia Circle Redwood City CA 94065
6/6/2022 19:18	Mandana Abollhassani	34 Barcelona circle Redwood city ca 94065
6/7/2022 9:30	Di Wu	837 Columbia Cir. Redwood Shores CA94065
6/7/2022 15:41	Ignati Griguentch	803 Intrepid lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/8/2022 16:20	Jianhong Sun	829 Lakeshore Dr. Redwood City, CA 94065
6/9/2022 10:46	Jian Wang	334 turkshead ln, redwood shores, ca 94065
6/9/2022 20:30	Marylou Schoone	835 Intrepid Lane
6/9/2022 22:45	Laura Parker	30 cape hatteras Ct, Redwood City ca 94065
6/10/2022 0:22	Ali Navabpour	1000 Rockport Ave. Redwood City Ca 94065
6/10/2022 11:44	Steven Goodale	825 port walk pl. Redwood Shores, CA, 94065
6/11/2022 11:03	Matthew Lazar	129 Shorebird Circle redwood city, CA 94065
6/11/2022 11:48	Wei Lei	47 Pelican Lane Redwood City ca 94065
6/11/2022 18:13	Stephanie Vance	130 shorebird circle redwood shores ca 94065
6/12/2022 9:43	Allison Martin	1008 Rockport Avenue

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
6/13/2022 13:57	Jess Mendez	820 Boardwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/13/2022 13:58	Lanie Go	818 Boardwalk Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/13/2022 14:00	Jao Yu	818 Boardwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/13/2022 16:22	Claudia Fort	99 Pelican In
6/14/2022 17:04	Alice roces	1 tidewater dr Redwood City ca 94065
6/14/2022 18:09	Sylvia Barranti	374 St Martin Drive
6/15/2022 13:26	Viya Choksi	65 Waterside Circle
6/15/2022 19:09	Michael Axelrod	121 Monaco Dr Redwood City CA 94065
6/15/2022 19:17	Nicholas McDowell	854 Newport Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/15/2022 20:21	Tess Rickson	854 Newport Circle, Redwood Shores, CA, 94065
6/16/2022 21:03	Hazel Zecha	61 Waterside Cir, redwood city, 94065
6/17/2022 16:19	Marisa Gniadek	304 Sandhurst Street Redwood City CA 94065
6/17/2022 16:20	Matt Gniadek	304 Sandhurst Street Redwood City CA 94065
6/17/2022 16:20	James Strain	570 Keelson Circle
6/17/2022 20:50	Lisa Seim	145 eyelet lane RWS 94065
6/19/2022 22:14	Olga Haislip	811 Seal Pointe Dr Redwood Shores, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
6/20/2022 16:00	Patricia Novak	950 Redwood Shores Pkwy, C101
6/20/2022 16:54	Wayne Homrig	564 compass circle
6/20/2022 19:01	Terry Strain	570 Keelson Circle
6/21/2022 16:17	Lisa Chavez	1012 Rockport Ave
6/21/2022 16:24	Karen Stevenot	308 Commander LN, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/22/2022 0:04	Elsa Hsieh	867 Portwalk Pl
6/22/2022 10:00	Jason Tung	625 Harbor Colony Ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
6/22/2022 13:22	Jillian Inapurapu	4320 Cambridge Way union city CA 94587
6/26/2022 8:22	Patrick Zecha	61 Waterside Cr., Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
2/27/2023 11:51	Donald Smith	530 Marlin Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/28/2023 5:43	Beni Poon	359 turkshead lane Redwood City ca 94065
2/28/2023 18:42	Elisa Garibay	825 Marshall st Redwood City ca 94063
3/1/2023 7:39	Candace Maxwell	950 Redwood Shores Parkway, Redwood City, CA, 94065
3/1/2023 11:51	Hong Xu	1000 Davit Ln Unit 104, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/1/2023 19:53	DONGMEI YANG	133 positano Cir, redwood shores, ca 94065
3/2/2023 17:13	Elron Supelana	527 Lanyard Drive
3/2/2023 17:28	Ryan Snider	530 Shannon Way, Apt 4110, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/2/2023 17:34	Elton Yee	844 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City CA 94065
3/3/2023 17:26	Nikola Eterovich	950 Redwood Shores Parkway , Apt. C304
3/4/2023 22:40	Curtis Fay	950 Redwood Shorea Pkwy
3/5/2023 13:45	Ernest Yip	714 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/5/2023 14:11	Ka wai wong	501 Baltic Cir unit 513, Redwood City, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
2/28/2022 9:25	Chai Siah Ku	631 Teredo Drive, Redwood City CA 94065
2/28/2022 9:42	CHIA YIAW CHONG	631 TEREDO DRIVE, REDWOOD CITY, CA 94065
2/28/2022 14:00	Barb Lundhild	749 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/28/2022 16:52	Cheryl A. Brennan	371 ENSIGN LANE, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/28/2022 19:17	Charles Ferguson	305treedust street, Redwood City
2/28/2022 19:19	Morihiro Ogawa	305 Treedust Street, Redwood City
3/1/2022 19:04	Debbie Bianconi	375 Ensign Ln
3/2/2022 10:26	Joseph Kuspa	2017 Rockport Avenue
3/2/2022 10:55	Lei Wang	802 Boardwalk place, Redwood City, CA, 94065
3/2/2022 12:05	Yun Cheng	704 Freeport Ln, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
3/3/2022 0:05	Li Pan	531 Skiff Cir, Redwood City
3/3/2022 8:01	Jenn-Gang Chern	500 Baltic Circle, Redwood City, CA94065
3/3/2022 9:13	Gerald Patrick	300 Baltic Circle #306
3/4/2022 23:45	leila Gray	831 lakeshore drive
3/5/2022 13:22	Josh Heller	316 Treedust St. Redwood City, CA 94065
3/5/2022 19:52	Stoyan Radov	364 Genoa Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/6/2022 11:24	Ian Campbell	214 Preserve lane, Redwood City
3/6/2022 13:20	Loyal Shen	404 whisper lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/6/2022 13:21	Lily Shen	404 Whisper Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/6/2022 14:18	Andrew Baum	222 Nice Court, Redwood City, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
3/6/2023 16:39	Jennifer de Castro	449 Bark Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
3/6/2023 19:45	Ramchand Raman	330 Saint Martin Dr
3/6/2023 20:10	Sathya Raman	330 Saint Martin Dr, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/7/2023 10:08	Jose de Castro	449 Bark Drive Redwood City CA 94065
3/7/2023 16:34	Michelle Hamilton	310 hill way, San Carlos ca 94070
3/7/2023 17:05	Tara Borejka	255 Grand Blvd #2, San Mateo, CA 94401
3/7/2023 17:10	Geoffroy Raby	409-D Cork Harbour Cir. Redwood Shores, CA, 94065
3/7/2023 22:21	Peggy Biocini	3 Blu Harbor Blvd # 134, Redwood City,CA 94063
3/8/2023 17:01	Patrick Chaffin	1 Franklin St Unit 726, Redwood City CA 94063
3/8/2023 19:17	Caroline Takahashi	926 Ruby Street, Redwood City, CA,94061
3/8/2023 19:22	Stephanie Ross	434 Alden Street, Redwood City, Ca. 94063
3/9/2023 9:38	Margaret Rogers	342 Elwood St., Redwood City, CA 94062
3/9/2023 14:47	Grace Tseng	794 Lakeshore Drive
3/12/2023 6:51	Jian Han	126 Positano cir, Redwood City, ca 94065
3/12/2023 17:53	Roxanne Rewa	1504 Stafford st Redwood City ca 94063
3/12/2023 18:09	Dan Rewa	1401 arguello st,Redwood City 94063
3/12/2023 23:06	Vivek Jayaraman	385 Quay Lane, Redwood City CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
3/13/2023 11:34	Janet Mok	7 Mandalay Ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
3/14/2023 12:40	Julia Nordman	550 Osprey Dr. Redwood City CA. 94065
3/14/2023 14:20	Abhi Jha	700 Newport Cir, Redwood City CA 94065
3/16/2023 7:47	Janice Mahoney	308 Starfish Lane, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
3/16/2023 9:17	Shaz Rajput	1 Franklin Street, Apt 712, Redwood City, CA 94063
3/16/2023 19:56	Jing zhou	425 cork harbour circle apt d Redwood City, ca 94065
3/17/2023 16:31	Suaima Figueroa	450 Redwood Ave, Redwood City, CA 94063
3/17/2023 18:21	Tianyi Wang	645 Turnbuckle Dr Unit 2107, Redwood City, CA 94063
3/17/2023 18:25	Josephine Pai	14 Cadiz Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/18/2023 20:03	Xiaoying Huang	491 Tiller Ln, Redwood City, CA, 84065
3/18/2023 21:11	Todd Shintani	636 Bair Island Road, Unit 313, Redwood City, CA. 94063
3/18/2023 22:09	Virginia Padron	524 Breakwater Dr. Redwood City ,CA 94065
3/19/2023 16:07	Kay Johnson	729 Mediterranean Lane, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
3/19/2023 16:38	Claudia Karina Estacuy	412 Bark Drive, Redwood City, CA, 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
3/20/2023 10:37	Kayvon Pejooch	822 Lakeshore Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
3/20/2023 15:19	Joseph Wucher	18 Barcelona Circle
3/24/2023 11:52	Elena Fedotova	72 Eddystone Ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
3/24/2023 16:44	Karina Malykhina	554 Keelson Cir. Redwood City, CA 94065
3/24/2023 19:19	Kristin Wagshul	516 anchor circle redwood shores ca 94065
3/24/2023 19:37	Bryce Wagshul	516 Anchor circle redwood city 94065
3/24/2023 19:45	Kim Loughead	744 Newport Cir. Redwood City CA 94065
3/25/2023 13:00	Darren Kumasawa	600 Baltic Circle Unit 618, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/25/2023 13:09	Laetitia king	767 Portwalk pl. Redwood City,CA 94065
3/25/2023 17:41	Kevin Tung	601 Landmark Lane
3/26/2023 21:37	Karen Wagshul	459 Trident Drive Redwood Shores/ City, CALIFORNIA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
5/23/2022 8:01	William Dreyfus	811 Columbia Circle Redwood City 94065
5/23/2022 12:09	Grace Chang	10 Tidewater Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/23/2022 12:12	Francis Chang	10 Tidewater Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/23/2022 14:15	Joyce Chang	10 Tidewater Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/23/2022 16:38	Alay Banker	65 Waterside circle, ca 94065
5/24/2022 12:06	Rhonda Van	541 Shoal Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/24/2022 13:33	Carol Ann Leonard	511 Shoal Circle Redwood Shores CA 94065
5/24/2022 13:55	Frances Szlapka	511 Shoal Circle Redwood Shores, Ca 94065
5/24/2022 14:32	Mary Carnegie	529 Shoal Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/24/2022 17:36	Lara Ostroff	60 Eddystone Ct, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/25/2022 10:38	Angelita Deakin	532 SHOAL CIR
5/25/2022 22:24	Phuong Trieu	146 Monaco Drive, Redwood City CA. 94065
5/26/2022 11:07	Todd Hagen	461 Starboard Drive. Redwood City. CA. 94065
5/27/2022 15:26	Ksenia Lukanova	12 Riviera Cir, Redwood City CA
5/29/2022 18:03	Christine Chung	516 Breakwater Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/29/2022 19:11	Shailesh Soliwal	521 Osprey Dr, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/29/2022 19:13	Jyotsna Repaka	521 Osprey Dr, Redwood City

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
10/26/2022 11:09	Olya Derby	105 S. Delaware st. San Mateo, CA
10/30/2022 22:37	Prashant Soral	3028 Whisperwave Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
11/17/2022 2:57	Jocelyn Carpio	408 Whisper Ln. Redwood City Ca 94065
11/18/2022 5:58	Alex Podell	1201 Howard Avenue, Burlingame 94010

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
10/3/2022 10:30	Bernadette Delaware	476 Fathom Ct Redwood City, CA
10/5/2022 5:59	Guillermina Castellanos	208 Mako Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/13/2022 8:38	David Mon	873 Portwalk Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/14/2022 21:23	Yvonne Sun	201 Monaco Drive, Redwood City, Ca. 94065
10/15/2022 12:35	Mike Collins	809 Cape Cod Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/15/2022 16:44	Adriana Vaughan	6 Portofino Circle -- Redwood City, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
8/29/2022 16:07	Bernard Arceo	556 Compass Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/29/2022 19:49	Joe Raccanello	551 Compass Circle
8/30/2022 13:57	Allene Ball	471 Bodega St
8/31/2022 17:38	Christina Umhofer	147 Warwick Street, Redwood City, CA
9/1/2022 21:58	Michele Carlsen	359 Mindanao Dr., Redwood City, CA 94065
9/2/2022 11:42	John Cianciolo	823 Southport Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
9/5/2022 14:32	Robert Carlsen	359 Mindanao Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
9/5/2022 23:09	Laura Gorran	668 Cedar Street San Carlos CA 94070
9/7/2022 13:04	heather holmes george	600 Log Cabin Ranch Rd La Honda CA 94020
9/7/2022 14:03	Gregory Kelly	1915 Kentucky street Redwood City ca 94061
9/7/2022 15:36	Tammy Alsterlind	1031 15th Ave., Redwood City, CA. 94063
9/11/2022 8:49	Suzanne DeSelover Sallie	400 Terrace Ave
9/11/2022 17:23	Susan Aloyan	806 Sun Blossom Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
9/12/2022 17:12	PK Olani	200 Redwood Shores Parkway

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
9/21/2022 17:52	Sara McNinch	455 Neptune Dr, Redwood City CA
9/22/2022 9:39	Giovanna Masarie	2604 Eaton Avenue, Redwood City, CA
9/23/2022 20:34	Denise Sink	154 Santiago Ave
9/24/2022 8:29	Mary Ann Coulson	1403 Virginia Ave RWC 94061
9/24/2022 8:38	Mike Salafia	1004 Rockport Ave, Redwood City, CA 94065

From: [Francine L. Olson](#)
To: [GRP-City Council](#)
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan
Date: Thursday, April 6, 2023 11:19:08 AM

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to *preserve* the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.** The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are

also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Francine L. Olson

Francine L. Olson
m. (650) 533-5166

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
10/22/2021 17:35	Earl Aiken	3033 Whisperwave Circle
10/22/2021 17:41	Qing Mao	453 CORK HARBOR CIR
10/22/2021 20:03	Shanshan Guo	429 cork Harbour cir, unit g
10/22/2021 20:04	Aiden Fang	Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/22/2021 20:07	Joyce Huang	100 Baltic Cir
10/22/2021 20:11	Xi Peng	429 Cork Harbour Cir
10/22/2021 20:26	Yonggang Jin	605 Seabrook Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/22/2021 21:37	Peipei Luo	811 Constellation Ct
10/22/2021 21:43	Yuan yue	A-417 corkharbour cir, Redwood City, 94065
10/22/2021 22:43	Yalan Zhang	409 Cork Harbour Circle
10/22/2021 23:14	Wenjing Li	624 Spar Dr, Redwood City, 94065 CA
10/23/2021 8:11	Jennifer Wang	Barnegat Ln, Redwood City
10/23/2021 11:16	Xin Li	801 Southport Dr , Redwood City, CA 94065
10/23/2021 13:03	Xuelian wei	509 Marlin Drive, Redwood City, CA, 94065
10/23/2021 13:34	Wen Zhang	14 Portofino Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/23/2021 13:59	Luciana Molinero	52 Cove Lane, Redwood City
10/23/2021 16:55	Maywun Wong	663 Island Place, RWS
10/23/2021 21:05	Lynn Carteris	314 Saint Martin Dr
10/23/2021 21:15	Lisa Yed	100 Baltic Circle
10/23/2021 21:36	Robin George	318 St Martin Dr
10/23/2021 23:11	Steven Stocker	643 Island Place, Redwood City, Ca 94065
10/23/2021 23:43	Greg Hargrove	536 Shorebird Circle Unit 5201, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
10/24/2021 8:20	Jieli Shen	469 Cork Harbour Cir, Redwood City
10/24/2021 8:25	Michael Villanueva	881 Portwalk Place
10/24/2021 9:29	Debra Carrubba	405H Cork Harbour Circle
10/24/2021 10:50	Maria & Ron Brownell	818 Portwalk Place Redwood City 94065
10/24/2021 10:55	Ting Bai	2108 Gossamer Ave
10/24/2021 10:56	Hong Chen	2108 Gossamer Ave
10/24/2021 11:03	Siyang liu	107 windlea ln, redwood shores,ca 94065
10/24/2021 12:37	Krysta Banazek	812 Boardwalk Place
10/24/2021 14:51	Jing Hong	803 Kraken Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/24/2021 14:55	Eva Pang	824 Boardwalk Pl, redwood city, ca 94065
10/24/2021 16:38	Sharon Lee	2 Gimbal Lane
10/24/2021 17:35	Andrea Levin	409 Cork Harbour Circle, Redwood City CA 94065
10/24/2021 20:32	Chris Tow	400 Whisper Ln
10/24/2021 21:43	Gaven Wang	305 Seattle Lane
10/24/2021 22:38	Sigal Eylon	235 Shorebird Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/24/2021 23:34	Olin Palmer	718 Portwalk Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/25/2021 7:58	David & Inga Bleich	3760 Waldo PL Upper Arlington, OH 43220
10/25/2021 11:12	Vidyut Lingamneni	255 Nice Ct, Redwood City CA 94065
10/25/2021 11:15	Emma Tcheau	223 nice court redwood shores 94065
10/25/2021 12:57	Fran Mottie	300 Mindanao Dr., Redwood Shores, CA 94065
10/25/2021 13:24	Elizabeth Tazbaz	247 Nice Court

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
10/25/2021 13:25	Imad lahham	247 Nice Court
10/25/2021 13:32	Jessica yau	258 Nice Ct, Redwood City, Ca 94065
10/25/2021 15:53	Brent McKay	806 Kraken Lane
10/25/2021 19:15	Raj Haldankar	312 Treedust Street
10/25/2021 23:55	Bruce Masker	409-G, Cork Harbour Circle
10/26/2021 0:22	Eric Johnstone	437 Cork Harbour Circle
10/26/2021 1:50	Janine Nguyen	437 Cork Harbour Cir, Apt C, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/26/2021 2:27	Kirsten Zener	417 Cork Harbour Circle Apt G
10/26/2021 2:29	Milan Bhalala	453 Cork Harbour Circle D. Redwood City, CA 94065
10/26/2021 4:47	Tom Walker	465 Cork Harbour Cir, #D
10/26/2021 5:51	Marie Pease	338 El Portal Ave Hillsborough / 445-E Cork Harbour
10/26/2021 6:36	Katie Evans	441 cork harbor cir unit a, Redwood City, Ca 94065
10/26/2021 6:51	Trevor Newman	520 Sandlewood Lane Redwood City
10/26/2021 7:09	Sandi Carrubba	405 Cork Harbour Circle Unit H
10/26/2021 7:43	Susan Torres	1459 Cordilleras Avenue, San Carlos, CA. 94070
10/26/2021 8:22	Vikki Ogden	445C Cork Harbour Circle RWC, CA 94065
10/26/2021 8:32	Kathy Gao	441 Cork Harbour #H, redwood shores, CA
10/26/2021 9:00	Sandeep Shekhawat	461 Cork Harbor Cir, H Redwood City, 94065
10/26/2021 9:16	Alan Mak	433 Cork Harbour Cir, Unit A, Redwood City CA 94065
10/26/2021 9:25	Roy& Cynthia Ilustrisimo	469-D Cork Harbour Circle Redwood City 94065
10/26/2021 10:22	Bhagyashree Shekhawat	461 Cork Harbor Cir
10/26/2021 10:23	Brigitte Aiken	3033 Whisperwave Circle
10/26/2021 11:17	Paola Costantino	461 Cork Harbour Circle Unit A
10/26/2021 11:34	Julie Rosing	437 Cork Harbor Circle Apt E Redwood City
10/26/2021 11:52	Jen Boulware	421 Cork Harbour Cir, Apt. C
10/26/2021 11:52	David SHu	417 Cork Harbour Circle Unit G Redwood Shores, CA 94065
10/26/2021 12:11	Alyssa Chen	453 Cork Harbour Cir
10/26/2021 13:00	Hisako Blair	473 cork harbour blvd F
10/26/2021 13:29	Carolyn Yim	469 Cork Harbour Cir Apt G
10/26/2021 14:07	Jackie Cheung	226 Nice Court
10/26/2021 14:32	Sabrina Leung	737 Mediterranean Lane, Redwood City CA 94065
10/26/2021 15:08	Julie Maemura-Tan	453 A Cork Harbor Circle
10/26/2021 15:09	Archit Lohokare	565 Keelson Cir
10/26/2021 16:06	Mary Rodriguez	413 Cork Harbour Circle, Apt. C, Redwood City, 94065
10/26/2021 18:29	Sarah Cheung	226 Nice Court
10/26/2021 21:00	Tommy Cheung	226 Nice Court, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
10/26/2021 23:23	Hema Batra	445 Cork Harbour Cir
10/26/2021 23:40	Ella Hwang	449 Cork Harbour Cir APT A, Redwood City, CA 95065
10/27/2021 10:00	Brittany Cheung	226 Nice Court, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/27/2021 10:57	Redwood Susan Passafiume	859 Columbia Circle
10/27/2021 14:27	Shu Wang	417 Cork Harbour Cir #H, 94065
10/27/2021 14:38	Bob Razura	429 cork Harbour Circle apt C. Redwood City Ca 94065
10/27/2021 15:44	Dhanraj Pondicherry	465 Cork Harbour Cir., Redwood Shores, Ca 94065

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
10/27/2021 16:11	Choon-mun Hooi	812 Portwalk PI Redwood City CA 94065
10/27/2021 18:09	De Liao	Cork Harbour 445 F
10/27/2021 18:10	Yingzi Zhang	445 Cork Harbour Cir Unit F
10/27/2021 20:55	Sonya Chan	450 Trident Drive, Redwood City CA 94065
10/28/2021 0:09	Mary Ellen Hills	922 Governors Bay Dr
10/28/2021 0:35	Diana Lu	823 Lakeshore Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/28/2021 9:32	Dave Pease	445-E Cork Harbour RWC
10/28/2021 10:54	Barbara Hvoschinsky	571 Seahorse Lane Redwood Shores CA
10/28/2021 14:38	Vijay Rawst	6 Dana Point Court, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/28/2021 17:40	Todd Horton	320 Genoa dr
10/28/2021 18:03	Anna Dowling	670 Island Place
10/28/2021 18:06	Dennis Fellers	865 Portwalk PI
10/28/2021 19:47	Lynda Vaughan	789 Mediterranean Lane
10/28/2021 20:24	Jennifer Dahlman	332 Meridian Dr, Redwood City, 94065
10/28/2021 20:48	Janet Dahlberg	835 Corriente Pointe Drive
10/28/2021 21:09	Peter Ministri	224 Monaco Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
10/28/2021 22:11	Clarissa Lau	449C Cork Harbour Circle
10/28/2021 22:23	Josephine Wong	832 Newport Circle
10/28/2021 22:56	Suzanne Woo	950 Redwood Shores Parkway
10/28/2021 23:08	Shibao Feng	5 Gimbal Lane
10/29/2021 3:32	Sundar Venkateswaran	552 SHOREBIRD CIRCLE
10/29/2021 6:15	GAIL Blesi	326 Quay Lane Redwood City, CA 94065
10/29/2021 6:50	Sophie Sweeney	419 Bark Dr, Redwood City CA
10/29/2021 10:21	Jane Hamlin	204 Mendocino Way, Redwood Shores
10/29/2021 10:57	Pedro Choi	6 Mandalay Ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
10/29/2021 14:13	Mary Miller	871 PORTWALK PL
10/29/2021 19:21	Nancy COMSTOCK	512 Keelson circle
10/29/2021 21:15	Li Vellinga	876 Newport Circle, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
10/29/2021 23:00	Cynthia Shannon	97 Waterside Circle
10/30/2021 9:49	David Hasselbacher	1008 Rockport Avenue, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/30/2021 15:32	Andrea apodaca	67 cove lane redwood city ca 94065
10/30/2021 17:57	Kumar Srinivasan	802 Mediterranean Ln
10/30/2021 21:51	Lisa Eliopoulos	154 Monaco Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
10/31/2021 7:35	Monique Vella	10 Admiralty Place, Redwood Shores, Ca 94065
10/31/2021 11:53	Olga Kibler	529 Osprey Dr
10/31/2021 12:09	Jennifer Kan	333 Montserrat Drive
10/31/2021 12:11	Daniel Lopez	210 Waldron Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
10/31/2021 12:12	Angelica Ayala	210 Waldron Drive
10/31/2021 14:50	Alicia Combs	591 Marlin Ct
10/31/2021 18:53	D. Evams	114 Sorebird Circle, Redwood Shores, CA 90465
10/31/2021 18:54	Jen Owen	404 Mendocino Way
10/31/2021 20:05	Andrea Evans	114 Shorebird Cir
10/31/2021 20:35	Jennifer Uyei	1 Admiralty Place, Redwood Shores, CA

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
10/31/2021 20:38	Jennifer Hom	3024 Whisperwave Cir
10/31/2021 22:00	Anh Truong	801 Columbia Circle RWC 94065
11/1/2021 5:01	Candace Chan	305 Seattle Ln
11/1/2021 6:24	Dhanya Unni	220 Demi Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/1/2021 12:28	Yangyang Zhan	425 Cork Harbour Circle Unit H Redwood City ca
11/1/2021 19:07	Lucia Wettasinghe	3046 WHISPERWAVE CiR
11/1/2021 22:09	Yi Ding	819 Lakeshore Dr
11/1/2021 23:31	Erin Page	808 Boardwalk Place, Redwood City CA 94065
11/2/2021 8:14	Shritapa Datta	88 EDDYSTONE CT.
11/2/2021 8:27	Jenny Li	244 Shorebird Circle, Redwood City
11/2/2021 9:01	Karie Trainer	584 Anchor Circle
11/2/2021 9:01	Ann Dreyfus	811 Columbia Circle
11/2/2021 14:14	Ladali Wijeratne	457 Cork Harbour Circle Apt H
11/2/2021 20:44	Scott Miron	567 Compass Circle
11/3/2021 21:22	Harry Apodaca	67 Cove In
11/4/2021 9:01	Jen Vitug	152 Positano Circle Redwood City, CA 94065
11/4/2021 10:55	Shamim Haldankar	312 Treedust Street
11/4/2021 11:56	julie wentz	500 Baltic Circle, #528
11/4/2021 13:19	Laura Glover	438 Compass Drive
11/4/2021 13:58	Candace Wilhelm	300 Baltic Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/4/2021 16:36	Penelope Shepherd	13 Barcelona Circle
11/4/2021 19:44	Louise Bennett	10 Mandalay Court Redwood City 94065
11/4/2021 23:15	Michael Armanini	582 Island Place, Redwood Shores
11/5/2021 9:01	Susie Berl	158Positano Circle
11/5/2021 9:46	Harshit Shah	577 Marlin Ct
11/5/2021 9:50	Monali Shah	577 Marlin Ct
11/5/2021 13:12	Todd Irwin	558 Compass Circle
11/5/2021 20:38	JoAnn Bitting	918 governors bay dr
11/5/2021 23:07	SAHAN DEB	88 EDDYSTONE CT, REDWOOD SHORES 94065
11/6/2021 8:39	Richard Bitting	918 Governors Bay Dr
11/6/2021 11:12	Mara Zuckerman	163 Monaco Dr.
11/6/2021 13:57	Lakshmi Subramanian	802 Mediterranean Ln
11/6/2021 17:20	Lisa-Anne Wookdridge	2104 HASTINGS SHORE LN
11/7/2021 7:03	Anna Ow	909 Bayberry lane, Redwood Shores
11/7/2021 9:04	Monica Ow	64 Cape Hatteras Ct, Redwood City
11/7/2021 9:43	Ramon Quesada	202 Harstene Drive Redwood City
11/7/2021 12:37	Karen carbonnet	8 MANDALAY ct Redwood shores 94065
11/7/2021 16:16	Sarah McGregor	58 Cape Hatteras Ct.
11/7/2021 18:05	Ravneet Kaur	743 Newport cir Redwood City ca 94065
11/7/2021 20:09	Zaki Elkodsi	804 boardwalk plc R W C C A. 94065
11/7/2021 22:15	Thomas Wong	243 Nice Court
11/7/2021 23:40	Supriya Rao	831 Intrepid Ln
11/8/2021 6:19	Doris Davis	889 Bauer Drive, San Carlos, CA

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
11/8/2021 10:45	Jalpesh Chitalia	848 Newport Cir
11/8/2021 10:46	Albert Woo	827 Bay Harbour Dr, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/8/2021 11:05	Rona Gundrum	577 Island Place
11/8/2021 11:34	Gerald Wentworth	506 Marlin Drive
11/8/2021 11:36	Keith Weng	808 bay harbour dr, 94065
11/8/2021 13:42	Amruta Chitnis	252 Monaco Drive, Redwood City
11/8/2021 16:41	Kaelyn Tam	824 Boardwalk Place Redwood City
11/8/2021 17:48	Tom Lease	3906 Edison Street
11/8/2021 18:27	Joe Ganem	104 Amalfi Way
11/8/2021 19:02	Claudia Pianca	48 Eddystone Ct
11/8/2021 20:02	Peggy Maguire	508 Breakwater Drive
11/8/2021 20:56	Jiyun Luo	601 Baltic Cir, Redwood City, CA, 94065
11/8/2021 21:09	Xiaoyu Shi	701 Baltic Cir, 731, Redwood City 94065
11/8/2021 21:13	Eswar Vandanapu	1000 Davit Ln
11/8/2021 23:06	Geetanjali Ningappa	400 Baltic circle
11/8/2021 23:41	Luciana Carusso	704 Newport Circle, Redwood City, CA, 94065
11/8/2021 23:42	Guillermo Spiller	704 Newport Circle, Redwood City, CA, 94065
11/9/2021 6:44	Anita Lam	425C Cork Harbour Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/9/2021 10:51	Monika Kansal	917 Governors Bay Drive
11/9/2021 11:08	Sandra Smith	200 Baltic Circle, 222, Redwood City, CA
11/9/2021 11:53	Taroon Kamdar	501 Baltic Circle, Apt 505
11/9/2021 12:25	Charles Willin Jr	917 Corriente Pointe Drive
11/9/2021 13:19	Emily Cooper	746 Newport Circle Redwood City, CA 94065
11/9/2021 15:19	Tara Adib	1000 Davit Lane
11/9/2021 15:25	Carmen Azpeitia-Adib	823 Mediterranean Lane
11/9/2021 15:31	Danya adib	823 Mediterranean Lane, Redwood Shores
11/9/2021 17:47	Wilson Chan	3031 Whisperwave Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/9/2021 17:48	Kai Wan Kwan	3031 Whisperwave Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/9/2021 19:42	Xiaowen Ding	701 Baltic Cir
11/9/2021 19:50	Yu wen chenn	867 port walk pl., Redwood City
11/9/2021 20:30	Cindy Hsieh	32 Dockside Circle
11/10/2021 8:40	Yuanpeng Zhang	701 Baltic Circle #703
11/10/2021 9:31	Lori Heller	316 Treedust St
11/10/2021 9:47	Lisa Newman	1 Avocet Drive
11/10/2021 10:55	Yes, Laura Gotelli-faust	527 Compass Drive, redwood shores, Redwood City
11/10/2021 11:25	Tana Billingsley	26 cove lane
11/10/2021 11:46	Larry McCarty	30 Cadiz Cir
11/10/2021 11:50	Jim Vessella	206 Pickleweed Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/10/2021 11:54	Patricia Mayer	704 Mendocino Way
11/10/2021 13:40	Jila Afjei	86 Waterside Circle
11/10/2021 13:58	Mahmoud Kedkad	348 Meridian Dr, Redwood shores, ca 94065
11/10/2021 14:05	Rahim Yaseen	3046 Whisperwave Circle, RC, CA 94065
11/10/2021 14:19	Marielle Bundukin	552 Seastorm Drive Redwood City, CA 94065

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
11/10/2021 14:28	Linda Perrino	2031 Seabrook Court
11/10/2021 14:38	Burcu Gezgor Lahmar	Newport circle
11/10/2021 15:02	Fannan Ashford	469 Cork Harbour Cir Apt E
11/10/2021 17:19	Lyudmila Varaksina	806 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/10/2021 17:58	Cameron Zarringhalam	1085 Rockport Avenue
11/10/2021 18:03	Adelaide Nye	842 Portwalk Pl. Redwood City, CA 94065
11/10/2021 18:30	Josiane Cravotto	2009 Hastings Shore Ln
11/10/2021 19:02	JONATHAN OW	909 Bayberry Lane, Redwood Shores
11/10/2021 20:04	Jackie Cockreham	453 Starboard Dr.
11/10/2021 20:34	Stephanie Taylor	1014 Windfield Street
11/10/2021 20:36	Sabrina Ayers	602 Island Pl Redwood City, CA 94065
11/10/2021 21:27	Carol Dudick-Nicholas	828 Sovereign Way Redwood City 94065
11/10/2021 21:27	Kristopher Johnson	55 Fulton St
11/10/2021 22:07	Zoe Crowder	238 Shorebird Circle
11/10/2021 22:20	Henry Chung	47 Dockside Cir, 94065
11/10/2021 22:36	Ching-Han Hsieh	867 Port Walk Place, Redwood City, CA, 94065
11/10/2021 23:15	LeighAnn Weiland	814 Corriente Point Drive
11/11/2021 0:42	Tamar Spektor	204 Moresby Lane Redwood City
11/11/2021 7:44	MARY MOORE	611 Marlin Court
11/11/2021 7:50	Steven Wong	244 Shorebird Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/11/2021 8:04	Yukon Fong	2013 Seabrook Court
11/11/2021 9:11	Steven Gimnicher	703 Mendocino Way, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/11/2021 9:33	Nancy Nunziati	337 St. Martin Dr.
11/11/2021 10:31	Josephine Cassidy	344 Mindanao Dr
11/11/2021 10:39	Annie Hopkins	351 Mindanao dr Redwood City ca94065
11/11/2021 10:44	Theodore CORDERY	584 Dory Lane
11/11/2021 10:52	Daniel Polsby	3016 Whisperwave Cir Redwood City, CA 94065
11/11/2021 12:00	Murray Herman	425 Cork Harbour Circle #F; Redwood Shores, CA 94065
11/11/2021 12:30	Rebecca Bridges	104 Amalfi Way
11/11/2021 12:45	douglas Herman	721 Boardwalk place Redwood shores Ca 94065
11/11/2021 13:38	Katherine Mayer	618 Marlin Ct, Redwood Shores 94065
11/11/2021 14:24	Valerie Ansara	437 Cork D Cork Harbor Circle
11/11/2021 14:52	Shima Kazerooni	310 Genoa Dr. 94065
11/11/2021 15:10	Dawn Gordon-Wylie	725 Boardwalk Pl RWS
11/11/2021 15:36	Liane Redford	99 Waterside Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/11/2021 17:04	Varsha Likhite	564 Anchor Cir
11/11/2021 17:05	James Diltz	458 Trident Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/11/2021 17:09	Arthur Pasquinelli	801 Mendocino Way Redwood City CA 94065
11/11/2021 18:00	Martin Stangeland	1000 Davit Lane
11/11/2021 19:47	Lewis Margolis	320 Mindanao Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
11/11/2021 20:34	Jennifer Kim	950 Redwood Shores Pkwy, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/11/2021 21:43	Cecilia Son	384 Gunter Ln Redwood City
11/11/2021 22:10	renee moresco	25 CHILTON AVE

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
11/12/2021 2:49	Ruth Wei	558 Osprey Drive
11/12/2021 6:05	Claudia Sarconi	19 Cove Lane, Redwood City
11/12/2021 7:25	Joel Davis	585 Shell Pkwy, Apt. 5212
11/12/2021 8:15	Jan Coulman	417 Luff Ln Redwood City, CA
11/12/2021 9:12	Meghan Coulson	816 Corriente Pt. Dr.
11/12/2021 10:29	Susan Kwong	2115 Hastings Shore Ln
11/12/2021 11:31	Lichan Wang	105 Mendocino Way
11/12/2021 11:31	Wenwen Han	819 Constellation Ct, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/12/2021 11:55	Stefania Giudici	366 Genoa dr
11/12/2021 12:09	Richard Einsiedl	541 Seastorm Drive
11/12/2021 15:22	Barbara Ramo	218 Nice Court Redwood Shores
11/12/2021 15:29	Heidi Vandermolen	530 Shorebird Cir #7202
11/12/2021 15:34	Teresa Foster	182 Sunnydale Ave.
11/12/2021 15:50	John F Nunziati	337 St Martin Dr RC CA 94065
11/12/2021 17:20	Elizabeth Damonte	414 Barnegat Lane
11/12/2021 19:30	Ellen Miller	756 Newport Circle, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
11/12/2021 20:56	Sandy Nelson	391 Mindanao Dr
11/13/2021 1:58	Jan Craig	409 Cork Harbour Circle AptA
11/13/2021 4:28	Richard Cartmell	780, Miramar Terrace
11/13/2021 11:31	Yuan Gu	579 SHOAL CIR
11/13/2021 12:16	Malu Gonzales	608 Dory Lane, Redwood City, CA. 94065
11/13/2021 12:36	Greg Lazar	804 Newport circle
11/13/2021 12:55	Jason Crouch	50 cape hatteras ct redwood city
11/13/2021 13:26	Paul & Lana Kunst	813 Lakeshore Dr
11/13/2021 15:44	Ana Nickolayeva	311 Commander Lane, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
11/14/2021 0:22	Marcela Pasquinelli	801 Mendocino Way
11/14/2021 10:00	Suzie Curtis	74 Eddystone Ct, Redwood City 94065
11/14/2021 13:48	Anna Jocson	410 promenade lane , Redwood City CA 94065
11/14/2021 15:54	Jim Chakos	871 Boardwalk Place
11/14/2021 16:19	Heydy Macias	5 Captain Ln
11/14/2021 18:08	Jingyao Li	843 Intrepid lane
11/14/2021 20:15	Ali Alp Ustun	212 Canoe Ct, Redwood City, CA, 94065
11/14/2021 22:21	Diep Tran	338 Turkshead Ln
11/14/2021 22:26	Patrice Richez	338 Turkshead Ln

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Yvonne Sun <plaoyl3@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2023 2:43 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: Patrick Lao
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Patrick & Yvonne

Sent from my iPhone



BEACON SHORES

HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION

REDWOOD SHORES, CALIFORNIA

Beacon Shores Homeowners Association Resolution Calling for the Redwood Planning Commission and Redwood City Council to Reject the Proposed Redwood LIFE Development Project in Redwood Shores

Whereas the Beacon Shores Homeowners Association (BSHOA) Board of Directors has been duly elected in accordance with California Civil Code Section 5100 and SB 323 to represent all 174 homeowners legally entitled to membership in the Beacon Shores Common Interest Development;

Whereas the obligation of managing the affairs of BSHOA rests exclusively with the BSHOA Board of Directors and includes protecting and maintaining the aesthetics, residential characteristics, and property values of Beacon Shores;

Whereas Redwood City Council approval of the Redwood LIFE development project will dramatically and negatively affect the aesthetics and residential characteristics of BSHOA and surrounding homeowner associations by replacing one and two story business and tech buildings on the site formerly known as the Westport technology campus with 16 five to six story buildings, and well over 2 million additional square feet of office space;

Whereas Redwood City Council approval of the Redwood LIFE development project will dramatically and negatively affect the property values of BSHOA and other homeowner associations in Redwood Shores by adding 8,000 employees to the current technology campus as well as the effects of heavy traffic congestion caused by movement of work vehicles operated by construction crews delivering materials and equipment along Marine Parkway and Redwood Shores Parkway for a period between 10 and 20 years; and

Whereas Redwood City Council approval of the Redwood LIFE development project will dramatically and negatively affect the quality of life in BSHOA and other homeowner associations in Redwood Shores from deep pile driving that will penetrate the municipal waste site cap, EPA ID #CAD982462343, and cause the release toxic materials into bay waters and surrounding air as well as noise pollution from deep pile driving at levels up to 120 decibels that can be heard throughout Redwood Shores and by homeowners in the communities of Belmont, Foster City, and San Carlos; now, therefore, be it



BEACON SHORES
 HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION
 REDWOOD SHORES, CALIFORNIA

Resolved, that the BSHOA Board of Directors:

1. formally and on behalf of all BSHOA homeowners declares unanimous and unequivocal opposition to the Redwood LIFE development project submitted to the Redwood Planning Commission, and the BSHOA Board of Directors urges denial by the Planning Commission of the Redwood Life Redevelopment proposal that will fundamentally and negatively change BSHOA and Redwood Shores forever; and
2. the BSHOA Board of Directors unanimously urges rejection by the Redwood City Council of the Redwood LIFE development project on the site formerly known as the Westport technology campus.

Mover: Ray Fowler, BSHOA Board of Directors, 650-465-5654

Seconder: Ray Ciardella, BSHOA Board of Directors, 650-455-3285

BSHOA Board of Directors	Vote
Sarah Nagle, President, BSHOA Board of Directors	Yes
Ray Ciardella, Vice President, BSHOA Board of Directors	Yes
Ellen Miller, Secretary, BSHOA Board of Directors	Yes
Sharon Nelson, Treasurer, BSHOA Board of Directors	Yes
Ray Fowler, Director at Large, BSHOA Board of Directors	Yes

On behalf of BSHOA Homeowners:



Sarah Nagle, President, BSHOA Board of Directors



Date

Redwood LIFE Open House, 6/29/22

Tuesday, June 29, at 8 pm, Redwood LIFE: Evolve hosted a community open house at its Redwood Shores amenity center to share information about its proposed 3.3 million square foot development project at Marine Parkway and Island Drive. Approximately 65 Redwood Shores residents and community members attended the catered event. Lauren McDermott and Longfellow team leaders Peter Fritz and Tara Korlipara facilitated a series of presentations designed around four key aspects of the project. The presentation topics included: transportation, sustainability, amenities, and project design. The attendees divided into four groups then rotated through all four presentations.

Longfellow Real Estate Partners is the owner and operator of the Redwood LIFE campus. Longfellow plans to build energy efficient life science workspaces and labs on its campus that features a park-like setting served by a variety of transportation models. The campus will also include an expanded amenity center and an investment in levee construction

Transportation. The theme focused Longfellow's multi-faceted transportation plan that emphasizes a reliance on fluid work schedules and public transportation. A question from the floor asked, "How can Longfellow mitigate congestion when the project will triple the number of employees currently working on the Redwood LIFE campus?" The answer is... public transportation options can mitigate traffic congestion. "What happens when an emergency like an earthquake occurs?" The response suggested employees will want to stay on campus as their workspaces will be safer than many other buildings in the area. The response did not account for employees leaving the campus to check on their families and home residences. Longfellow is still examining Bay Area residents' reluctance to use public transportation as well as the effects on public safety from the heavier traffic around its campus.

Sustainability. The project will replace a "sea of asphalt" with parks and energy efficient buildings. Longfellow touts its inclusion of solar arrays that will provide energy for its tenants, and they plan to use recycled water for landscaping. A question from the floor asked, "Will the power generation systems planned for the project will make the site energy independent?" No. The project will have to rely on PG&E to meet its electricity needs. Next, "As life science labs don't use recycled water, how much water will such an extensive project need?" The answer suggested that life science tenants will not use a lot of water. However, that response did not account for the water needs of 5,000 more employees which could be added to the Redwood LIFE campus. Finally, "What will be done about the toxic waste created by the life science labs?" According to the presenters, the tenant activities will be required to independently contract with waste removal vendors.

Amenities. Once again, the presentation emphasized parks and an amenity center which will be made available to the public. The reality is that locals are drawn to the Bay Trail on the edge of the property. They enjoy the open air and the natural habitat for waterfowl. Those things are already present, and they are not dependent on Longfellow. One of the presenters

remarked that Longfellow will be adding a childcare center to the site. However, Longfellow's project narrative says that Longfellow is still "exploring" the possibility of bringing childcare to the site. Housing was also mentioned as an amenity, and Longfellow is contributing \$85 million to affordable housing off site. It was pointed out that Redwood City's stated goal is to create nearly 7,000 new housing units in Redwood City by 2030, and the question was asked, "How many affordable housing units will Longfellow "contribute" to Redwood City's goal?" The presenters' response was vague, but an estimate of 250 units was suggested by the presenters. Next question, "How will 250 units spread across the many, many years that Longfellow projects it will take to redevelop their campus actually alleviate the affordable housing crisis?" Additionally, "Isn't it unlikely that employees on Longfellow's campus will be able to qualify for such affordable housing?" The response suggested that some "service" workers who will qualify for affordable housing will be employed on Longfellow's site. The final point made by an attendee was that Longfellow is not redeveloping its campus to bring in service workers, and that means their \$85 million "contribution" is not really an amenity for the larger community.

Project Design. This presentation featured an architect, an engineer, and a construction consultant. The architect spoke to the site's design and how it is intended to blend with the natural landscape from the coastal hills that slope across marshlands to the bay. A point was made by an attendee that construction of 100+ foot buildings on the site would not mirror the environmental features found near the campus. The consulting engineer presented a view that it was OK to build on top of a landfill. While that may be true theoretically, the rapid escape of toxins from the landfill under the project site was not discussed as a practical matter. This possibility remains a concern and issue for most nearby residents. One attendee suggested moving the life science labs away from Marine Parkway. Another attendee commented that such a move might be a good idea partly because the life science tenants do not really care where their labs are located on the site. A closing point about project design centered on the effects of earthquake activity on the life science buildings. In other words, "What level of earthquakes could the new construction survive?" A vague answer that they could survive a "major earthquake" was offered by the presenters. When pressed for a Richter scale number, the answer did not change. According to the presenters, the buildings could survive a "major earthquake."

All exchanges between attendees and presenters were polite and civil. However, it was clear that a majority of the attendees, especially those who live near the Redwood LIFE campus, do not support the project.

Not in anyone's backyard

Longfellow Real Estate Partners recently submitted a commercial project proposal to develop an 84-acre site near Island Drive and Marine Parkway in Redwood City. Longfellow's Redwood LIFE project is an ambitious plan that includes razing 20 one and two-story office buildings that are not at full occupancy. Longfellow wants to replace those structures with 15 buildings, some towering 100 feet, next to an area of Redwood City reserved for several residential neighborhoods.

The first question has to be "why?" Short answer: corporate greed. This is not to say all commercial development is bad. However, the time and money already spent by Longfellow is designed to turn a profit at the expense of wrecking residential neighborhoods. Longfellow is a corporation registered in Delaware and represented by Registered Agent Solutions. While it is not unusual for companies to file papers of incorporation in business-friendly Delaware, it is important to ask... who is supplying the funding Longfellow needs to knock down a 1 million square foot technology park and replace it with 3.3 million square feet of office space and laboratories? CalSTRS may be contributing. Are there any foreign investors?

The project may take 20 years to complete. During that time, thousands of residents in nearby neighborhoods will suffer the effects of heavy traffic supporting project construction and the pounding of deep pile driving that will be audible all over Redwood Shores plus parts of Foster City and Belmont. There are also environmental concerns. San Francisco's Water Quality Board has identified 25 Bay Area landfills, including the Redwood LIFE site, as areas that pose a danger of leaking toxins into the surrounding environment due to sea level rise. The protective cap over the landfill could be damaged by construction of Longfellow's 15 bigger and taller buildings. If that happens, toxins might be released close to nearby neighborhoods, and there is an elementary school only three-quarters of a mile to the east of the Redwood LIFE construction site.

Longfellow is trying to engender public and City Council support for its project with alluring features. The Project Narrative says Longfellow is "... exploring options to bring childcare to the Redwood LIFE campus." The Burlingame Point commercial development project just up the road included plans for a childcare center. The childcare center did not materialize. Longfellow is proposing a 49,000 square foot amenity center. This will be an amenity for employees not residents. The amenity center will evolve into a tenant-oriented facility as only 1400 square feet will be set aside for Redwood City residents to reserve space for events. That is 3% of the square footage currently proposed for the amenity center. Longfellow's Project Narrative claims its Redwood LIFE campus will generate increased revenue for Redwood City. Well, there is a supermarket, a handful of eateries, and a couple of banks in Redwood Shores about a mile away. However, there are no major retailers, gas stations or businesses that would stock items needed by life science laboratories. The nearly 7,000 employees that Longfellow predicts may work on its Redwood LIFE campus will not do their grocery shopping in Redwood Shores at the end of the workday, but their cars will be clogging Marine and Redwood Shores Parkways as they make their way to US 101 for the commute home.

That brings the discussion back to "why?" There are two life science projects, one for 650,000 square feet and the other for 200,000 square feet, proposed for the property three-

quarters of a mile to the west of the Redwood LIFE site. They are virtually across the street from the Oracle Corporation campus. How many life science projects does Redwood City need? The Redwood City Council should be pursuing affordable housing not 100-foot commercial buildings only hundreds of feet away from families living in several nearby and unique neighborhoods. Longfellow is “committing to invest \$85 million” for housing, and Longfellow believes “its investment could generate hundreds of affordable housing units over the development horizon for the Project...” How many units and where? Does “over the development horizon” mean five, ten, fifteen or more years from now?

This is not a case of residents in Redwood Shores saying, “Not In My Backyard,” but it is the nearly 1,000 Redwood Shores residents who have signed the <https://www.stopedredwoodlife.net> petition saying, “Not In Anyone’s Backyard.”

Ray Fowler
Redwood City
650-465-5654

Ray Fowler is a native Californian and 36-year resident of Redwood City. He retired as a naval aviator at the rank of captain, and he is a retired high school history teacher. He enjoys long distance motorcycle riding. Ray may be contacted at rayfowler@gmx.us.

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
4/17/2023 6:50	Joanna Ngo	4 Avocet Dr, Redwood City 94065
4/17/2023 10:59	Javier uribe	531 Woodside Rd apt 413, Redwood City 94061
4/18/2023 11:14	Peng Zhao	63 cove on, Redwood City, 94065
4/18/2023 11:19	Merrily Robinson	952 Ruby St Redwood City, CA 94061
4/18/2023 11:22	Raghav Sharm	563 Compass Cir. , RWS, CA 94065
4/18/2023 13:12	Patrick Fram	10 avocet drive, Apt 207 , redwood city, 94065
4/18/2023 15:35	Qimghuai Kong	418 Tiller Lane Redwood City CA 94065
4/18/2023 17:42	Mayhew Seavey	548 Shorebird Cir Unit 3204, Redwood City, 94065
4/18/2023 19:58	Chung Man Fan	501 Baltic Circle Unit 513, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/18/2023 22:32	Rabendra Patel	425 Windfield Ln, Redwood City,CA-94065
4/19/2023 6:34	Paul Kelly	809 Lakeshore Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
4/19/2023 8:07	Sam Nakib	983 Governors Bay Drive, Redwood City CA 94065
4/19/2023 20:24	Julio leiva	11 yarnall place redwood city ca 94063
4/19/2023 22:58	Nancy Kelly	809 Lakeshore Drive , Redwood City , Ca 95065
4/20/2023 13:12	Lisa Carreno	654 Buckeye St. Redwood City, CA 94063
4/20/2023 16:17	Blair Robertson	851 Columbia Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/20/2023 17:02	Scott Rice	215 Poseidon Ln, Redwood City 94065
4/20/2023 17:20	Logan Schneider	3121 Bay Rd, Redwood City, CA 94063
4/20/2023 17:33	Amanda Mendoza	1019 Jones Ct, Redwood City 94063
4/20/2023 20:56	Luis Espino Cervantes	769 Douglas Ave Redwood City Ca 94063
4/20/2023 21:21	Robyn White	513 Shoal Circle, Redwood City, 94065
4/20/2023 23:08	Theresa Gonzalez	41 Broadway Street, Redwood City, 94063
4/21/2023 16:05	Maribel Rios	719 Stambaugh Street Redwood City 94063
4/21/2023 22:04	Salvador Miranda	2016 Gossamer Ave., Redwood City 94065
4/21/2023 22:07	Elysia Miranda	2016 Gossamer Ave. Redwood City 94065
4/22/2023 17:32	Sang Le	844 Portwalk Place, Redwood City CA 94065
4/22/2023 17:52	Natasha Okhuoya	531 Shoal Circle, Redwood Shores, 94065
4/22/2023 19:45	Miguel Sandoval	1014 tenth avenue, Redwood City CA 94063
4/22/2023 20:11	Michelle Erazo	952 Haven Ave, Redwood City CA 94063
4/22/2023 21:33	Leela sanjeev	308 sea cliff lane Redwood City 94065
4/23/2023 9:56	Richard Kim	3 Oceanside Way Redwood Shores CA 94066
4/23/2023 9:57	Song Soo Jung	3 Oceanside Way Reswood Shores CA 94065
4/23/2023 11:31	Sarah Delzio	304 Treedust st. Redwood City, CA 94065
4/23/2023 16:24	Caroline Tudor	1042 Montgomery, San Carlos, CA 94070

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
3/28/2022 9:02	Maureen O'Donnell	717 Newport Circle, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
3/28/2022 17:15	David C Woodward	329 Quay Lane, Redwood Shores. CA 94065
3/29/2022 8:08	Susanne Burrill	740 Newport Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/29/2022 13:27	Sandra Nyholm Goncalves	316 Capstan Ct, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
3/29/2022 16:15	Patricia Michon	319 Quay Lane
3/29/2022 16:17	Roy Michon	319 Quay Lane
3/29/2022 16:19	Wilma Sekely	319 Quay Lane
3/29/2022 17:26	gregory trenkner	318 quay ln redwood city
3/30/2022 8:12	Cheryl kenney	330 quay lane
3/31/2022 15:12	Carole Woodward	329 Quay Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/1/2022 16:33	Jenny Wang	334 Turkshead Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/3/2022 14:38	Brian Sugano	710 Newport Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/3/2022 14:42	Ginny Hom	710 Newport Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/3/2022 18:39	Feyza Ostroff	60 Eddystone Ct, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/3/2022 20:20	Seyyed Vahid Hashemian	437 Lanyard Dr., Redwood City, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
4/4/2022 21:34	URI Rosenberg	941 Corriente Point drive Redwood City 94065
4/5/2022 15:33	Nick Kaufman	121 Positano Circle Redwood Shores ca 94065
4/5/2022 17:59	Sema Tosun	112 Amalfi Way Redwood Shores CA 94065
4/5/2022 18:01	Steve Tosun	116 Amalfi Way Redwood Shores CA 94065
4/5/2022 18:58	James Wong	319 Turkshead Ln RWC CA 94065
4/6/2022 10:54	Zhaojun Mu	341 TURKSHEAD LN, redwood city, CA, 94065
4/6/2022 11:25	Xi Cheng	147 Positano Cir Redwood City California
4/6/2022 15:26	Sandra Karinja	326 Genoa Dr, Redwood City, Ca 94065
4/9/2022 11:46	Chelsie Stanford	30 Eddystone Court Redwood City, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
4/12/2022 19:35	Smita Venkateswaran	552 Shirebird circle-1101, redwood shores, CA 94065
4/12/2022 20:37	junchao wu	21 spinnaker pl
4/12/2022 20:47	Ou Liu	21 Spinnaker Pl, Redwood City, CA, 94065
4/13/2022 14:11	Walter Guevara	589 Anchor Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/13/2022 19:21	Laura Aden	350 Turkshead Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/13/2022 19:39	Gary Aden	350 Turkshead Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/14/2022 11:54	Jacqueline Claybaugh	260 Monaco Dr., Redwood City, CA 94065
4/14/2022 11:56	Allen Claybaugh	260 Monaco Dr., Redwood City, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
4/18/2022 6:31	Payal Vaish	923 Corriente Point Drive
4/21/2022 18:44	Steve Blandino	357 Quay Lane, Redwood city, ca 94065
4/27/2022 10:55	Yuezi Zhang	309 Treedust Street, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/27/2022 11:08	Manuel Roces	1 tidewater dr Redwood City ca 94065
4/27/2022 11:10	Yu Guo	469 cork harbour cir, Redwood City, 94065
4/27/2022 11:12	Lakshmi Maya Paratian	129 Positano Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/27/2022 11:13	Rosa Silvestri	2038 Quintara Street, SF, CA
4/27/2022 11:15	Xavier Carbonnet	8 MANDALAY COURT, Redwood City California 94065
4/27/2022 11:15	Marie Crouch	2626 Carlmont Drive Belmont CA 94002
4/27/2022 11:16	Peilee Liu	214 Preserve Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/27/2022 11:25	Xinyue Ji	845 Newport Cir, Redwood City, CA, 94065
4/27/2022 11:29	Lixin Zhao	845 Newport Cir, Redwood City, 94065, CA
4/27/2022 11:36	Zhengyi Le	810 Constellation Ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
4/27/2022 11:45	Leroy Rosing	437 Cork Harbor Circle Apt E Redwood City, CA 94065
4/27/2022 12:10	Yue gao	5631 ravenna Ct, San Jose , CA 95118
4/27/2022 14:44	Lee Neidle	1 Passage Lane Redwood City, CA 94065
4/27/2022 14:48	Sachin Pansuria	3 Dana Point Ct. Redwood City, CA 94065
4/27/2022 15:03	Dennis Gioffre	6 Gimbal Lane I, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/27/2022 15:08	Anna Gioffre	6 Gimbal lane Redwood City ca 94065
4/27/2022 16:01	Elsie Y. Woo	827 Bay Harbour Drive
4/27/2022 16:06	Julian Gioffre	6 gimbal Lane
4/27/2022 18:33	Jodie Bowen	927 Corriente Pointe Drive
4/27/2022 19:10	Cassandra Kurmis	4 gimbal lane redwood shores ca 94065
4/27/2022 19:28	Barbara Qin	274 Redwood Shores Pkwy #320, CA 94065
4/27/2022 23:15	Miguel Goncalves	316 Capstan Ct, Redwood City, CA, 94065
4/28/2022 14:45	Brad Hart	8 Spinnaker Place Redwood City, CA 94065
4/28/2022 20:53	Sunil Tandel	4 Buccaneer lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/29/2022 17:27	Ellen Alberstat	5)7 lanyard dr redwood shores ca
4/29/2022 18:32	Vasundhara Padmanabhan	802 Newport Circle Redwood Shores
4/29/2022 18:34	Holenarasipur Padmanabhan	802 Newport Circle Redwood Shores
4/29/2022 18:48	Patricia Roth	819 Mediterranean Lane Redwood City, CA 94065
4/29/2022 21:34	Sebastian eccleshall	429 Biscayne avenue
4/30/2022 0:40	John Cheung	237 Monaco Dr., Redwood City, CA 94065
4/30/2022 1:40	Michelle Cheung	237 Monaco Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/30/2022 2:03	mabel cheung	237 Monaco Drive, RWS, 94065
4/30/2022 12:49	Sulina Cheung	237 Monaco Drive, Redwood City, CA94065
4/30/2022 13:29	Susan Feledy	35 Shelford Ave., San Carlos CA 94070
4/30/2022 19:05	Mary Willms	2828 Brittan Ave.
5/1/2022 8:15	Katherine Urrutia	1110 Polynesia Dr. Foster city CA 94404
5/1/2022 8:18	Carol Wilner	720 Promontory Point Apt 2107
5/1/2022 8:50	Lynn porcedda	2279 Cobblehill pl San Mateo ca 94402
5/1/2022 12:37	Marijana Krizmanic	2603 Hastings Shore Ln, Redwood City, CA, 94065
5/1/2022 15:55	Alex Skurikhin	1 Oceanside Way, redwood city, ca, 94065
5/1/2022 17:37	R J Nice	PO Box 1351 San Mateo
5/1/2022 22:02	David Lilienfeld	399 Port Royal Avenue, Foster City, CA 94404
5/1/2022 22:46	Suzette Gulsen	3029 Seabrook Ct
5/1/2022 23:00	Lapi D	648 Spar Drive Redwood City

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
8/1/2022 13:40	Lauren Dodge	601 Baltic Cir, #623, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/1/2022 14:27	Carol Wong	319 Treasure Island Dr Belmont CA 94002
8/1/2022 15:29	Wayne Chow	357 Saint Martin Drive
8/1/2022 15:30	Kim Widarczyk	75 Pelican Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/1/2022 16:58	Patricia Becker	359 Montserrat Drive, Redwood City, CA
8/1/2022 17:17	Kristen tomita	585 keelson circle Redwood City CA 94065
8/1/2022 17:21	Carolyn Wilbur	569 Marlin Ct, Redwood City, Ca
8/1/2022 17:33	Maureen Jamasbi	523 Shoal Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/1/2022 18:51	Lisa Hora	508 Arlington Road, Redwood City, CA 94062
8/1/2022 20:49	Melissa Bunac	3805 Martin Dr
8/1/2022 21:05	Grace Law	#410 400 Baltic Circle, Redwood City, Ca 94065
8/2/2022 0:25	Yi-Shiuan Yu	435 Bark Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/2/2022 6:44	Aaron Dodge	1668 Taylor Street, San Mateo
8/2/2022 7:37	Michael Craig	496 Marine View Ave Belmont CA 94002
8/2/2022 7:55	Kathryn Anderson	400 Baltic Circle #402, Redwood City
8/2/2022 9:33	Ramon Quesada	804 Corriente Pointe Drive 94065
8/2/2022 9:53	Susan Hoffman	601 Harvard Rd. San Mateo 94402
8/2/2022 10:06	Jeff Cleland	225 Aberdeen Drive, San Carlos
8/2/2022 10:47	Shannon Seeberan	2303 Hastings shore lane
8/2/2022 11:30	Katherine Cleland	225 Aberdeen Dr San Carlos, CA 94070
8/2/2022 12:47	Colleen Kaiser	539 South Rd Belmont CA
8/2/2022 13:31	Christine Peyton	150 Monaco Drive
8/2/2022 17:08	Cecilia Schoenstein	1141 Whipple Ave. #106
8/2/2022 17:33	Christoph Schoenstein	1503 Madison Ave., Redwood City, CA 94061
8/3/2022 9:08	Suzanne DeSelover Sallie	400 Terrace Ave. Moss Beach, Ca.
8/3/2022 12:05	Monica craig	1749 alameda
8/3/2022 12:07	Leslie Howard	34 Cadiz Circle Redwood City CA 94065
8/3/2022 12:07	Margot Diltz	458 Trident Drive, Redwood City 94065
8/3/2022 12:16	Evangeline McNeil	1621 Maddux Drive Redwood City CA 94061
8/3/2022 12:48	Juan carlos mora	912 bay rd e palo alto
8/3/2022 12:52	judith sullivan	1532 Whipple Ave
8/3/2022 13:23	D'Ann Burns	25 Mariani Court Emerald Hills, Ca. 94062
8/3/2022 13:31	Darlene West	1203 Truman St., Redwood City, CA 94061
8/3/2022 13:33	Ekaterina stomakhina	3864 Jefferson ave, Emerald Hills, CA 94062
8/3/2022 13:44	Theresa Markiewicz	900 E. Hillsdale Blvd # 103, Foster City, CA 94404
8/3/2022 13:49	Nicole byer	999 Edgewood Road Redwood City, Ca 94062
8/3/2022 14:54	Ronald J Puccinelli	3609 Highland Ave Redwood City Ca. 94062

8/3/2022 15:46	Arlene Storm	879 BLANDfORD BLVD, Redwood City, CA 94062
8/3/2022 16:40	Ronda Hoxsie	786 Hillcrest Way, Emerald Hills CA 94062
8/3/2022 17:17	Brandi Robertson	1350 Norman St, Redwood City
8/3/2022 17:40	Julie Griffith	153 Inner Circle Redwood City 94062
8/3/2022 22:44	Karin Heller	302 Beacon Shores Drive
8/4/2022 9:47	Linnea Wong	6 Breaker Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/4/2022 9:48	Alan C. Wong	6 Breaker Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/4/2022 11:01	Kimberly Wilcox	786 Hillcrest Way, Emerald Hills, CA 94062
8/5/2022 6:18	Cynthia Johnson	24 Cadiz Circle
8/5/2022 8:14	Deidre Sparks	818 Lakeshore Drive Redwood City CA 940
8/5/2022 21:25	Queenie Wu	804 Columbia Cir, Redwood City
8/6/2022 9:41	Jehane Jones	151 Stratford Street, Redwood City, ca 94062
8/6/2022 20:47	Violeta Alcantara	75 Carmel Avenue, Daly City, CA 94015
8/7/2022 7:55	Eleanor Eberhard	51 Pelican Lane Redwood City CA 94065
8/7/2022 9:07	Brielle Charmasson	107 Wharf Row
8/7/2022 17:48	David Gabel	484 Sequoia Avenue, Redwood City, California

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
1/31/2022 6:41	Dhanraj Pondicherry	577 Keelson Cir., Redwood City, Ca 94065
1/31/2022 10:03	Nicole Quasney	421 D Cork Harbour Circle Redwood City CA 94065
1/31/2022 11:03	Markus Baur	808 Portwalk Pl., Redwood City, CA94065
1/31/2022 18:08	Darrell Koltsov	546 Shorebird Circle Unit #26202
2/1/2022 9:12	Wuming Zhang	22 Bremerton Cir
2/1/2022 9:49	Mark Caraballo	311 Seattle lane, Redwood City, 94065
2/1/2022 15:43	Nadie Lee Matthews	758 Newport Cir, RWS 94065
2/1/2022 16:19	Tanvi Sahni	6 Bremerton Cir, Redwood City
2/2/2022 9:26	Sanny Weber	552 Shorebird Circle Unit 1202, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/2/2022 9:27	Ingomar Weber	552 Shorebird Circle Unit 1202, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/2/2022 14:08	Lu Fan	315 Beacon Shores Dr. Redwood City 94065
2/2/2022 15:04	Claire Chen	797 Mediterranean Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/2/2022 15:32	Wenli Zhou	317 Saint Martin Dr, Redwood City
2/2/2022 15:40	Cong wang	12 Oceanside way, Redwood City
2/2/2022 16:01	Chen Xu	546 Shorebird Cir
2/2/2022 16:19	Qiao Liang	317 Saint Martin Dr Redwood City CA 94065
2/2/2022 16:29	Yisi Liu	819 Columbia Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/2/2022 16:40	Christy Hu	300 Baltic Cir Redwood City
2/2/2022 18:09	Ruokun Ren	710 Lacewing Ln, Redwood City 94065
2/2/2022 19:06	Jun Zhu	2208 Hastings Shore Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/2/2022 19:10	Xu wu	539 marlin Dr, redwood city
2/2/2022 19:55	Zhengyi Le	810 constellation ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
2/2/2022 20:23	Yiqun Li	546 Shorebird Cir
2/2/2022 21:36	Jenny Li	600 Seabrook Ln, Redwood City, CA, 94065
2/3/2022 9:08	Yating Ou	819 Columbia Circle, Redwood City, 94065
2/3/2022 13:37	Sarah Nagle	311 Beacon Shores Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/3/2022 22:50	Yu Qin	857 Boardwalk Pl., Redwood City, CA 94065
2/5/2022 16:59	pat Dianda	837Newport circle
2/5/2022 16:59	Mavis Dianda	837Newport circle
2/5/2022 17:29	Adrienne Crusick	24 Pelican Lane
2/5/2022 19:42	Zelda Elcin	60 Cove Lane Redwood City CA 94065
2/5/2022 22:44	Qinqin Zhang	116 Northampton Ln
2/5/2022 23:14	Bradley Gao	259 Nice Ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
2/6/2022 11:41	Lo Yang	228 Monaco Drive, Redwood City, CA
2/6/2022 12:59	Roxana Heppner	13 Cove Lane, Redwood City, CA
2/6/2022 16:25	DILIP GUNAWARDENA	872 Newport Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/6/2022 20:17	Dmitry Nizhegorodov	843 Newport Circle Redwood Shores CA 94065
2/6/2022 20:43	Sowmya Padmanabhan	802 Newport Circle Redwood Shores CA
2/6/2022 21:00	Jeanne Sartor	835 Newport Circle

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
1/3/22 15:43	Susanne Malabey	651 Teredo Drive. Redwood Shores, CA 94065
1/3/22 15:44	Angelique Malabey	651 Teredo Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
1/3/22 16:18	Roxann Albiani	640 Teredo dr, Redwood City, Ca 94065
1/3/22 19:04	Adriana V Vaughan	6 PORTOFINO CIRCLE
1/4/22 18:20	Susan mendiara	581 Anchor Crcl
1/5/22 8:47	Joni Roake	558 Seahorse Ln Redwood Shores 94065
1/5/22 19:51	Carol- Jean Meddaugh	46 Cape Hatteras Court, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/9/22 22:21	Matthew Lottice	218 Shorebird Circle
1/10/22 12:58	Colleen Cassity	232 Shorebird Circle, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
1/10/22 15:31	Tianyi Zhao	603 Mendocino Way, Redwood City, CA
1/10/22 15:32	Yuhan Wu	603 Mendocino Way, Redwood City, CA
1/10/22 16:32	Katherine Sullivan	806 Mendocino Way
1/10/22 17:15	Inbal Lupesko	706 Mendocino Way, Redwood Shores
1/11/22 10:49	Richard Mayer	704 Mendocino Way
1/11/22 10:58	Stan Tan	935 Corriente Pointe
1/11/22 18:25	Irene Jaffe	205 Mendocino Way, Redwood City, CA
1/11/22 18:28	chantal cox	207 Mendocino Way
1/13/22 7:30	Raphael Mehrbians	101 Mendocino Way, Redwood Cit CA 94065
1/14/22 15:39	Donald Chang	803 Southport Drive, Redwood City 94065
1/15/2022 11:33	Min Li	823 Bay Harbour Dr, Redwood City CA 94065
1/15/2022 12:27	Jenny Figueredo	806 Bay Harbour Dr Redwood City CA 94065
1/15/2022 12:27	Mary Stofega	837 Portwalk Place Redwood City, CA 94065
1/15/2022 13:13	Limei Mizota	733 port walk place Redwood City
1/15/2022 13:30	Katherine Lee	811 portwalk place, redwood city
1/15/2022 14:26	Lisa Evens	873 Portwalk Place
1/15/2022 14:38	Anahid Kocharians	811 Bay Harbour Dr Redwood City, Ca 94065
1/15/2022 16:59	Gordon Harvey	810 Bay Harbour Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/15/2022 20:28	William Smith	102 Wharf Row, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/16/2022 9:49	Linda Cashion	725 Portwalk Place
1/16/2022 11:03	Lynne Mok	808 Sea Chase Drive, Redwood City, Ca. 94065
1/16/2022 11:04	Paul Mok	808 Sea Chase Drive, Redwood City, Ca. 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
1/24/2022 15:09	Barbara Reyn	732 Port Walk Place, Redwood City CA
1/24/2022 18:53	Radha Kamdar	501 Baltic Circle , #505, RWC, CA 94065
1/25/2022 10:59	Jackie Moore	109 Shorebird Cir
1/26/2022 16:38	Marjean Reynolds	755 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/26/2022 17:29	Sasha Kibler	529 Osprey Dr
1/26/2022 18:45	Gary Kibler	529 Osprey Dr Redwood City, CA 94065
1/26/2022 19:13	Andre Malabey	651 Teredo Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
1/26/2022 19:13	Kathey Tam	824 Boardwalk Place Redwood City CA 94065
1/26/2022 19:14	Timothy Katrina	824 Boardwalk Place Redwood City CA 94065
1/26/2022 19:15	Linda Tam	824 Boardwalk Place Redwood City CA 94065
1/26/2022 19:16	Alexa Tam	824 Boardwalk Place Redwood City CA 94065
1/26/2022 19:16	Anthony Hills	922 Governors Bay Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
1/26/2022 19:16	Katie Tam	705 Boardwalk Place Redwood City CA 94065
1/26/2022 20:13	Suzanne Sullivan	906 Governors Bay Drive, Redwood Shores
1/26/2022 22:54	Xiaoping hu	266 nice ct, redwood shores, ca, 94065
1/27/2022 10:13	Deanna Albiani	640 Teredo Dr Redwood City CA 94065
1/27/2022 11:04	Candace Kirsch	913 Governors Bay Drive RWC CA 94065
1/27/2022 11:04	Charles Faulk	913 Governors Bay Drive RWC CA 94065
1/27/2022 14:33	Anton Heras	208 Puget Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/27/2022 14:33	Irene Heras	208 Puget Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/27/2022 14:34	Patrick Hollister	Hartstene Drive
1/27/2022 15:13	Lizete Santos	306 Bethel lane
1/28/2022 5:08	Stephanie Erickson	110 Waldron Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/29/2022 4:04	Jean Dow	77 waterside circle Redwood City ca
1/29/2022 10:52	Mohit Mittal	6 Bremerton Cir, Redwood City
1/29/2022 16:32	David Parrent	765 Portwalk Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/29/2022 16:33	Olin Palmer	718 Portwalk Place
1/29/2022 17:16	Jacob Tao	729 Newport Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/29/2022 17:42	Tianyi Yang	405 Cork Harbour Cir, Apt A
1/30/2022 0:10	Jie Zhu	401 Cork Harbour Cir. #C, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/30/22 14:08	Guang Yang	315 Beacon Shores Dr, Redwoods City CA, 94065
1/30/2022 14:25	Pamela Quasney	421 D Cork Harbour Circle Redwood City CA 94065
1/30/2022 23:19	Maggie Tang	413 Cork Harbour Cir

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
3/7/2022 15:53	Ian Whitmore	500 Baltic Circle Unit 500
3/9/2022 17:31	Michael J Fitzgerald	842 Lakeshore Drive Redwood City Ca 94065
3/9/2022 17:34	Marian Wong	842 Lakeshore Drive Redwood City Ca 94065
3/10/2022 9:13	Ramona Raybin	50 Mounds Road, San Mateo, CA 94402
3/10/2022 9:14	Tomas Pfister	754 Newport circle, redwood shores
3/10/2022 9:15	Sophia pfister	754 Newport circle, redwood shores
3/10/2022 9:32	Sheila Ferguson	Owner of 307 Commander Ln in Redwood Shores, 94065
3/11/2022 16:40	Tina Yang	4 Channel Dr., Redwood City, CA 94065
3/11/2022 17:45	Manuel Rocés	1 Tidewater Dr. Redwood Shores Ca 94065
3/12/2022 8:55	Honglin Su	420 Windfield Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/12/2022 9:00	Lan Huang	420 Windfield Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/12/2022 10:33	Maria Ong	75 Waterside Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/12/2022 16:39	Patricia Toy	202 Mendocino Way Redwood City 94065
3/12/2022 18:52	Shuting Zhao	540 Shorebird Cir
3/13/2022 14:00	Darja Cvetkova	501 Canoe Ct

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
3/14/2022 0:07	Jun Zhou	37 Waterside Cir, Redwood City
3/14/2022 10:05	Kathryn Shen	536 Skiff Circle, Redwood City CA
3/14/2022 10:14	Nausheen Qureshi	2 Cove Ln Redwood City, CA 94065
3/14/2022 14:20	Marina Chang	10 Tidewater Drive Redwood Shores CA94065
3/15/2022 12:55	Risa Tapales	603 Rockingham Lane, RWS
3/15/2022 17:46	Sally Spangenberg	739 Port Walk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/15/2022 17:50	Jill Archer	52 Cape Hatteras Court, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
3/15/2022 18:05	Daniel Gordon	739 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/16/2022 10:07	Keren Hamer	86 Eddystone Ct
3/16/2022 11:00	Kathleen Outman	14 Cape Hatteras Ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
3/16/2022 17:31	Sharon Ann Grignon Smith	980 Governors Bay Dr
3/16/2022 18:28	Eduardo Boetsch	36 Eddystone Ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
3/16/2022 19:40	Adrian Percer	972 Governors Bay Dr
3/17/2022 11:16	Roger Haeussler	912 Governors Bay Drive Redwood City CA 94065
3/17/2022 17:01	Patricia Owen	2 Eddystone Court
3/17/2022 18:39	Teresa B Skinner	764 Newport Circle, Redwood City 94065
3/18/2022 9:22	Szu-yu lin	458 Barnegat lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/19/2022 11:49	Tom Ostroff	60 Eddystone Ct Redwood Shores CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
3/21/2022 19:23	Talia Lamb	765 Barnegat Lane
3/22/2022 4:51	Jill Lin	22 Cape Hatteras Ct
3/22/2022 4:55	Dan Feil	22 Cape Hatteras Court
3/23/2022 19:28	Betty Chen	806 Boardwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94965
3/24/2022 18:44	Laura Banazek	812 Boardwalk Place, Redwood City
3/27/2022 18:08	Victoria Molinelli	718 Newport Circle
3/27/2022 21:18	haorui wang	716 newport cir

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
5/2/2022 8:39	James Groenke	282 C St Redwood City CA 94063
5/2/2022 9:36	Libbie Frank	141 Central Ave Redwood city
5/2/2022 16:36	Ling Shee	579 Seastorm Drive, RWS
5/2/2022 18:11	Nahid Ziaee	2108 Lyon Ave, Belmont CA 94002
5/3/2022 7:55	Kenneth Pizzi	2018 Fairmont Dr. San Mateo, CA 94402
5/3/2022 7:57	Nancy Shideler	11 Murphy Place, San Mateo, CA 94402
5/3/2022 16:04	Anna Pleikis	560 keelson cir, redwood city ca 94065
5/3/2022 21:52	Peti Arunamata	364 Montserrat Drive, Redwood City, CA
5/4/2022 17:01	Charlene Ho	202 Demi Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/4/2022 23:12	Xiaoyuan Hu	37 Waterside Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/6/2022 10:53	Paula Coe	741 Aries Lane, Foster City CA 94404
5/6/2022 11:17	Craig Holland	602 Harbor Colony Ct., Redwood City, CA, 94065
5/6/2022 11:42	Dennis Collins	618 Harbor Colony Ct Redwood City Ca 94065
5/6/2022 12:01	Cynthia Collins	618 Harbor Colony Ct Redwood City Ca 94065
5/6/2022 19:36	Julien Vaughan	789 Mediterranean Ln, redwood shores, ca 94065
5/6/2022 19:38	Michael Abell	789 Mediterranean LANE, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
5/6/2022 20:26	Marsha Sims	519 Cringle Dr, Redwood City CA 94065
5/7/2022 17:15	Teresa Baxter	358 Turkshead Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/7/2022 18:14	Judith Lewis	790 Mediterranean Lane Redwood City ca
5/8/2022 12:46	Gary Wong	546 Skiff Cir., Redwood City CA 94065
5/8/2022 12:46	Winnie Wong	546 Skiff Cir., Redwood City CA 94065
5/8/2022 17:30	Carol Taylor	509 Neptune dr.
5/8/2022 20:06	Scott Taylor	509 Neptune Dr. Redwood City, CA 94065
5/8/2022 22:07	Cecilia Hugon	815 Lakeshore Drive,Redwood City,Ca.94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
5/9/2022 11:18	Heng Li	829 Lakeshore Dr. Redwood City, CA 94065
5/9/2022 11:26	Chuyun Zhang	829 Lakeshore Dr Redwood City California 94065
5/9/2022 12:13	Mike gilbert	552 skiff circle,redwood city 94065
5/9/2022 12:15	Laurie gilbert	552 skiff circle,redwood city94065
5/9/2022 21:09	Liliane Saadeh	459 Neptune dr., Redwood City, CA 94065
5/10/2022 11:32	Mary Hicks	751 Barnegat Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/10/2022 11:40	Lynn Kunesh	751 Barnegat Lane, Redwood City CA 94065
5/10/2022 14:05	Hedy Lu	823 Lakeshore Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/10/2022 16:55	Falguni Sonawala	408 Compass Dr
5/10/2022 17:16	Gary Hastings	423 Keel Lane, Redwood City,Ca 94065
5/10/2022 17:20	Leslie Rea	411 Bark Drive
5/11/2022 14:57	Donald Reid	554 Compass Circle Redwood City, CA 94065
5/11/2022 20:47	Mohamed Higgy	548 Skiff Circle, Redwood Shores CA 94065
5/11/2022 20:53	Zhao Lou	531 Skiff Cir,Redwood City, CA
5/11/2022 21:25	Caroline Villegas	1000 Davit Lane Redwood City, CA
5/13/2022 12:02	LeAndra Quijano	2111, Hastings Shore Lane Redwood City 94065
5/13/2022 12:18	Sarah Kwong	2115 Hastings Shore Lane
5/13/2022 18:33	grace huang	Hastings Shore Lane 2008
5/13/2022 21:12	Qinghuai Kong	418 Tiller Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/14/2022 7:57	Justin Sterling	2107 Hastings Shore Ln Redwood City, CA 94065
5/14/2022 8:09	Sinziana Sterling	2107 Hastings Shore Ln, Redwood City CA 94065
5/14/2022 17:16	Michele Brenner	461 Trident Drive
5/14/2022 18:48	Arthur Thomas	530 Becket Dr. Redwood City CA 94065
5/14/2022 19:09	Eileen Deasy	530 becket drive redwood shores ca 94065
5/14/2022 20:16	Aria Li	829 Lakeshore Dr. Redwood City, CA 94065
5/15/2022 6:36	Clarissa Louie	601 Baltic Cir, 613, Redwood Shores, California
5/15/2022 9:23	Olga Danilevitch	741 Portwalk Place, Redwood Shores, 94065
5/15/2022 11:44	Eugene Voznesensky	32 Cadiz cir Redwood City ca 94065
5/15/2022 12:07	Karen Hall	18 Cadiz Circle, Redwood City Ca 94065
5/15/2022 13:48	Dan Young	481 Barkentine Lane
5/15/2022 16:54	Jane Hennessy	3021 Seabrook ct. Redwood City ca 94065
5/15/2022 20:41	Julie Shieh	24 Lido Circle Redwood City Ca 94065
5/15/2022 20:51	Will Chong	24 Lido Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/15/2022 22:28	Joan Lindecker	677 Martinique Drive, Redwood City, Ca 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
5/16/2022 10:01	Isabel Sadsad	18 lido circle redwood city 94065
5/16/2022 10:30	Nancy Sadsad	18 Lido Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/16/2022 16:09	Kimberley Meints	609 Spar Drive, redwood shores CA 94066
5/16/2022 17:04	Marcia A Sklar	783 Mediterranean Lane
5/16/2022 19:13	Paul carlino	660 Spar Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/17/2022 9:06	Demmi Santana	597 Teredo Drive redwood shores, ca 94065
5/17/2022 9:52	Kuan Carlino	660 Spar Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/17/2022 12:29	Andong Zhan	420 compass dr, Redwood City, 94065
5/17/2022 13:43	Melanie Teepronpirut	2502 Hastings Shore Ln, Redwood City
5/17/2022 16:39	kaveh Dowlatshahi	34 Barcelona Circle Redwood City CA 94065
5/18/2022 20:28	SUCHITA RAO	832 lakeshore dr Redwood City
5/19/2022 18:55	Alex de Crespigny	419 Compass Dr, Redwood City
5/19/2022 18:57	Helen Darceuil	419 Compass Drive, Redwood City CA 94065
5/21/2022 14:07	Laura Liao	763 Mediterranean Ln
5/21/2022 15:00	Taisen Lin	57 dockside cir, Redwood City, ca 94065
5/21/2022 16:39	Elizabeth Henderson	519 Cringle Dr, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/21/2022 18:29	Rajat Shroff	19 Waterside Circle, 94065
5/21/2022 22:03	Grace Wang	2 Tidewater dr, redwood city, CA 94065
5/21/2022 23:34	Chong Zhang	47 Waterside CIR, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/22/2022 0:06	Stephen Chang	10 Tidewater Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/22/2022 9:06	Cayde jackson	83 waterside circle
5/22/2022 14:47	Benjamin Fong	40 Dockside Circle, Redwood Shores, CA
5/22/2022 21:11	Nilay Banker	65 Waterside Circle, CA 94065

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
11/15/2021 7:08	Ramon S Quesada	804 Corriente Pointe Drive, Redwood City 94065
11/15/2021 8:16	Denise Kohlmann	562 Keelson Circle , Redwood Shores
11/15/2021 19:05	Hitomi Ohsawa	643 Island Place
11/15/2021 21:39	Carolyn Schwartzbord	572 Seahorse Lane
11/16/2021 10:11	Anthea Pang	323 Turkshead Lane, Redwood City, CA94065
11/16/2021 10:12	Kurt Kwok	323 Turkshead Lane
11/16/2021 20:48	Susan Thorne	331 Turkshead Lane
11/17/2021 12:28	Linda Colloran	146 Shorebird Circle RWC
11/17/2021 12:32	Lisa Valkenaar	534 SHOREBIRD CIRCLE, #17101
11/17/2021 20:41	Aviva Cohen	544 Shorebird Circle unit 25102, Un
11/18/2021 11:29	Dolores Schriever	812 Sovereign Way
11/20/2021 19:05	Mirella Stefan	363 Mindanao Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
11/21/2021 16:07	Michael Handley	832 Lakeshore Drive

Date	Name	Address
27-Oct	Rita Quan	883 Boardwalk Place, RWS
1-Nov	Connie Lambert	885 Boardwalk Place, RWS 94065
20-Oct	Julie Bekson	5 Pilot Circle RWS
20-Oct	Todd Welch	5 Pilot Circle RWS
22-Oct	Linda Badal	300 Meridian Drive
21-Oct	Naomi Hernandez	7 Pilot Circle RWS
22-Oct	Kim Jettas	415 Compass Dr RWS
22-Oct	Irene Jettas	415 Compass Dr RWS
22-Oct	Lorrie Jettas	415 Compass Dr RWS
25-Oct	Adam Abelkop	824 Portwalk Place RWS
2-Nov	Sandra Karinja	326 Genoa Drive RWS

Petition to Stop Redwood Life!

Say "NO" to the Redwood Life Development Project

We, the undersigned, concerned residents of Redwood Shores are petitioning the Redwood City Planning Commission and City Council to act now and reject the Redwood Life Development Project proposal.

Print Name & Signature	Address	Date
1 <i>Rita Quan Fitch</i>	883 Boardwalk KPL RWS	10/27/21
2 <i>Connie Lambert</i> <i>Connie Lambert</i>	885 Boardwalk Pl 94065	11-01-2021
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		

Petition to Stop Redwood Life!

Say "NO" to the Redwood Life Development Project

We, the undersigned, concerned residents of Redwood Shores are petitioning the Redwood City Planning Commission and City Council to act now and reject the Redwood Life Development Project proposal.


Print Name & Signature	Address	Date
1 Julie Berkson <i>Julie Berkson</i>	5 Pilot Circle Redwood Shores, CA 94065	10/20/21
2 TODD WELCH <i>Todd Welch</i>	5 Pilot Circle Redwood Shores, CA 94065	10/20/21
3 <i>Anna Bagdal</i> <i>Anna Bagdal</i>	300 Meridian Drive RWC 94065	10/20/21
4 <i>Michael Jettas</i>	7 Pilot RWS	10/21/21
5 Kim Jettas <i>Kim Jettas</i>	415 Compass Dr. RWC 94065	10/22/21
6 IRENE JETTAS <i>Irene Jettas</i>	415 Compass Dr RWC 94065	10/22/21
7 Horrie Jettas <i>Horrie Jettas</i>	415 Compass Dr. RWC 94065	10/22/21
8 Adam Abelkop <i>Adam Abelkop</i>	824 Portwalk Place, RWC, 94065	10/25/21
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		

Petition to Stop Redwood Life!

Say "NO" to the Redwood Life Development Project

We, the undersigned, concerned residents and owners of Peninsula Landing in Redwood Shores, are petitioning the Redwood City Planning Commission and City Council to act now and reject the Redwood Life Development Project proposal.

(Use blue or black ink)

Print Name & Signature	Address	Date
1 Sandra Karinja 	326 Genoa Dr Redwood City CA 94065	11/2/21
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
11/22/2021 18:10	ann pocapalia	632 marlin court
11/22/2021 18:34	Leyla Ozgur Alhassen	208 Mendocino Way
11/22/2021 18:48	Lisa Sweeney	419 Bark Dr
11/22/2021 19:37	Dita Naik	357 Bowsprit Dr
11/25/2021 10:53	Fares Alhassen	208 Mendocino Way
11/28/2021 16:43	Dorothy Yang	434 Barnegat Lane, Redwood City, CA 94064
11/29/2021 11:50	Rumika Chaudhry	822 Boardwalk Place
11/29/2021 15:26	Ellen Boelens	814 Constellation Ct., Redwood Shores
11/30/2021 9:16	Setu Anand	806 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA-94065
11/30/2021 19:02	Lu Chen	822 Portwalk Pl, Redwood shore
12/1/2021 10:50	Svetlana Krishtop	735 Portwalk Pl
12/1/2021 15:42	Barb Cordery	584 Dory Lane
12/2/2021 11:14	Minal Brahmabhatt	591 Shoal Circle
12/3/2021 11:58	Osrin Arya	352 Mindanao Dr
12/3/2021 12:00	Ria arya	352 Mindanao Dr
12/3/2021 16:08	Wei Xian Lu	403 Promenade Ln
12/3/2021 23:17	Arnau Ramisa	546 Compass Circle
12/4/2021 13:38	John Baker	854 Corriente Point Dr., Redwood Shores 94065
12/4/2021 21:23	Cheryl Brennan	371 Ensign Lane
12/4/2021 21:37	Jan Craig	409A Cork Harbour Circle
12/4/2021 21:52	Moddy Wong	602 Seasons Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
12/5/2021 7:14	Vera Cianciolo	823 Southport Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
12/5/2021 7:17	Bob Cianciolo	823 Southport Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
12/5/2021 13:49	David Wang	857 Boardwalk Pl
12/5/2021 17:30	Jennifer Willin	917 Corriente pointe
12/5/2021 21:31	Ember Pickands	807 Portman Dr
12/5/2021 22:13	Jun Tan	2057 Rockport Ave
12/5/2021 22:18	Shin Tan	935 Corriente Pointe

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
12/6/2021 8:16	Chris Neves	11 Barcelona Circle
12/6/2021 9:08	Nancy Glaser	54 Cape Hatteras Court
12/6/2021 11:39	Laurence DeWitt	950 Redwood Shores Pkwy
12/6/2021 11:48	Kevin Ulisse Consani	568 Harbor Colony Court
12/6/2021 11:59	Laura Castro	701 Baltic Circle #725
12/6/2021 13:45	Willi Huang	3 Manhattan Ct., Redwood City
12/6/2021 13:52	Erica Attard	528 Anchor Circle, Redwood Shores
12/6/2021 15:19	Kris Binasik	546 Shorebird Circle #26102
12/7/2021 14:41	Allen Pogorzelski	10 Cove Lane
12/7/2021 23:15	Mark Castro	2051 Seabrook Ct
12/8/2021 8:47	Serina Wong	507 Osprey Ct, Redwood City, CA 94065
12/8/2021 8:59	Ivan lotchenko	26 Cape Hatteras
12/8/2021 19:04	Kevin Joe	51 Osprey Dr. Redwood City, CA 94065
12/8/2021 22:16	Yuheng Qiu	399 mindanao dr, redwood city
12/9/2021 15:32	Jannot Ross	10 Cove Lane
12/9/2021 15:36	Angela Yip	125 Wharf Row, Redwood City, 94065
12/9/2021 15:48	Kaelyn Katrina	705 Boardwalk Place Redwood City CA 94065
12/9/2021 16:47	Jean Munson	74 Cape Hatteras Ct.
12/9/2021 17:00	Dennis Dehne	52 Eddystone Court
12/9/2021 17:17	Sheng Jie Xi	425 Cork Harbour Circle Unit H Redwood City CA 94065
12/9/2021 22:58	Jinen Kamdar	807 Bay Harbor Drive, Redwood Shores
12/10/2021 7:29	Albert albiani	640 Teredo Dr
12/10/2021 13:57	xi chen	31 Pelican Lane
12/11/2021 7:30	Melissa Fard	5 avocet drive #5-207 Redwood City, ca 94065
12/11/2021 7:32	Kevin Gomez	5 Avocet Drive
12/11/2021 11:22	Yoko Ogawa	305 Treedust Street
12/11/2021 21:13	Janet Tipper	327 Alameda De Las Pulgas, Redwood City, CA
12/12/2021 9:48	Brian Yu	32 Bremerton Circle, Redwood Shores

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
11/7/2022 17:40	Richard Mirowski	824 Lakeshore Drive Redwood Shores
11/10/2022 19:47	Inna Magner	1074 Tiller Lane
11/11/2022 16:54	John O'Sullivan	306 Beacon Shores Drive, Redwood City CA 94065
11/11/2022 23:37	Natasha Chaturvedi	648 Spar Drive, Redwood City, 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
3/27/2023 6:12	L Dixit	648 Spar Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
3/27/2023 11:54	Beth Ann Filippi	222 King Street, Redwood City, CA 94062
3/27/2023 12:51	Annaloy Nickum	821 Beech St, Redwood city
3/27/2023 18:08	Kristin Fabianski	545 Cringle Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/28/2023 8:54	Cynthia Fabianski	545 Cringle Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
3/28/2023 8:57	Robert Fabianski	545 Cringle Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
3/28/2023 9:55	Tara Bradley	977 Rose Avenue Redwood City CA 94063
3/28/2023 14:13	Carol Lopez-Alfaro	736 Maple St. Redwood City, CA 94063
3/28/2023 20:53	Carmel Pariseau	3015 East Bayshore Road, Redwood City
3/29/2023 15:57	Tony Hanni	218 D Street Redwood City, CA 94063
3/29/2023 16:10	Judy DiStasio	1280 Veterans Blvd Apt 501 Redwood City , CA 94063
3/29/2023 19:02	Sari Hamman	432 compass drive
3/30/2023 16:03	Lim Chen	3109 Hoover Street Unit A Redwood City, CA 94063
3/31/2023 18:12	Elizabeth Hall	507 Seastorm Dr., Redwood City CA 94065
3/31/2023 18:24	Liliya Sarokina	328 Meridian Dr Redwood City CA 94065
4/1/2023 16:56	Liyun Ni	920 Corriente Point drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/1/2023 22:47	Anna Lyapis	850 Columbia Cir
4/2/2023 7:41	Filipp Brunshteyn	850 Columbia Cir Redwood Shores CA 94065
4/2/2023 9:20	Liza Percer	972 Governors Bay Drive, Redwood City, CA94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
4/3/2023 19:10	Evelyn Barrera	1085 15th Ave Redwood City CA 94063
4/3/2023 19:11	Veronica Barrera	1085 15th Ave Redwood City ca 94063
4/3/2023 19:12	Karina Barrera	1085 15th Ave Redwood City CA 94063
4/3/2023 19:14	Fatima Barrera	1085 15th Ave Redwood City CA 94063
4/3/2023 19:15	Rogelio Barrera	1085 15th Ave Redwood City CA 94063
4/4/2023 14:20	Jade Margolis	320 Mindanao Dr, Redwood City, CA, 94065
4/5/2023 17:06	Megan Halbrook	526 Shorebird Circle #16102, Redwood City, CA
4/6/2023 15:11	Jenny Jia	569 Anchor Circle, Redwood City, Ca 94569
4/6/2023 15:25	Carina Qi	271 Nice Court, Redwood City
4/6/2023 17:47	Wei Hai	271 Nice Ct, Redwood City
4/6/2023 19:04	Ester Souza	968 haven ave Redwood City ca 94063
4/6/2023 19:40	Ruizhi wu	801 cape cod drive, Redwood City
4/6/2023 20:33	Yunyan Zhang	1000 Davit Lane, Redwood City 94065
4/6/2023 21:30	Xinyan Tang	2008 Hastings Shore Ln
4/6/2023 22:47	Chunling Wang	727 Portwalk Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
4/6/2023 22:56	Adam Yang	Lido Cir
4/6/2023 23:01	Grace Tseng	Tidewater Dr, Redwood City, CA94065
4/6/2023 23:12	Kathie tang	88 pelican lane, Redwood City, ca, 94065
4/8/2023 14:02	Hong Tan	652 Sea Anchor Dr Unit 2202, Redwood City, CA 94063

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
8/8/2022 9:00	Karla Villanueva	308 Demi Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/8/2022 9:25	Viana Hagani	341 Bowsprit Drive Redwood City
8/8/2022 16:21	Alyssa Sanchez	602 Lanyard Drive
8/8/2022 16:32	Brad Nelson	734 Newport Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/8/2022 16:52	Morris Loya	730 Newport Circle, Redwood City, Ca 94065
8/8/2022 16:55	Edmond Loya	730 Newport Circle, Redwood City. Ca 94065
8/8/2022 16:56	Henry Loya	730 Newport Circle, Redwood City, Ca 94065
8/8/2022 17:51	Dave Webb	590 Avocet Dr
8/8/2022 20:28	Soumik Sarkar	520 Compass Dr
8/9/2022 7:30	Tom Lease	3906 Edison Street San Mateo, Ca 94403
8/9/2022 8:06	Rebecca Matthias	303 Beacon Shores Dr. Redwood City ca 94065
8/9/2022 14:54	Robert Faust	527 Compass Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
8/9/2022 15:52	Ashley faust	527 compass drive Redwood City ca 94064
8/9/2022 17:20	Celine roces	1 tidewater drive
8/9/2022 22:56	Sandra J Sullivan	690 Bradford St #4 Redwood City, CA 94063
8/11/2022 10:35	Deborah Hull	36 Cove Lane Redwood City CA 94065
8/11/2022 14:42	Isabelle Cotto	709 Clinton Street
8/11/2022 16:44	Prashant Khandelwal	814 Sea Chase Dr, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/11/2022 16:46	Poonam Gorakshakar	814 Sea Chase Dr, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/11/2022 19:35	Roma Olvera	458 Quartz Street, 94062
8/11/2022 21:32	Bibo Wang	208 Waldron Dr
8/11/2022 23:25	Juexin lin	302 Whidbey Ln, ca, 94065
8/12/2022 10:26	Victor Yeung	507 Osprey Ct, Redwood City
8/12/2022 17:23	Noel Shen	933 Governors Bay Drive, Redwood City
8/12/2022 20:50	Erin Simpson	1212 Whipple Ave, Redwood City, CA 94062
8/12/2022 21:05	Daniel McGowan	1212 Whipple Ave, Redwood City, CA 94062
8/13/2022 10:48	Angelica Michelle Ocampo	64 Grand Street, Redwood City, CA 94062
8/13/2022 12:14	Nancy Sheinbaum	1723 Kansas St, 94061
8/13/2022 16:56	Rena Dugish	3705 Laurel Way Redwood City CA 94062
8/13/2022 23:00	Vanessa To	601 Landmark Ln Redwood City, CA 94065
8/13/2022 23:19	Sandy Saunders	1244 Crompton Road, Redwood City
8/14/2022 9:22	Katherine Alward	735 Mediterranean Ln Redwood City CA 94065
8/14/2022 15:53	Katherine Koenig	299 Franklin Street, Redwood City, CA

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
8/15/2022 9:33	Angelica Fields	2100 Gossamer Ave.
8/15/2022 11:16	Jo Ann Arneson	506 Crest View Ave. Belmont, CA 94002
8/15/2022 18:47	Lavanya Adusumilli	205 Pender lane
8/16/2022 14:16	Justin Loye	3 Vera Ct. Redwood City, CA
8/17/2022 17:03	YIngfei Zhao	566 Compass Circle, Redwood City, 94065
8/17/2022 18:01	Jamie Trimble	1634 Whipple Avenue Redwood City
8/17/2022 20:23	Troy Stopera	3 Avocet Drive #104, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/17/2022 21:02	Tuba Senbabaoglu	322 Meridian Dr Redwood City CA 94065
8/18/2022 10:41	Rachael Stopera	3 Avocet Drive #104 Redwood City CA 94065
8/19/2022 8:59	Angela Salafia	1004 Rockport Ave, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/19/2022 9:20	Michael Salafia	1004 Rockport Ave, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/19/2022 11:25	Richard Chen	457 Cork Harbour Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/19/2022 13:10	Matthew Debski	1910 Oak Knoll Dr, Belmont, CA 94002
8/20/2022 2:43	Mary Ann Murphy	3729 Laurel Way Redwood City Ca 94062
8/20/2022 9:52	Carol Li	274 redwood shores pkwy. Redwood City CA 94065
8/21/2022 8:59	Jennifer Baker	602 Hopkins Avenue
8/21/2022 12:33	Nina Goodale	825 Portwalk Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/21/2022 13:14	Natasha Cook	200 Baltic Circle, Unit 214, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/21/2022 13:35	Linda Popky	10 Portofino Circle, Redwood City, CA
8/21/2022 19:32	Debbie mangone	551 Skiff Circle redwood shores, ca 94065
8/21/2022 22:34	Jill McHale	794 Sequoia Avenue San Mateo CA 94403

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
8/22/2022 9:34	Robin Carlier	5 Oceanside Way Redwood City,CA 94065
8/23/2022 10:25	Gina VanDusen	965 Valota Rd Redwood City, Ca. 94061
8/23/2022 12:28	Francine Taylor	271 Alameda de las Pulgas
8/24/2022 15:43	Faryal Saiidnia	200 Baltic Circle, Unit 238, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/25/2022 19:56	Robert S Whitmore	836 Alameda, Belmont, CA 94002
8/25/2022 21:32	Yen Tochimoto	1016 Gull ave. Foster city, cA 94404
8/26/2022 10:01	Lisa Recker	353; Altamont Way Redwood City CA 94062
8/26/2022 12:48	Sabine Sahyoun	3031 Hopkins Ave
8/26/2022 14:02	Lon Pini	15 finger avenue
8/26/2022 15:04	Lisa Schofield	3103 Goodwin Ave, RWC 94061

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
11/26/2022 9:25	Martina Speight	4048 Martin Dr
11/27/2022 19:45	Maureen Dermenjian	19 Haydon Court, Belmont, CA 94002
11/30/2022 8:36	Nicole Ovadia	408 Quadrant Lane
11/30/2022 16:32	Gil John Rodriguez	619 Canoe Court
12/1/2022 11:10	Robin Van Why	2406 Buena Vista Ave Belmont Ca 94002
12/1/2022 18:41	Judy Gilbertson	2606 Prindle Rd, Belmont, CA 94002
12/3/2022 12:57	Marisa Ramos	338 St. Martin Drive Redwood City 94065
12/3/2022 19:06	Brian Hanson	864 Boardwalk Place
12/3/2022 22:56	Sandeep Pyapali	16 Dockside Cir Redwood City 94065
12/4/2022 9:20	Susan Berl	158 Positano Circle
12/4/2022 9:51	min wang	569 Anchor Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
12/4/2022 17:29	David Sapper	10 Admiralty Place, Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
12/5/2022 21:33	Mary Spangler	1115 Edgewood Rd. Redwood City 94062
12/6/2022 23:54	Maria nelson	546 lanyard drive Redwood City
12/7/2022 13:07	Michelle Cabral	987 Laguna Circle, Foster City
12/9/2022 16:14	Chris Davis	622 Marlin Court Redwood City 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
12/21/2022 19:04	Michelle Boire	1605 Redwood Avenue, Redwood City 94061
12/30/2022 10:42	Elizabeth Carey	2600 Isabelle Ave San Mateo, CA 94403
12/31/2022 17:51	Alana Barrett	465 Cork Harbour Circle, C, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/1/2023 10:22	Mary Venturoni	2717 Monserat Avenue, Belmont, CA

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
2/7/2022 7:51	Iori spiegl	760 Newport Circle
2/7/2022 12:05	Gary Gfroerer	320 Sea Cliff Lane Redwood City CA 94065
2/7/2022 12:08	Tammy Fischetti	313 Sea Cliff Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/7/2022 13:31	Shannon S. Moon	711 Lacewing Ln, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/7/2022 13:32	Avery Moon	711 Lacewing Ln, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/7/2022 13:54	Arthur Faro	540 Shorebird Circle #21202, Redwood Shores, CA 97540
2/7/2022 17:09	Hohyun Shim	921 Corriente Point Dr. Redwood City, CA 94065
2/7/2022 17:29	Eduardo Gonzalez	106 Waldron dr redwood city CA 94065
2/7/2022 18:12	Anthony Fischetti	313 Sea Cliff Lane Redwood City, CA 94065
2/7/2022 18:16	Denise Comer	324 Commander Lane
2/7/2022 18:49	HE SHAO	845 Newport Circle
2/7/2022 18:49	Carolee Stabno	311 Beacon Shores Drive
2/7/2022 19:39	Natalie Hill	807 Corriente point drive Redwood City, CA
2/8/2022 9:50	Holly Christensen	4 Dana Pointe Court, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/8/2022 11:00	Elena Sapozhnikova	1 Oceanside Way
2/8/2022 11:25	Nancy Scheppler	750 Newport Circle
2/8/2022 16:44	Darlene Turturici	304 Sea Cliff Ln. Redwood City, CA 94065
2/8/2022 16:46	Ben Turturici	304 Sea Cliff Ln. Redwood City, CA 94065
2/8/2022 18:03	Justa Quesada	804 Corriente Pointe Drive, Redwood city, CA 94065
2/8/2022 20:08	Steve Martino	544 Shorebird Circle #25204, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/9/2022 11:07	Michael Comstock	512 Keelson Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/9/2022 12:07	Eileen Cassidy	540 Shorebird Circle, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/9/2022 12:10	edward cassidy	343 hudson st, redwood city, ca 94062
2/9/2022 13:13	joan courtney	509 anchor circle
2/9/2022 15:21	James soncuya	303 Satuma dr Redwood City ca 94065
2/9/2022 16:36	Sara Eckles	469 Barkentine Ln, Redwood Shores
2/10/2022 8:15	Yasmina Abdiche	853 Boardwalk Place
2/10/2022 11:22	Victoria Gonzalez	106 Waldron drive, redwood city, ca 94065
2/10/2022 14:23	Ray Fowler	871 Newport Circle
2/10/2022 15:30	Ms Cassidy (Kathlene)	343 Hudson, Redwood city, ca
2/10/2022 17:04	Lynn Emrick	319 Starfish Lane, Redwood Shores, CA
2/10/2022 17:07	Mike Emrick	319 Starfish Lane, Redwood City, CA
2/11/2022 8:55	Yi Li	519 Anchor Circle, Redwood City CA94065
2/11/2022 9:00	Dorothea Bunk	315 Starfish Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/11/2022 11:24	Lori Clerkin	216 Shorebird Circle Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/11/2022 17:02	Veronica Chico Rickson	315 Starfish Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/11/2022 17:16	Lori Menachof	941 Corriente Point Drive
2/11/2022 18:24	Alex Botvinik	808 Corriente Point Dr, Redwood City CA 94065
2/11/2022 21:51	Kristy Tsadick	319 Starfish Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/12/2022 13:02	Ashley Baxter	124 Monaco Drive, Redwood City, CA
2/12/2022 17:02	Vinnan Rangarajan	314 Beacon Shores Dr, Redwood City, 94065
2/13/2022 7:41	Cesar Rojas	312 Demi Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/13/2022 11:45	Sidharath Jain	820 , Corriente Point dr, Redwood City, CA-94065
2/13/2022 11:47	Vishakha Mahajan	820 , Corriente Point dr, Redwood City, CA-94065
2/13/2022 12:05	Ashley Baxter	124 Monaco Drive, Redwood City, CA
2/13/2022 13:38	Jeff Ashworth	126 Shorebird Cir, Redwood City, CA, 94065
2/13/2022 16:14	Leland Lai	721 Newport Circle, Redwood City CA 94065
2/13/2022 16:15	Serena Lai	721 Newport Circle, Redwood City CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
2/14/2022 8:40	HIROAKI TANAKA	532 Shorebird cir. #6203
2/14/2022 8:55	Louise Bennett	10 Mandalay Court Redwood City 94065
2/14/2022 9:06	Ashley Bennett	10 Mandalay Ct, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/14/2022 11:22	Mandy Zhang	729 Newport Cir.
2/14/2022 11:59	Broc Kanaday	540 Shorebird #21202, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/14/2022 12:02	Jana Boracini	540 Shorebird Cir. #21202, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/14/2022 12:38	Mary Graves	230 Shorebird Circle, Redwood Shores CA
2/14/2022 12:48	Trish Novak	950 Redwood Shores Pkwy, C101
2/14/2022 21:16	Anne Miltimore	933 Corriente Point Dr., Redwood Shores
2/15/2022 9:05	Adrian Botvinik	808 Corriente Point Dr, Redwood City CA, 94065
2/15/2022 17:05	Li Chan	309 Sea Cliff Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/15/2022 17:06	Joseph Kim	309 Sea Cliff Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/15/2022 19:20	Galina Rozenblyum	540 Anchor Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/16/2022 11:41	Anna Pleikis	560 Keelson Cir, Redwood city CA 94065
2/16/2022 13:03	Jincong Wang	27 Bremerton Cir, Redwood City, 94065, CA
2/16/2022 16:35	Amir Fanai	646 Island Place, Redwood City CA94065-1556
2/16/2022 16:53	Susan Fanai	646 Island Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/16/2022 17:53	Rick Schulze	561 Island Place, Redwood City
2/16/2022 18:01	Catherine Schulze	561 Island Place
2/16/2022 20:40	Mary Kaufman	537 Becket Dr
2/17/2022 8:08	Debra Weiner	610 Island Place, Redwood City, CA
2/19/2022 10:45	Olena Gutsalova	843 Newport Circle, Redwood City, CA, 94065
2/19/2022 16:13	Keyvan Keyhan	532 Shorebird Circle #6204
2/20/2022 12:23	Wilvin Szeto	372 Montserrat Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/20/2022 18:10	Fang Chen	336 Montserrat Dr
2/20/2022 19:52	Imad Lahham	247 Nice Court

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
2/21/22 11:39	Raymond Ng	394, Mindanao Drive
2/21/22 11:45	Hannah Hwang	394 Mindanao Drive, Redwood City, CA94065
2/21/22 13:14	Nitin Gaglani	400 krystallos lane, redwood city, CA 94065
2/21/22 13:19	Brian Huynh	2043 Seabrook Court
2/21/22 15:43	Helen Doneux	429 D Cork Harbour Circle Redwood City 94065
2/21/22 17:37	Jiefang Zhang	300 Commander Ln
2/21/22 17:41	Bin Qian	309 Treedust street
2/21/22 20:01	Chloe Lahham	247 Nice Court, Redwood City CA 94065
2/21/22 20:01	Luke Zheng	3010 Whisperwave Cir. Redwood City 94065 CA
2/21/22 22:06	Nanfei Yan	3010 Whisperwave Cir. Redwood City, CA 94065
2/22/22 14:22	Patricia Murdock	3001 Seabrook Ct Redwood City, CA 94065
2/26/22 10:59	Kelly Ann Matsuoka	97pelican Lane Redwood City Ca 94065
2/26/22 15:48	Keith Matsuoka	97 Pelican Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/26/22 16:05	Kelly Matsuoka	99 Pelican In
2/26/22 17:29	Luther Mok	368 Montserrat Drive Redwood city CA 94065
2/26/22 20:19	Ping Chan	376 Montserrat drive, redwood city, CA 94065
2/26/22 21:29	Jinshu Niu	137 Monaco Dr, Redwood City CA 94065
2/26/22 21:30	Kairan Zhu	137 Monaco Dr
2/27/22 13:05	Jacki Graf	745 Port Walk Pl
2/27/22 15:44	Mark DeSouza	59 Cove Lane Redwood City CA 94065
2/27/22 17:20	Colleen Rodriguez	743 Port Walk Place

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
1/30/2023 10:36	Braden Andersen	125 Shorebird Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/30/2023 16:02	Sophia Andruha	888 Boardwalk PL, RWS 94065
1/30/2023 19:44	Charu Anchlia	318 bethel lane redwood city CA 94065
1/30/2023 22:33	Gerry Kuller	50 Eddystone Ct
1/31/2023 13:05	Brian Ascher	225 Monaco Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
1/31/2023 13:13	Michael Mogan	1057 Continentals Way #11, Belmont
1/31/2023 21:30	Tracy Banuelos	524 anchor cr redwood city ca 94065
2/1/2023 11:42	Gareth Baron	950 Redwood Shores Pkwy, redwood City, 94065
2/1/2023 16:32	Francisco Banuelos	524 Anchor Circle, Redwood City CA. 94065
2/4/2023 17:07	Adrian Carpio	408 Whisper Ln Redwood City CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
2/8/2023 8:31	Austin Gundry	825 Marshall St, Redwood City, CA
2/9/2023 13:51	Patricia Chiang	42 Dockside Cir Redwood City 94065
2/9/2023 14:21	Rajiv Chopra	937 Corriente Point Dr.
2/9/2023 15:54	Deniz Bolbol	15 Wakefield Ct Belmont CA 94002
2/10/2023 6:13	Silvia Antonelli	612 Jefferson Ave #204, Redwood City
2/10/2023 9:11	Antonio Martinez Alcantara	331 Turkshead Ln
2/10/2023 13:48	Lori Castagno	315 Turkshead Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/10/2023 13:49	Joe Castagno	315 Turkshead Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/10/2023 16:43	Ellen Swift	381 Ensign Lane Redeood City Ca 94065
2/10/2023 21:42	Pamela Jeung	35 Verbalee Ln Burlingame CA 94010
2/11/2023 9:12	Hong Lu	312 Whidbey Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/11/2023 9:15	Yekun Wang	312 Whidbey Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/11/2023 13:01	Ronald Clark	809 Salt Court Redwood City, Ca. 94065
2/12/2023 6:22	Marta He	202 , Shorebird Cir Redwood City
2/12/2023 15:40	Ed Swift	381 Ensign Lane

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
2/14/2023 20:29	Kendra Bronstein	737 Portwalk Place
2/16/2023 10:22	Amy Plante	620 Veterans BLVD
2/16/2023 10:31	Jonathan smith	620 Veterans Boulevard
2/17/2023 19:09	carol bartlett	924 warren st, redwood city CA 94063
2/18/2023 23:03	Abhishek Ghuwalewala	702 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA
2/19/2023 7:24	Cindy Gonzalez	299 Franklin St Apt 710 Redwood City CA 94063
2/19/2023 10:14	Ana-Paula Martins-Fernandes	705 Mendocino Way, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/19/2023 10:35	Almond Loh	228 Monaco Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/19/2023 10:37	Craig Montgomery	243 C St Redwood City, 94063
2/19/2023 10:39	Kaitlyn Kwan	307 Turkshead Lane
2/19/2023 12:22	Zoe Byun	2111 Hastings Shore Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/19/2023 16:24	Allison Don	1036 Rockport Ave, Redwood City, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
2/20/2023 9:48	Anoop Menon	117 Hartstene Dr, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/20/2023 10:04	Arvind Sharma	110 Amalfi Way Redwood City CA 94065
2/20/2023 10:36	Ashok Nambiar	807 Southport Drive Redwood City 94065
2/20/2023 16:09	Alex Zvenigorodsky	315 Quay Lane Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/20/2023 18:40	Avikk Ghose	35 Dockside Circle, Redwood Shores 94065
2/20/2023 19:07	Ann Saylor	822 Mediterranean Lane, Redwood Shores 94065
2/20/2023 20:19	Jennifer Freitas	38 Cape Hatteras Court, Redwood Shores, ca 94065
2/20/2023 20:53	Amanda Icasiano	700 Baltic Circle, Redwood City, 94065
2/20/2023 21:26	Peter Dy	400 Uccelli Dr, Apt 4304, Redwood City, CA 94063
2/20/2023 21:32	Alyssa Herrera-Set	311 Quay Ln. Redwood City, CA 94065
2/21/2023 6:26	Adele Cox	45 Fulton Street Redwood City CA 94062
2/21/2023 8:43	Beth Fenwick	1000 Davit Ln, Unit 128
2/21/2023 13:49	Akosua Grant	921 Salt Court
2/21/2023 18:25	Britney Fong	809 Bay Harbour Drive
2/21/2023 19:32	Brad Friedman	207 Shorebird Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/21/2023 21:11	Emma Fuller	1405 El Camino Real, Apt 548, Redwood City, CA 94063
2/23/2023 16:03	Javidan Guliyev	620 Veterans Blvd, Unit 344
2/23/2023 16:44	Jenny Deng	240 Monaco Dr. Redwood City, CA 94065
2/23/2023 16:55	Scott Chau	240 Monaco Dr. RWS, CA 94065
2/23/2023 17:53	Robert Sun	205 Pickleweed Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/24/2023 8:03	Joanne Liu	500 Baltic Circle Unit 502, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/25/2023 10:05	Ales Plsek	834 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/25/2023 10:53	Charles Tan	943 Corriente Point Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/25/2023 20:37	David Moon	600 Baltic Cir #604, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/25/2023 20:37	Kathleen Moon	600 Baltic Cir #604, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/26/2023 6:13	David Poon	359 Turkshead lane Redwood city California 94065
2/26/2023 14:44	David Shannon	804 Cape Cod Dr Redwood City, CA 94065
2/26/2023 15:00	Doris Singer	70 Waterside Circle
2/26/2023 16:40	Cheng-yeh Yen	819 Southport Dr., Redwood City, CA 94065

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
12/13/21 11:21 AM	Erika Osteraas	1315 James Ave, Redwood City, CA
12/13/21 11:34 AM	Alexander Wong	602 Seasons Lane, Redwood City, 94065
12/13/21 8:21 PM	Allen Thrasher	157 Positano Circle, Redwood City
12/13/21 11:44 PM	Gail Gannon	560 Elm St 94070
12/14/21 1:04 PM	Kelly Lamb	874 Newport Circle
12/16/21 1:41 PM	Lars Porsmose	21 Waterside Circle, Redwood City, CA 94080
12/16/21 1:42 PM	Jasmine Gao	21 Waterside Circle, Redwood City, CA 94080
12/20/21 11:35 PM	Jordana Simon	372 Genoa Drive, Redwood Shores. CA 94065
12/21/21 4:58 PM	Michael Hall	610 Island Place
12/21/21 10:02 PM	Yelena Vayn	6 Avocet Dr 6206 Redwood City Ca 94065
12/23/21 7:40 PM	Karen Turner	137 Lexington Ave. , Redwood City, CA
12/26/21 12:08 PM	James Chen	134 Positano Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
12/31/21 5:26 PM	Sherry Jamali	120 Shorebird Circle, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
1/1/22 10:17 AM	Cynthia Rogers	215 Shorebird Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
1/6/2023 16:51	Kristine Smith	5 Barcelona Cir Redwood Shores CA 94065
1/6/2023 21:41	Maria Meka	540 Shorebird Cir
1/6/2023 22:20	Alex Gonikman	8 Cadiz Circle Redwood City
1/6/2023 23:19	Barbara Rothe	331 Staysail Court, Foster City, CA 94404
1/6/2023 23:50	Kenna Seagrist	552 Shorebird Cir, Unit 1201, Redwood City 94065
1/6/2023 23:52	Jackson Seagrist	552 Shorebird Cir, Unit 1201, Redwood City 94065
1/7/2023 4:53	Craig Seim	145 Eyelet Lane
1/7/2023 23:36	Farzana Perwad	426 Bark Drive Redwood City CA 94065
1/8/2023 8:50	Catherine Wilkes	446 Barnegat Lane Redwood City, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
1/9/2023 19:56	Claire Mailhot	509 Starboard Drive, Redwood Shores, Ca 94065
1/11/2023 11:41	Katrina Crawford	Po Box 6515 San Mateo Ca 94002
1/11/2023 18:34	Christopher chow	2065 rockport ave, redwood shores, ca 94065
1/14/2023 17:40	henry loya	747 martinique dr redwood city ca 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
1/20/2023 16:01	Sandy Rosa	548 Shorebird Circle Unit 3201 Redwood City CA 94065
1/29/2023 13:15	Vikas Aggarwal	100 Baltic Circle, #104 Redwood City, CA-94065
1/29/2023 16:49	Robert Aboyme	3065 Whisperwave Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
6/27/2022 8:48	Joe Cheung	140 Northampton Lane, Belmont CA 94002
6/27/2022 9:21	Marcos Gutierrez	364 Ensign Lane
6/27/22 11:51	James Coffman	1109 Virginia Avenue, Redwood City, CA 9401
6/27/2022 19:04	Angie Wong	981 Governors Bay Drive
6/27/2022 19:08	Jackson Stodgel	266 41st Avenue, San Mateo CA, 94403
6/27/2022 21:35	Karen Hart	8 Spinnaker Place
6/27/2022 21:55	Ronda Crenshaw	36 Cove Ln
6/27/2022 22:56	Angelo Delcampo	786 Mediterranean lane, Redwood City CA
6/27/2022 23:02	Sonya Heerema	106 Wharf Row
6/28/2022 11:35	suzanne tschaekofske	75 duane st #15 redwood city, ca 94062
6/28/2022 13:15	cindy kasali	927 woodland ave san carlos,ca 94070
6/28/2022 15:34	Ramesh Lingamneni	255 Nice Ct, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/28/2022 18:46	Michael Sakayeda	976 Governors Bay Drive
6/28/2022 19:49	yan chen	63 cove ln, redwood city, CA94065
6/28/2022 19:55	Yaroslav Babych	57 Cove Ln
6/28/2022 20:48	AbdulHamed Mohammed	63 Pelican Ln, Redwood city, 94065
6/29/2022 14:32	Veena Khattak	799 Mediterranean Avenue, Redwood City, 94065
6/29/2022 14:32	Chandra Khattak	799 Mediterranean Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/29/2022 18:16	Debsubhra Roy	401 Baltic Cir #419 Redwood City
6/29/2022 23:41	Rich Brazeau	719 Newport Cir
6/30/2022 14:12	Lori Gfroerer	320 Sea Cliff Lane
6/30/2022 19:28	Gloria Velez	5 Cadiz circle
7/1/2022 1:32	Eric Set	311 Quay Lane Redwood City Ca 94065
7/1/2022 1:36	Julita Set	563 Shoal Circle Redwood City CA 94065
7/1/2022 7:59	Chris rae	470 barkentine ln
7/1/2022 9:31	Calona Paiko	802 Constellation Ct, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/1/2022 9:47	ivan yeung	808 sovereign way, redwood city, ca 94065
7/1/2022 10:12	Manique Wijewardena Bloom	820 , Seal Pointe Drive
7/1/2022 10:59	Hichem Sellami	4 Manhattan Ct, Redwood City CA
7/1/2022 12:10	Gaith Kawar	827 Columbia Cir
7/1/2022 18:07	james jim	210 Canoe Ct
7/1/2022 21:36	Mike Keehin	1081 Beach Park Blvd., Foster City
7/1/2022 21:36	Marilyn Canadas	1634 Peck Ave, San Mateo, CA. 94401
7/1/2022 22:14	April Lu	2 Dana pointe Court
7/2/2022 2:50	Marina Afanasieff	390 Bodega Street Foster City
7/2/2022 6:16	Judy Wu	887 Boardwalk Pl, redwood shores ca94065
7/2/2022 7:47	Danielle Enderson	610 Chesterton Ave, Belmont
7/2/2022 8:22	Dario Bortolotto	1113 Tanglewood way
7/2/2022 9:05	Sara Shayesteh	2514 S Norfolk St, San Mateo, CA 94403
7/2/2022 9:05	Michael Scott Chang	9 Mandalay Ct
7/2/2022 9:15	Betty Frase	135 Hillcrest Road, San Carlos, CA 94070
7/2/2022 9:34	Ila Patel	835 Portwalk Place, Redwood city, Ca 94065

7/2/2022 10:05	Deborah Hart	861 Columbia Circle, Redwood Shores, CA. 94065
7/2/2022 10:43	Cathleen Yedinak	2715 Victoria Manor San Carlos CA 94070
7/2/2022 10:53	Ayanna Carey	1410 Monroe Ave, San Mateo
7/2/2022 10:53	Paula Shea	2400 CARLMONT DR APT 308E Belmont ca
7/2/2022 11:56	Peter Cheung	55 Dockside Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/2/2022 11:59	Cynthia Wilson	115 Alameda De Las Pulgas, Redwood City, CA 94062
7/2/2022 12:00	James White	2603 Graceland Ave. San Carlos, CA 94070
7/2/2022 13:06	kimbery shern	57 w. 39th avenue san mateo, ca 94403
7/2/2022 13:48	Kimberly Wendt	102 Central Ave, Redwood City, 94061
7/2/2022 14:40	Herb Mesler	1549 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070
7/2/2022 15:02	David Skinner	764 Newport Circle
7/2/2022 15:25	Marta Lombana	1910 Arbor Avenue, Belmont, CA 94002
7/2/2022 15:46	Ilona Gabor	394 Menhaden Ct Foster City Ca.94404
7/2/2022 15:57	Carolyn MacKenzie	3384 Shasta Drive, San Mateo, Calif. 94403
7/2/2022 16:02	Pamela Segale	706 Temescal Way, Emerald Hills, CA 94062
7/2/2022 16:43	Nicholas Lamb	765 Barnegat Lane, Redwood City, 94065
7/2/2022 18:20	Chia-Hsiang Hsueh	46 Eddystone Ct. Redwood City, CA 94065
7/2/2022 18:37	Valerie Castillo	553 Dory lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/2/2022 19:11	Michael Kelso	2231 Carmelita Dr. San Carlos, Ca. 94070
7/2/2022 19:19	Scott Dolan	905 Crane Ave Foster City CA 94404
7/2/2022 19:47	Ben sangi	1326 skiff dr
7/3/2022 6:45	Christina Kidd	817 Southport Drive
7/3/2022 9:13	Gwen Thomas	813 Canyon Road, Redwood City
7/3/2022 12:30	Celia Driscoll	358 D Street Redwood City, Ca. 94063
7/3/2022 14:53	Marcelene Luna	10 Garden St Redwood City 94063
7/3/2022 16:13	Ms Cassidy	343 Hudson Street
7/3/2022 17:18	George Hubbard	161 Blossom Circle Unit 2K, San Mateo CA 94403
7/3/2022 21:26	Linda Modica	135 Rockridge Rd San Carlos, CA 94070
7/3/2022 21:55	Aileen Thompson	3705 Martin Drive San Mateo, ca 94403
7/3/2022 22:05	Kristina Ho	915 Buckland Ave, San Carlos

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
7/4/2022 0:29	Andrew Wu	31 Admiralty Place
7/4/2022 0:48	Max Guo	18 pelican In, Redwood City, ca 94065
7/4/2022 10:11	Sonia Strom	3 Antique Forest Ln, Belmont, CA 94002
7/4/2022 10:35	Vivian El Shawa	701 Freeport Lane Redwood Shores 94065
7/4/2022 15:08	Ann C Harrison	405 Cork Harbour Circle, Unit C, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/4/2022 15:38	John Tran	931 Governors Bay Drive, Redwood Shores, CA
7/4/2022 16:04	Jean Tran	931 Governors Bay Drive, Redwood Shores, CA
7/4/2022 16:31	Keith Silver	2760 Marlborough Ave Redwood City CA 94063
7/4/2022 16:32	Oscar Mace	1054 Galley Lane, Foster City, CA 94404
7/4/2022 16:52	Chris Robell	1261 Crompton Rd Redwood City
7/4/2022 17:49	Susan Kelly	1915 Kentucky St, Redwood City, Ca
7/4/2022 20:44	Minal Patel	469 Trident Drive
7/4/2022 21:47	Jiawen Zhu	586 Seahorse Lane, Redwood City 94065
7/5/2022 0:26	Bharath Sekar	303 Starfish Ln Redwood City CA 94065
7/5/2022 9:30	Ingrid Falk	480 Quartz Street, Redwood City, CA 94062
7/5/2022 9:50	Karen Coutant	633 Highland Avenue, 3, San Mateo, CA 94401
7/5/2022 11:21	Inger Bischofberger	983 Barroilhet Ave
7/5/2022 14:46	Ann Watters	233 Sonora Dr, San Mateo, CA 94402
7/5/2022 22:25	Betty Chandler	529 Breakwater Dr. Redwood City
7/6/2022 7:28	Francine Olson	300 Sea Cliff Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/6/2022 10:42	Peter Fleming	5 Cadiz circle. Redwood City ca 94065
7/6/2022 11:24	Tarah Haslett	115 Alameda de las puulgas, redwood city CA 94062
7/6/2022 11:27	June Sarchett	550 Shannon Way # 6110 Redwood City, ca 94065
7/6/2022 12:19	Sydney Dellinger	529 Breakwater Dr
7/6/2022 21:09	Shannon Dellinger	121 Shorebird Cir. Redwood City CA 94065
7/7/2022 11:48	Melissa Holder	2053 E Bayshore Rd #86, Redwood City, CA 94063
7/8/2022 6:54	David Barth	790 Lakeshore DR, Redwood City, CA. 94065
7/8/2022 9:47	Marie Comer	1815 Maddux drive, redwood city, can 94061
7/8/2022 10:10	Alexey Petrenko	11 Channel Dr
7/8/2022 10:48	Judith Anderson	108 Farallon Drive, Belmont, CA 94002
7/8/2022 11:50	Ketan Kittur	811 ,Sun Blossom Lane
7/8/2022 12:14	Shankar Subramaniam	135 Eyelet Ln
7/8/2022 14:13	Deborah Parker	2606 Hastings Shore Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/8/2022 14:42	Frank Casale	2425 Casa Bona Belmont, CA 94002
7/8/2022 17:33	Sherri Collins	809 Cape Cod Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
7/8/2022 17:34	Justin Ling	807 Intrepid Ln, Redwood Shores CA 94065
7/8/2022 19:04	Barbara McCormick	2700 Hacienda St # 324 San Mateo CA 94403

7/8/2022 20:39	Jacqueline Shen	933 Governors Bay Drive, Redwood City, 94065
7/8/2022 20:40	Erin Walsh	150 Duane St, Apt 5
7/8/2022 20:42	Vincent Conner	150 Duane St, RWC CA
7/8/2022 20:50	Kelly Tranter	354 Camille Court, Mountain View, CA 94040
7/10/2022 10:20	Laura Borden	1142 Rainier Ave, Pacifica CA 94044
7/10/2022 16:48	Dian Barth	790 Lakeshore Drive Redwood City, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
7/11/2022 9:07	Laurie Keit	135 Hillcrest Road, San Carlos, CA 94070
7/11/2022 14:33	Shayla Villarreal	1101 Salt Court Redwood City CA 94065
7/11/2022 14:34	Deborah Villarreal	1101 Salt Court Redwood City CA 94065
7/12/2022 8:18	Sandra Stoecker	740 16th Avenue, Menlo Park CA 94025
7/12/2022 17:32	Stella Loh	528 Shorebird Circle, Unit 3203, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
7/12/2022 20:34	Thahiyya Syeda	15 Cove Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/13/2022 12:05	Andreas Wolf	955 Pleasant Hill Rd. Redwood City CA 94061
7/13/2022 13:13	Susanne Marcellais	12 Alameda De Las Pulgas, Redwood City,CA
7/13/2022 13:37	Karen Lutke	2701 Hastings Shore Lane Redwood City
7/13/2022 16:44	Bonnie Courtney-Rodriguez	835 6th Avenue, Redwood City, CA 94063
7/13/2022 18:49	Jill Fraser	80 Eddystone Court Redwood City, CA
7/13/2022 19:02	Stacie Wong	3612 Santiago Street, San Mateo, CA 94403
7/14/2022 6:23	Robin Suzuki	54 Cove Lane
7/14/2022 14:28	Kimberly Schofield	91 Pelican Lane
7/15/2022 7:34	michelle sheehan	25 Pelican Lane, Redwood City CA 94065
7/15/2022 8:54	Teresa Power	36 Pelican Lane Redwood City 94065
7/15/2022 9:59	Zoe Chien	19 Cove Lane, redwood shores CA 94065
7/16/2022 9:44	ho ng	23 cove ln
7/16/2022 13:41	Connie dunham	49 Pelican Lane Redwood City ca
7/16/2022 21:41	Lisa Brody	516 Shoal Circle
7/17/2022 8:00	Olivia Austen	1090 Main Street Redwood City Ca 94063
7/17/2022 10:08	Hidetaka Kojima	56 Pelican Ln, Redwood City CA 94065
7/17/2022 14:43	Nanzhi Zang	68 pelican Lane
7/17/2022 15:38	Christine Kenny	65 Cove Lane, Redwood City 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
7/18/2022 8:01	Joyce Leung	59 Pelican Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/18/2022 8:49	Paul Chun	49 cove lane redwood city ca 94065
7/18/2022 11:54	Robert Colangelo	72 Pelican Lane Redwood City 94065
7/18/2022 18:25	Monte Mansir	48 Pelican Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
7/20/2022 15:19	Yu Li	9 Cove Ln, Redwood City, CA, 94065
7/21/2022 9:44	Pamela DeVoy	125 Eyelet Lane Redwood City, CA 94065
7/22/2022 6:12	John Johnson	143 G St Redwood City, CA 94063
7/22/2022 13:16	Juliet Griffith	153 Inner Circle, Redwood City, CA 94062
7/24/2022 20:43	Melissa Diaz	875 Woodside rd, Redwood City 94061

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Nam	Home Address
7/26/2022 9:20	Parine Fowler	590 Keelson Circle Redwood City CA 94065
7/27/2022 12:05	Lynne Torunian	125 King Street, Redwood City, CA 94062
7/27/2022 12:06	Joclyn Castor	822 Beech Street, RWC, 94063
7/27/2022 12:10	Toni Ann Secrest	576 Marlin Court
7/27/2022 12:12	Janice Diridoni	368 Nimitz Ave Redwood City
7/27/2022 12:13	Julie Kaus	400 Baltic Circle Redwood Shores CA
7/27/2022 12:14	Jeanie Cotton	1458 Hudson St. #306
7/27/2022 12:25	Jeffrey Krosse	3646 Highland Ave, Redwood City, CA 94062
7/27/2022 12:33	Patty Cullen	146 Iris St
7/27/2022 12:43	Mayra Cervantes	530 Shannon Way Redwood City, CA 94065
7/27/2022 12:52	Karla oliveira	237 highland terrace, Woodside, CA 94062
7/27/2022 13:46	Andrea Kehe	119 Highland Terrace Woodside
7/27/2022 14:40	Jodi Murphy	4040 Jefferson Ave
7/27/2022 16:30	Diana S. Hallesy	1238 Crompton Road Redwood City CA 94061
7/27/2022 17:08	Sonni Doran	180 Atherwood Ave Redwood City
7/27/2022 20:14	Karen Keefer	1720 Valota Road, Redwood City 94061
7/28/2022 8:40	Donna Wright	3430 Crestmoor dr San Bruno, ca. 94066
7/28/2022 20:46	Marina Chabg	10 Tidewater Drive, Redwood City CA94065
7/29/2022 9:38	Helen Meyer	2777 Bristol Way Redwood City CA 94061
7/30/2022 16:50	Gurpreet hazra	2068 Rockport Redwood City CA 94065
7/30/2022 21:11	Justine Yu	32 Bremerton Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
5/30/2022 9:55	Michael Garrison	516 Breakwater Drive
5/30/2022 10:18	Tianmin Jung	536 Shoal Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/30/2022 11:43	Siu Hong	512 Jetty Way
5/30/2022 11:44	Kei Tung	512 Jetty Way
5/30/2022 18:23	Mao Geng	525 Osprey Dr, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/30/2022 21:24	Burbank Jung	536 Shoal Circle
5/31/2022 10:47	SUNDANCE FRIEDRICH	802 Boardwalk Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/31/2022 12:13	Chetna sureka	2807 Hastings Shore Ln Redwood City 94065
6/1/2022 8:08	Ala Aviosnava	573 Osprey Drive, Redwood City
6/1/2022 10:56	Sasha Elzey	532 Seastorm Dr
6/1/2022 12:02	Devika Watkins	507 Starboard Drive, Redwood City 94065
6/2/2022 14:49	Anahi McKane	562 Shoal Circle, Redwood City CA 94065
6/2/2022 16:38	Dolores Salvi Schriever	812 SOVEREIGN WAY
6/2/2022 17:18	Nachuan Ouyang	804 Columbia Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/2/2022 17:36	Meilan Chen	810 constellation ct., redwood city, ca 94065
6/2/2022 19:17	Victor Jin	763 Mediterranean Ln
6/2/2022 22:49	Mo Zhu	815 Columbia Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/3/2022 0:05	Li Li	807 Columbia circle, Redwood City, 94065
6/3/2022 14:30	Pojaman Pojaman	821 Columbia Cir Redwood City CA 94065
6/3/2022 16:59	Jacqueline Parr	830 Sovereign Way Redwood City, CA 94065
6/4/2022 14:13	Mary English	5 Admiralty Place, RWC
6/4/2022 15:02	Richard Saunders	596 Marlin Ct.
6/4/2022 15:12	Joan Anway	19 Admiralty Place Redwood City, CA 94065
6/4/2022 16:26	Kimberly Dubin	639 Marlin Ct
6/4/2022 18:00	Hang Qu	819 Constellation Ct, Redwood City, 94065
6/4/2022 18:16	Cristi Summers	33 Admiralty Place
6/4/2022 18:40	Oleg Musteata	828 Columbia Cir, Hayward, CA
6/5/2022 7:56	Natasha Beilin	20 admiralty place Redwood City
6/5/2022 9:32	Olga Strongin	502 Barkentine Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/5/2022 10:02	Ron Herz	28 admiralty pl redwood shores
6/5/2022 11:08	Taninnan Thiptanakitchot	600 Marlin Court, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/5/2022 12:00	Seyed shafaatian	586 Marlin Ct
6/5/2022 14:53	Peter Budelov	21 Admiralty Place Redwood City, CA 94065
6/5/2022 15:07	Thomas De Vries	849 Columbia Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/5/2022 15:09	Mary De Vries	849 Columbia Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/5/2022 16:37	Marilyn Budevov	21 Admiralty Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/5/2022 18:44	Harold Zhang	815 Intrepid Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
6/6/2022 9:24	Phil Solk	817 Sovereign Way, Redwood Shores 94065
6/6/2022 11:24	Qianxun Wu	804 Columbia Cir
6/6/2022 11:55	Linda Manes Goodwin	817 Sovereign Way, Redwood Shores, CA
6/6/2022 19:03	Pamela M Burton PhD	806 Columbia Circle Redwood City CA 94065
6/6/2022 19:18	Mandana Abollhassani	34 Barcelona circle Redwood city ca 94065
6/7/2022 9:30	Di Wu	837 Columbia Cir. Redwood Shores CA94065
6/7/2022 15:41	Ignati Griguentch	803 Intrepid lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/8/2022 16:20	Jianhong Sun	829 Lakeshore Dr. Redwood City, CA 94065
6/9/2022 10:46	Jian Wang	334 turkshead ln, redwood shores, ca 94065
6/9/2022 20:30	Marylou Schoone	835 Intrepid Lane
6/9/2022 22:45	Laura Parker	30 cape hatteras Ct, Redwood City ca 94065
6/10/2022 0:22	Ali Navabpour	1000 Rockport Ave. Redwood City Ca 94065
6/10/2022 11:44	Steven Goodale	825 port walk pl. Redwood Shores, CA, 94065
6/11/2022 11:03	Matthew Lazar	129 Shorebird Circle redwood city, CA 94065
6/11/2022 11:48	Wei Lei	47 Pelican Lane Redwood City ca 94065
6/11/2022 18:13	Stephanie Vance	130 shorebird circle redwood shores ca 94065
6/12/2022 9:43	Allison Martin	1008 Rockport Avenue

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
6/13/2022 13:57	Jess Mendez	820 Boardwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/13/2022 13:58	Lanie Go	818 Boardwalk Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/13/2022 14:00	Jao Yu	818 Boardwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/13/2022 16:22	Claudia Fort	99 Pelican In
6/14/2022 17:04	Alice roces	1 tidewater dr Redwood City ca 94065
6/14/2022 18:09	Sylvia Barranti	374 St Martin Drive
6/15/2022 13:26	Viya Choksi	65 Waterside Circle
6/15/2022 19:09	Michael Axelrod	121 Monaco Dr Redwood City CA 94065
6/15/2022 19:17	Nicholas McDowell	854 Newport Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/15/2022 20:21	Tess Rickson	854 Newport Circle, Redwood Shores, CA, 94065
6/16/2022 21:03	Hazel Zecha	61 Waterside Cir, redwood city, 94065
6/17/2022 16:19	Marisa Gniadek	304 Sandhurst Street Redwood City CA 94065
6/17/2022 16:20	Matt Gniadek	304 Sandhurst Street Redwood City CA 94065
6/17/2022 16:20	James Strain	570 Keelson Circle
6/17/2022 20:50	Lisa Seim	145 eyelet lane RWS 94065
6/19/2022 22:14	Olga Haislip	811 Seal Pointe Dr Redwood Shores, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
6/20/2022 16:00	Patricia Novak	950 Redwood Shores Pkwy, C101
6/20/2022 16:54	Wayne Homrig	564 compass circle
6/20/2022 19:01	Terry Strain	570 Keelson Circle
6/21/2022 16:17	Lisa Chavez	1012 Rockport Ave
6/21/2022 16:24	Karen Stevenot	308 Commander LN, Redwood City, CA 94065
6/22/2022 0:04	Elsa Hsieh	867 Portwalk Pl
6/22/2022 10:00	Jason Tung	625 Harbor Colony Ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
6/22/2022 13:22	Jillian Inapurapu	4320 Cambridge Way union city CA 94587
6/26/2022 8:22	Patrick Zecha	61 Waterside Cr., Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
2/27/2023 11:51	Donald Smith	530 Marlin Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/28/2023 5:43	Beni Poon	359 turkshead lane Redwood City ca 94065
2/28/2023 18:42	Elisa Garibay	825 Marshall st Redwood City ca 94063
3/1/2023 7:39	Candace Maxwell	950 Redwood Shores Parkway, Redwood City, CA, 94065
3/1/2023 11:51	Hong Xu	1000 Davit Ln Unit 104, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/1/2023 19:53	DONGMEI YANG	133 positano Cir, redwood shores, ca 94065
3/2/2023 17:13	Elron Supelana	527 Lanyard Drive
3/2/2023 17:28	Ryan Snider	530 Shannon Way, Apt 4110, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/2/2023 17:34	Elton Yee	844 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City CA 94065
3/3/2023 17:26	Nikola Eterovich	950 Redwood Shores Parkway , Apt. C304
3/4/2023 22:40	Curtis Fay	950 Redwood Shorea Pkwy
3/5/2023 13:45	Ernest Yip	714 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/5/2023 14:11	Ka wai wong	501 Baltic Cir unit 513, Redwood City, CA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
2/28/2022 9:25	Chai Siah Ku	631 Teredo Drive, Redwood City CA 94065
2/28/2022 9:42	CHIA YIAW CHONG	631 TEREDO DRIVE, REDWOOD CITY, CA 94065
2/28/2022 14:00	Barb Lundhild	749 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
2/28/2022 16:52	Cheryl A. Brennan	371 ENSIGN LANE, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
2/28/2022 19:17	Charles Ferguson	305treedust street, Redwood City
2/28/2022 19:19	Morihiro Ogawa	305 Treedust Street, Redwood City
3/1/2022 19:04	Debbie Bianconi	375 Ensign Ln
3/2/2022 10:26	Joseph Kuspa	2017 Rockport Avenue
3/2/2022 10:55	Lei Wang	802 Boardwalk place, Redwood City, CA, 94065
3/2/2022 12:05	Yun Cheng	704 Freeport Ln, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
3/3/2022 0:05	Li Pan	531 Skiff Cir, Redwood City
3/3/2022 8:01	Jenn-Gang Chern	500 Baltic Circle, Redwood City, CA94065
3/3/2022 9:13	Gerald Patrick	300 Baltic Circle #306
3/4/2022 23:45	leila Gray	831 lakeshore drive
3/5/2022 13:22	Josh Heller	316 Treedust St. Redwood City, CA 94065
3/5/2022 19:52	Stoyan Radov	364 Genoa Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/6/2022 11:24	Ian Campbell	214 Preserve lane, Redwood City
3/6/2022 13:20	Loyal Shen	404 whisper lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/6/2022 13:21	Lily Shen	404 Whisper Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/6/2022 14:18	Andrew Baum	222 Nice Court, Redwood City, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
3/6/2023 16:39	Jennifer de Castro	449 Bark Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
3/6/2023 19:45	Ramchand Raman	330 Saint Martin Dr
3/6/2023 20:10	Sathya Raman	330 Saint Martin Dr, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/7/2023 10:08	Jose de Castro	449 Bark Drive Redwood City CA 94065
3/7/2023 16:34	Michelle Hamilton	310 hill way, San Carlos ca 94070
3/7/2023 17:05	Tara Borejka	255 Grand Blvd #2, San Mateo, CA 94401
3/7/2023 17:10	Geoffroy Raby	409-D Cork Harbour Cir. Redwood Shores, CA, 94065
3/7/2023 22:21	Peggy Biocini	3 Blu Harbor Blvd # 134, Redwood City,CA 94063
3/8/2023 17:01	Patrick Chaffin	1 Franklin St Unit 726, Redwood City CA 94063
3/8/2023 19:17	Caroline Takahashi	926 Ruby Street, Redwood City, CA,94061
3/8/2023 19:22	Stephanie Ross	434 Alden Street, Redwood City, Ca. 94063
3/9/2023 9:38	Margaret Rogers	342 Elwood St., Redwood City, CA 94062
3/9/2023 14:47	Grace Tseng	794 Lakeshore Drive
3/12/2023 6:51	Jian Han	126 Positano cir, Redwood City, ca 94065
3/12/2023 17:53	Roxanne Rewa	1504 Stafford st Redwood City ca 94063
3/12/2023 18:09	Dan Rewa	1401 arguello st,Redwood City 94063
3/12/2023 23:06	Vivek Jayaraman	385 Quay Lane, Redwood City CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
3/13/2023 11:34	Janet Mok	7 Mandalay Ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
3/14/2023 12:40	Julia Nordman	550 Osprey Dr. Redwood City CA. 94065
3/14/2023 14:20	Abhi Jha	700 Newport Cir, Redwood City CA 94065
3/16/2023 7:47	Janice Mahoney	308 Starfish Lane, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
3/16/2023 9:17	Shaz Rajput	1 Franklin Street, Apt 712, Redwood City, CA 94063
3/16/2023 19:56	Jing zhou	425 cork harbour circle apt d Redwood City, ca 94065
3/17/2023 16:31	Suaima Figueroa	450 Redwood Ave, Redwood City, CA 94063
3/17/2023 18:21	Tianyi Wang	645 Turnbuckle Dr Unit 2107, Redwood City, CA 94063
3/17/2023 18:25	Josephine Pai	14 Cadiz Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/18/2023 20:03	Xiaoying Huang	491 Tiller Ln, Redwood City, CA, 84065
3/18/2023 21:11	Todd Shintani	636 Bair Island Road, Unit 313, Redwood City, CA. 94063
3/18/2023 22:09	Virginia Padron	524 Breakwater Dr. Redwood City ,CA 94065
3/19/2023 16:07	Kay Johnson	729 Mediterranean Lane, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
3/19/2023 16:38	Claudia Karina Estacuy	412 Bark Drive, Redwood City, CA, 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
3/20/2023 10:37	Kayvon Pejooch	822 Lakeshore Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
3/20/2023 15:19	Joseph Wucher	18 Barcelona Circle
3/24/2023 11:52	Elena Fedotova	72 Eddystone Ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
3/24/2023 16:44	Karina Malykhina	554 Keelson Cir. Redwood City, CA 94065
3/24/2023 19:19	Kristin Wagshul	516 anchor circle redwood shores ca 94065
3/24/2023 19:37	Bryce Wagshul	516 Anchor circle redwood city 94065
3/24/2023 19:45	Kim Loughead	744 Newport Cir. Redwood City CA 94065
3/25/2023 13:00	Darren Kumasawa	600 Baltic Circle Unit 618, Redwood City, CA 94065
3/25/2023 13:09	Laetitia king	767 Portwalk pl. Redwood City, CA 94065
3/25/2023 17:41	Kevin Tung	601 Landmark Lane
3/26/2023 21:37	Karen Wagshul	459 Trident Drive Redwood Shores/ City, CALIFORNIA 94065

STOP REDWOOD LIFE PETITION

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
5/23/2022 8:01	William Dreyfus	811 Columbia Circle Redwood City 94065
5/23/2022 12:09	Grace Chang	10 Tidewater Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/23/2022 12:12	Francis Chang	10 Tidewater Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/23/2022 14:15	Joyce Chang	10 Tidewater Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/23/2022 16:38	Alay Banker	65 Waterside circle, ca 94065
5/24/2022 12:06	Rhonda Van	541 Shoal Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/24/2022 13:33	Carol Ann Leonard	511 Shoal Circle Redwood Shores CA 94065
5/24/2022 13:55	Frances Szlapka	511 Shoal Circle Redwood Shores, Ca 94065
5/24/2022 14:32	Mary Carnegie	529 Shoal Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/24/2022 17:36	Lara Ostroff	60 Eddystone Ct, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/25/2022 10:38	Angelita Deakin	532 SHOAL CIR
5/25/2022 22:24	Phuong Trieu	146 Monaco Drive, Redwood City CA. 94065
5/26/2022 11:07	Todd Hagen	461 Starboard Drive. Redwood City. CA. 94065
5/27/2022 15:26	Ksenia Lukanova	12 Riviera Cir, Redwood City CA
5/29/2022 18:03	Christine Chung	516 Breakwater Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/29/2022 19:11	Shailesh Soliwal	521 Osprey Dr, Redwood City, CA 94065
5/29/2022 19:13	Jyotsna Repaka	521 Osprey Dr, Redwood City

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
10/26/2022 11:09	Olya Derby	105 S. Delaware st. San Mateo, CA
10/30/2022 22:37	Prashant Sorai	3028 Whisperwave Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
11/17/2022 2:57	Jocelyn Carpio	408 Whisper Ln. Redwood City Ca 94065
11/18/2022 5:58	Alex Podell	1201 Howard Avenue, Burlingame 94010

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
10/3/2022 10:30	Bernadette Delaware	476 Fathom Ct Redwood City, CA
10/5/2022 5:59	Guillermina Castellanos	208 Mako Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/13/2022 8:38	David Mon	873 Portwalk Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/14/2022 21:23	Yvonne Sun	201 Monaco Drive, Redwood City, Ca. 94065
10/15/2022 12:35	Mike Collins	809 Cape Cod Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/15/2022 16:44	Adriana Vaughan	6 Portofino Circle -- Redwood City, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
8/29/2022 16:07	Bernard Arceo	556 Compass Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
8/29/2022 19:49	Joe Raccanello	551 Compass Circle
8/30/2022 13:57	Allene Ball	471 Bodega St
8/31/2022 17:38	Christina Umhofer	147 Warwick Street, Redwood City, CA
9/1/2022 21:58	Michele Carlsen	359 Mindanao Dr., Redwood City, CA 94065
9/2/2022 11:42	John Cianciolo	823 Southport Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
9/5/2022 14:32	Robert Carlsen	359 Mindanao Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
9/5/2022 23:09	Laura Gorran	668 Cedar Street San Carlos CA 94070
9/7/2022 13:04	heather holmes george	600 Log Cabin Ranch Rd La Honda CA 94020
9/7/2022 14:03	Gregory Kelly	1915 Kentucky street Redwood City ca 94061
9/7/2022 15:36	Tammy Alsterlind	1031 15th Ave., Redwood City, CA. 94063
9/11/2022 8:49	Suzanne DeSelover Sallie	400 Terrace Ave
9/11/2022 17:23	Susan Aloyan	806 Sun Blossom Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
9/12/2022 17:12	PK Olani	200 Redwood Shores Parkway

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Home Address
9/21/2022 17:52	Sara McNinch	455 Neptune Dr, Redwood City CA
9/22/2022 9:39	Giovanna Masarie	2604 Eaton Avenue, Redwood City, CA
9/23/2022 20:34	Denise Sink	154 Santiago Ave
9/24/2022 8:29	Mary Ann Coulson	1403 Virginia Ave RWC 94061
9/24/2022 8:38	Mike Salafia	1004 Rockport Ave, Redwood City, CA 94065

Timestamp	First and Last Name	Address
4/11/2023 18:15	Michael Umali	459 Starboard Drive, Redwood City 94065
4/11/2023 21:56	Michael Nager	371 quay In Redwood City 94065
4/14/2023 9:54	Joel Todd Hochstatter	1321 Marshall Apt 513, Redwood City 94063
4/14/2023 11:13	Jennifer Corona	990 15th ave. Redwood City, CA
4/15/2023 18:14	Natalie Stainton	400 Barnegat Ln, Redwood City CA 94065
4/15/2023 20:53	Munish Gandhi	502 Trident Dr. Redwood Shores. CA 94065
4/16/2023 10:22	Nancy Hunkeler	821 Bay Harbour Dr, Redwood City. CA 94065
4/16/2023 10:34	Nelson Fortis	28 Spinnaker place, Redwood City 94065
4/16/2023 13:24	Niharika Dixit	1006 Windfield Street, Redwood City, 94065
4/16/2023 16:08	Andrew Pierce	716 Davit Ln Redwood City, CA 94065
4/16/2023 16:24	Kylie pierce	716 Davit Lane Redwood City, CA 94065
4/16/2023 18:54	Noah Parado	2 Avocet Dr Apt 2-102
4/16/2023 20:32	Ching Ng	60 Dockside Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
10/22/2021 17:35	Earl Aiken	3033 Whisperwave Circle
10/22/2021 17:41	Qing Mao	453 CORK HARBOR CIR
10/22/2021 20:03	Shanshan Guo	429 cork Harbour cir, unit g
10/22/2021 20:04	Aiden Fang	Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/22/2021 20:07	Joyce Huang	100 Baltic Cir
10/22/2021 20:11	Xi Peng	429 Cork Harbour Cir
10/22/2021 20:26	Yonggang Jin	605 Seabrook Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/22/2021 21:37	Peipei Luo	811 Constellation Ct
10/22/2021 21:43	Yuan yue	A-417 corkharbour cir, Redwood City, 94065
10/22/2021 22:43	Yalan Zhang	409 Cork Harbour Circle
10/22/2021 23:14	Wenjing Li	624 Spar Dr, Redwood City, 94065 CA
10/23/2021 8:11	Jennifer Wang	Barnegat Ln, Redwood City
10/23/2021 11:16	Xin Li	801 Southport Dr , Redwood City, CA 94065
10/23/2021 13:03	Xuelian wei	509 Marlin Drive, Redwood City, CA, 94065
10/23/2021 13:34	Wen Zhang	14 Portofino Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/23/2021 13:59	Luciana Molinero	52 Cove Lane, Redwood City
10/23/2021 16:55	Maywun Wong	663 Island Place, RWS
10/23/2021 21:05	Lynn Carteris	314 Saint Martin Dr
10/23/2021 21:15	Lisa Yed	100 Baltic Circle
10/23/2021 21:36	Robin George	318 St Martin Dr
10/23/2021 23:11	Steven Stocker	643 Island Place, Redwood City, Ca 94065
10/23/2021 23:43	Greg Hargrove	536 Shorebird Circle Unit 5201, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
10/24/2021 8:20	Jieli Shen	469 Cork Harbour Cir, Redwood City
10/24/2021 8:25	Michael Villanueva	881 Portwalk Place
10/24/2021 9:29	Debra Carrubba	405H Cork Harbour Circle
10/24/2021 10:50	Maria & Ron Brownell	818 Portwalk Place Redwood City 94065
10/24/2021 10:55	Ting Bai	2108 Gossamer Ave
10/24/2021 10:56	Hong Chen	2108 Gossamer Ave
10/24/2021 11:03	Siyang liu	107 windlea ln, redwood shores,ca 94065
10/24/2021 12:37	Krysta Banazek	812 Boardwalk Place
10/24/2021 14:51	Jing Hong	803 Kraken Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/24/2021 14:55	Eva Pang	824 Boardwalk Pl, redwood city, ca 94065
10/24/2021 16:38	Sharon Lee	2 Gimbal Lane
10/24/2021 17:35	Andrea Levin	409 Cork Harbour Circle, Redwood City CA 94065
10/24/2021 20:32	Chris Tow	400 Whisper Ln
10/24/2021 21:43	Gaven Wang	305 Seattle Lane
10/24/2021 22:38	Sigal Eylon	235 Shorebird Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/24/2021 23:34	Olin Palmer	718 Portwalk Place, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/25/2021 7:58	David & Inga Bleich	3760 Waldo PL Upper Arlington, OH 43220
10/25/2021 11:12	Vidyut Lingamneni	255 Nice Ct, Redwood City CA 94065
10/25/2021 11:15	Emma Tcheau	223 nice court redwood shores 94065
10/25/2021 12:57	Fran Mottie	300 Mindanao Dr., Redwood Shores, CA 94065
10/25/2021 13:24	Elizabeth Tazbaz	247 Nice Court

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
10/25/2021 13:25	Imad lahham	247 Nice Court
10/25/2021 13:32	Jessica yau	258 Nice Ct, Redwood City, Ca 94065
10/25/2021 15:53	Brent McKay	806 Kraken Lane
10/25/2021 19:15	Raj Haldankar	312 Treedust Street
10/25/2021 23:55	Bruce Masker	409-G, Cork Harbour Circle
10/26/2021 0:22	Eric Johnstone	437 Cork Harbour Circle
10/26/2021 1:50	Janine Nguyen	437 Cork Harbour Cir, Apt C, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/26/2021 2:27	Kirsten Zener	417 Cork Harbour Circle Apt G
10/26/2021 2:29	Milan Bhalala	453 Cork Harbour Circle D. Redwood City, CA 94065
10/26/2021 4:47	Tom Walker	465 Cork Harbour Cir, #D
10/26/2021 5:51	Marie Pease	338 El Portal Ave Hillsborough / 445-E Cork Harbour
10/26/2021 6:36	Katie Evans	441 cork harbor cir unit a, Redwood City, Ca 94065
10/26/2021 6:51	Trevor Newman	520 Sandlewood Lane Redwood City
10/26/2021 7:09	Sandi Carrubba	405 Cork Harbour Circle Unit H
10/26/2021 7:43	Susan Torres	1459 Cordilleras Avenue, San Carlos, CA. 94070
10/26/2021 8:22	Vikki Ogden	445C Cork Harbour Circle RWC, CA 94065
10/26/2021 8:32	Kathy Gao	441 Cork Harbour #H, redwood shores, CA
10/26/2021 9:00	Sandeep Shekhawat	461 Cork Harbor Cir, H Redwood City, 94065
10/26/2021 9:16	Alan Mak	433 Cork Harbour Cir, Unit A, Redwood City CA 94065
10/26/2021 9:25	Roy& Cynthia Ilustrisimo	469-D Cork Harbour Circle Redwood City 94065
10/26/2021 10:22	Bhagyashree Shekhawat	461 Cork Harbor Cir
10/26/2021 10:23	Brigitte Aiken	3033 Whisperwave Circle
10/26/2021 11:17	Paola Costantino	461 Cork Harbour Circle Unit A
10/26/2021 11:34	Julie Rosing	437 Cork Harbor Circle Apt E Redwood City
10/26/2021 11:52	Jen Boulware	421 Cork Harbour Cir, Apt. C
10/26/2021 11:52	David SHu	417 Cork Harbour Circle Unit G Redwood Shores, CA 94065
10/26/2021 12:11	Alyssa Chen	453 Cork Harbour Cir
10/26/2021 13:00	Hisako Blair	473 cork harbour blvd F
10/26/2021 13:29	Carolyn Yim	469 Cork Harbour Cir Apt G
10/26/2021 14:07	Jackie Cheung	226 Nice Court
10/26/2021 14:32	Sabrina Leung	737 Mediterranean Lane, Redwood City CA 94065
10/26/2021 15:08	Julie Maemura-Tan	453 A Cork Harbor Circle
10/26/2021 15:09	Archit Lohokare	565 Keelson Cir
10/26/2021 16:06	Mary Rodriguez	413 Cork Harbour Circle, Apt. C, Redwood City, 94065
10/26/2021 18:29	Sarah Cheung	226 Nice Court
10/26/2021 21:00	Tommy Cheung	226 Nice Court, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
10/26/2021 23:23	Hema Batra	445 Cork Harbour Cir
10/26/2021 23:40	Ella Hwang	449 Cork Harbour Cir APT A, Redwood City, CA 95065
10/27/2021 10:00	Brittany Cheung	226 Nice Court, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/27/2021 10:57	Redwood Susan Passafiume	859 Columbia Circle
10/27/2021 14:27	Shu Wang	417 Cork Harbour Cir #H, 94065
10/27/2021 14:38	Bob Razura	429 cork Harbour Circle apt C. Redwood City Ca 94065
10/27/2021 15:44	Dhanraj Pondicherry	465 Cork Harbour Cir., Redwood Shores, Ca 94065

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
10/27/2021 16:11	Choon-mun Hooi	812 Portwalk PI Redwood City CA 94065
10/27/2021 18:09	De Liao	Cork Harbour 445 F
10/27/2021 18:10	Yingzi Zhang	445 Cork Harbour Cir Unit F
10/27/2021 20:55	Sonya Chan	450 Trident Drive, Redwood City CA 94065
10/28/2021 0:09	Mary Ellen Hills	922 Governors Bay Dr
10/28/2021 0:35	Diana Lu	823 Lakeshore Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/28/2021 9:32	Dave Pease	445-E Cork Harbour RWC
10/28/2021 10:54	Barbara Hvoschinsky	571 Seahorse Lane Redwood Shores CA
10/28/2021 14:38	Vijay Rawst	6 Dana Point Court, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/28/2021 17:40	Todd Horton	320 Genoa dr
10/28/2021 18:03	Anna Dowling	670 Island Place
10/28/2021 18:06	Dennis Fellers	865 Portwalk PI
10/28/2021 19:47	Lynda Vaughan	789 Mediterranean Lane
10/28/2021 20:24	Jennifer Dahlman	332 Meridian Dr, Redwood City, 94065
10/28/2021 20:48	Janet Dahlberg	835 Corriente Pointe Drive
10/28/2021 21:09	Peter Ministri	224 Monaco Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
10/28/2021 22:11	Clarissa Lau	449C Cork Harbour Circle
10/28/2021 22:23	Josephine Wong	832 Newport Circle
10/28/2021 22:56	Suzanne Woo	950 Redwood Shores Parkway
10/28/2021 23:08	Shibao Feng	5 Gimbal Lane
10/29/2021 3:32	Sundar Venkateswaran	552 SHOREBIRD CIRCLE
10/29/2021 6:15	GAIL Blesi	326 Quay Lane Redwood City, CA 94065
10/29/2021 6:50	Sophie Sweeney	419 Bark Dr, Redwood City CA
10/29/2021 10:21	Jane Hamlin	204 Mendocino Way, Redwood Shores
10/29/2021 10:57	Pedro Choi	6 Mandalay Ct., Redwood City, CA 94065
10/29/2021 14:13	Mary Miller	871 PORTWALK PL
10/29/2021 19:21	Nancy COMSTOCK	512 Keelson circle
10/29/2021 21:15	Li Vellinga	876 Newport Circle, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
10/29/2021 23:00	Cynthia Shannon	97 Waterside Circle
10/30/2021 9:49	David Hasselbacher	1008 Rockport Avenue, Redwood City, CA 94065
10/30/2021 15:32	Andrea apodaca	67 cove lane redwood city ca 94065
10/30/2021 17:57	Kumar Srinivasan	802 Mediterranean Ln
10/30/2021 21:51	Lisa Eliopoulos	154 Monaco Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
10/31/2021 7:35	Monique Vella	10 Admiralty Place, Redwood Shores, Ca 94065
10/31/2021 11:53	Olga Kibler	529 Osprey Dr
10/31/2021 12:09	Jennifer Kan	333 Montserrat Drive
10/31/2021 12:11	Daniel Lopez	210 Waldron Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
10/31/2021 12:12	Angelica Ayala	210 Waldron Drive
10/31/2021 14:50	Alicia Combs	591 Marlin Ct
10/31/2021 18:53	D. Evams	114 Sorebird Circle, Redwood Shores, CA 90465
10/31/2021 18:54	Jen Owen	404 Mendocino Way
10/31/2021 20:05	Andrea Evans	114 Shorebird Cir
10/31/2021 20:35	Jennifer Uyei	1 Admiralty Place, Redwood Shores, CA

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
10/31/2021 20:38	Jennifer Hom	3024 Whisperwave Cir
10/31/2021 22:00	Anh Truong	801 Columbia Circle RWC 94065
11/1/2021 5:01	Candace Chan	305 Seattle Ln
11/1/2021 6:24	Dhanya Unni	220 Demi Ln, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/1/2021 12:28	Yangyang Zhan	425 Cork Harbour Circle Unit H Redwood City ca
11/1/2021 19:07	Lucia Wettasinghe	3046 WHISPERWAVE CiR
11/1/2021 22:09	Yi Ding	819 Lakeshore Dr
11/1/2021 23:31	Erin Page	808 Boardwalk Place, Redwood City CA 94065
11/2/2021 8:14	Shritapa Datta	88 EDDYSTONE CT.
11/2/2021 8:27	Jenny Li	244 Shorebird Circle, Redwood City
11/2/2021 9:01	Karie Trainer	584 Anchor Circle
11/2/2021 9:01	Ann Dreyfus	811 Columbia Circle
11/2/2021 14:14	Ladali Wijeratne	457 Cork Harbour Circle Apt H
11/2/2021 20:44	Scott Miron	567 Compass Circle
11/3/2021 21:22	Harry Apodaca	67 Cove In
11/4/2021 9:01	Jen Vitug	152 Positano Circle Redwood City, CA 94065
11/4/2021 10:55	Shamim Haldankar	312 Treedust Street
11/4/2021 11:56	julie wentz	500 Baltic Circle, #528
11/4/2021 13:19	Laura Glover	438 Compass Drive
11/4/2021 13:58	Candace Wilhelm	300 Baltic Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/4/2021 16:36	Penelope Shepherd	13 Barcelona Circle
11/4/2021 19:44	Louise Bennett	10 Mandalay Court Redwood City 94065
11/4/2021 23:15	Michael Armanini	582 Island Place, Redwood Shores
11/5/2021 9:01	Susie Berl	158Positano Circle
11/5/2021 9:46	Harshit Shah	577 Marlin Ct
11/5/2021 9:50	Monali Shah	577 Marlin Ct
11/5/2021 13:12	Todd Irwin	558 Compass Circle
11/5/2021 20:38	JoAnn Bitting	918 governors bay dr
11/5/2021 23:07	SAHAN DEB	88 EDDYSTONE CT, REDWOOD SHORES 94065
11/6/2021 8:39	Richard Bitting	918 Governors Bay Dr
11/6/2021 11:12	Mara Zuckerman	163 Monaco Dr.
11/6/2021 13:57	Lakshmi Subramanian	802 Mediterranean Ln
11/6/2021 17:20	Lisa-Anne Wookdridge	2104 HASTINGS SHORE LN
11/7/2021 7:03	Anna Ow	909 Bayberry lane, Redwood Shores
11/7/2021 9:04	Monica Ow	64 Cape Hatteras Ct, Redwood City
11/7/2021 9:43	Ramon Quesada	202 Harstene Drive Redwood City
11/7/2021 12:37	Karen carbonnet	8 MANDALAY ct Redwood shores 94065
11/7/2021 16:16	Sarah McGregor	58 Cape Hatteras Ct.
11/7/2021 18:05	Ravneet Kaur	743 Newport cir Redwood City ca 94065
11/7/2021 20:09	Zaki Elkodsi	804 boardwalk plc R W C C A. 94065
11/7/2021 22:15	Thomas Wong	243 Nice Court
11/7/2021 23:40	Supriya Rao	831 Intrepid Ln
11/8/2021 6:19	Doris Davis	889 Bauer Drive, San Carlos, CA

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
11/8/2021 10:45	Jalpesh Chitalia	848 Newport Cir
11/8/2021 10:46	Albert Woo	827 Bay Harbour Dr, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/8/2021 11:05	Rona Gundrum	577 Island Place
11/8/2021 11:34	Gerald Wentworth	506 Marlin Drive
11/8/2021 11:36	Keith Weng	808 bay harbour dr, 94065
11/8/2021 13:42	Amruta Chitnis	252 Monaco Drive, Redwood City
11/8/2021 16:41	Kaelyn Tam	824 Boardwalk Place Redwood City
11/8/2021 17:48	Tom Lease	3906 Edison Street
11/8/2021 18:27	Joe Ganem	104 Amalfi Way
11/8/2021 19:02	Claudia Pianca	48 Eddystone Ct
11/8/2021 20:02	Peggy Maguire	508 Breakwater Drive
11/8/2021 20:56	Jiyun Luo	601 Baltic Cir, Redwood City, CA, 94065
11/8/2021 21:09	Xiaoyu Shi	701 Baltic Cir, 731, Redwood City 94065
11/8/2021 21:13	Eswar Vandanapu	1000 Davit Ln
11/8/2021 23:06	Geetanjali Ningappa	400 Baltic circle
11/8/2021 23:41	Luciana Carusso	704 Newport Circle, Redwood City, CA, 94065
11/8/2021 23:42	Guillermo Spiller	704 Newport Circle, Redwood City, CA, 94065
11/9/2021 6:44	Anita Lam	425C Cork Harbour Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/9/2021 10:51	Monika Kansal	917 Governors Bay Drive
11/9/2021 11:08	Sandra Smith	200 Baltic Circle, 222, Redwood City, CA
11/9/2021 11:53	Taroon Kamdar	501 Baltic Circle, Apt 505
11/9/2021 12:25	Charles Willin Jr	917 Corriente Pointe Drive
11/9/2021 13:19	Emily Cooper	746 Newport Circle Redwood City, CA 94065
11/9/2021 15:19	Tara Adib	1000 Davit Lane
11/9/2021 15:25	Carmen Azpeitia-Adib	823 Mediterranean Lane
11/9/2021 15:31	Danya adib	823 Mediterranean Lane, Redwood Shores
11/9/2021 17:47	Wilson Chan	3031 Whisperwave Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/9/2021 17:48	Kai Wan Kwan	3031 Whisperwave Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/9/2021 19:42	Xiaowen Ding	701 Baltic Cir
11/9/2021 19:50	Yu wen chenn	867 port walk pl., Redwood City
11/9/2021 20:30	Cindy Hsieh	32 Dockside Circle
11/10/2021 8:40	Yuanpeng Zhang	701 Baltic Circle #703
11/10/2021 9:31	Lori Heller	316 Treedust St
11/10/2021 9:47	Lisa Newman	1 Avocet Drive
11/10/2021 10:55	Yes, Laura Gotelli-faust	527 Compass Drive, redwood shores, Redwood City
11/10/2021 11:25	Tana Billingsley	26 cove lane
11/10/2021 11:46	Larry McCarty	30 Cadiz Cir
11/10/2021 11:50	Jim Vessella	206 Pickleweed Lane, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/10/2021 11:54	Patricia Mayer	704 Mendocino Way
11/10/2021 13:40	Jila Afjei	86 Waterside Circle
11/10/2021 13:58	Mahmoud Kedkad	348 Meridian Dr, Redwood shores, ca 94065
11/10/2021 14:05	Rahim Yaseen	3046 Whisperwave Circle, RC, CA 94065
11/10/2021 14:19	Marielle Bundukin	552 Seastorm Drive Redwood City, CA 94065

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
11/10/2021 14:28	Linda Perrino	2031 Seabrook Court
11/10/2021 14:38	Burcu Gezgor Lahmar	Newport circle
11/10/2021 15:02	Fannan Ashford	469 Cork Harbour Cir Apt E
11/10/2021 17:19	Lyudmila Varaksina	806 Portwalk Pl, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/10/2021 17:58	Cameron Zarringhalam	1085 Rockport Avenue
11/10/2021 18:03	Adelaide Nye	842 Portwalk Pl. Redwood City, CA 94065
11/10/2021 18:30	Josiane Cravotto	2009 Hastings Shore Ln
11/10/2021 19:02	JONATHAN OW	909 Bayberry Lane, Redwood Shores
11/10/2021 20:04	Jackie Cockreham	453 Starboard Dr.
11/10/2021 20:34	Stephanie Taylor	1014 Windfield Street
11/10/2021 20:36	Sabrina Ayers	602 Island Pl Redwood City, CA 94065
11/10/2021 21:27	Carol Dudick-Nicholas	828 Sovereign Way Redwood City 94065
11/10/2021 21:27	Kristopher Johnson	55 Fulton St
11/10/2021 22:07	Zoe Crowder	238 Shorebird Circle
11/10/2021 22:20	Henry Chung	47 Dockside Cir, 94065
11/10/2021 22:36	Ching-Han Hsieh	867 Port Walk Place, Redwood City, CA, 94065
11/10/2021 23:15	LeighAnn Weiland	814 Corriente Point Drive
11/11/2021 0:42	Tamar Spektor	204 Moresby Lane Redwood City
11/11/2021 7:44	MARY MOORE	611 Marlin Court
11/11/2021 7:50	Steven Wong	244 Shorebird Cir, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/11/2021 8:04	Yukon Fong	2013 Seabrook Court
11/11/2021 9:11	Steven Gimnicher	703 Mendocino Way, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/11/2021 9:33	Nancy Nunziati	337 St. Martin Dr.
11/11/2021 10:31	Josephine Cassidy	344 Mindanao Dr
11/11/2021 10:39	Annie Hopkins	351 Mindanao dr Redwood City ca94065
11/11/2021 10:44	Theodore CORDERY	584 Dory Lane
11/11/2021 10:52	Daniel Polsby	3016 Whisperwave Cir Redwood City, CA 94065
11/11/2021 12:00	Murray Herman	425 Cork Harbour Circle #F; Redwood Shores, CA 94065
11/11/2021 12:30	Rebecca Bridges	104 Amalfi Way
11/11/2021 12:45	douglas Herman	721 Boardwalk place Redwood shores Ca 94065
11/11/2021 13:38	Katherine Mayer	618 Marlin Ct, Redwood Shores 94065
11/11/2021 14:24	Valerie Ansara	437 Cork D Cork Harbor Circle
11/11/2021 14:52	Shima Kazerooni	310 Genoa Dr. 94065
11/11/2021 15:10	Dawn Gordon-Wylie	725 Boardwalk Pl RWS
11/11/2021 15:36	Liane Redford	99 Waterside Circle, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/11/2021 17:04	Varsha Likhite	564 Anchor Cir
11/11/2021 17:05	James Diltz	458 Trident Drive, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/11/2021 17:09	Arthur Pasquinelli	801 Mendocino Way Redwood City CA 94065
11/11/2021 18:00	Martin Stangeland	1000 Davit Lane
11/11/2021 19:47	Lewis Margolis	320 Mindanao Drive Redwood City, CA 94065
11/11/2021 20:34	Jennifer Kim	950 Redwood Shores Pkwy, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/11/2021 21:43	Cecilia Son	384 Gunter Ln Redwood City
11/11/2021 22:10	renee moresco	25 CHILTON AVE

<u>Timestamp</u>	<u>First and Last Name</u>	<u>Home Address</u>
11/12/2021 2:49	Ruth Wei	558 Osprey Drive
11/12/2021 6:05	Claudia Sarconi	19 Cove Lane, Redwood City
11/12/2021 7:25	Joel Davis	585 Shell Pkwy, Apt. 5212
11/12/2021 8:15	Jan Coulman	417 Luff Ln Redwood City, CA
11/12/2021 9:12	Meghan Coulson	816 Corriente Pt. Dr.
11/12/2021 10:29	Susan Kwong	2115 Hastings Shore Ln
11/12/2021 11:31	Lichan Wang	105 Mendocino Way
11/12/2021 11:31	Wenwen Han	819 Constellation Ct, Redwood City, CA 94065
11/12/2021 11:55	Stefania Giudici	366 Genoa dr
11/12/2021 12:09	Richard Einsiedl	541 Seastorm Drive
11/12/2021 15:22	Barbara Ramo	218 Nice Court Redwood Shores
11/12/2021 15:29	Heidi Vandermolen	530 Shorebird Cir #7202
11/12/2021 15:34	Teresa Foster	182 Sunnydale Ave.
11/12/2021 15:50	John F Nunziati	337 St Martin Dr RC CA 94065
11/12/2021 17:20	Elizabeth Damonte	414 Barnegat Lane
11/12/2021 19:30	Ellen Miller	756 Newport Circle, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
11/12/2021 20:56	Sandy Nelson	391 Mindanao Dr
11/13/2021 1:58	Jan Craig	409 Cork Harbour Circle AptA
11/13/2021 4:28	Richard Cartmell	780, Miramar Terrace
11/13/2021 11:31	Yuan Gu	579 SHOAL CIR
11/13/2021 12:16	Malu Gonzales	608 Dory Lane, Redwood City, CA. 94065
11/13/2021 12:36	Greg Lazar	804 Newport circle
11/13/2021 12:55	Jason Crouch	50 cape hatteras ct redwood city
11/13/2021 13:26	Paul & Lana Kunst	813 Lakeshore Dr
11/13/2021 15:44	Ana Nickolayeva	311 Commander Lane, Redwood Shores, CA 94065
11/14/2021 0:22	Marcela Pasquinelli	801 Mendocino Way
11/14/2021 10:00	Suzie Curtis	74 Eddystone Ct, Redwood City 94065
11/14/2021 13:48	Anna Jocson	410 promenade lane , Redwood City CA 94065
11/14/2021 15:54	Jim Chakos	871 Boardwalk Place
11/14/2021 16:19	Heydy Macias	5 Captain Ln
11/14/2021 18:08	Jingyao Li	843 Intrepid lane
11/14/2021 20:15	Ali Alp Ustun	212 Canoe Ct, Redwood City, CA, 94065
11/14/2021 22:21	Diep Tran	338 Turkshead Ln
11/14/2021 22:26	Patrice Richez	338 Turkshead Ln

Public Comment
April 24 CC Meeting

April 24, 2023

Honorable Redwood City Mayor Gee and Council Members --

I would like to start with a facts-based discussion and then bring you to my involvement and time in Redwood Shores as I express my support for the City Council to direct staff to initiate the CEQA process for the Redwood LIFE Evolve proposal submitted by Longfellow Real Estate Partners.

The San Mateo County development pipeline remains strong totaling just under 2 million square feet of office space currently under construction. However, the only OFFICE project that was delivered in the Q1 2023 was at 250 California Dr, Burlingame totaling 30,634 SF of office space. Needless to state, there will be limited new development planned beyond this coming year and if projects are approved, there will be substantial preleasing lender requirements. In areas like San Francisco, where office vacancy is high, and there is no appetite to change and modernize space needs to employment trends such as biotech; I heard this weekend from a large developer they are concerned that office vacancy may hit 40% in Q4 2023.

My personal involvement in Redwood Shores goes back to 1989 with serving on the association board managing the buildout of Redwood Shores called the Redwood Shores Owners Association; which in tandem with the Shores Business Center Association approved architecturally most of Redwood Shores; including the build out in the residential area of: schools, a shopping center, a library, a community center, a fire department and at one time a church. Additionally, I was honored to sit on the GID 64

committee as a resident representative. I mention this, because as a community we have had a WELCOMING attitude in the buildout of Redwood Shores. We have not had an entitled attitude, it isn't the way we have rolled as a greater community. I don't mean that everyone liked every project or developer; but we worked collaboratively to achieve the jewel we have today. Along the way we told people to trust the process and have an open mind. I stand before you today, asking the same thing of our potential new neighbors and an exciting industry we should embrace as our workforce evolves and shifts in the region to specialize in biotech. Initiating the CEQA process is the next logical step for this project before you tonight.

Thank you for accepting both my verbal and written testimony and my personal thanks for all that you do for our community.



Mary Morrissey Parden

mmparden@gmail.com

805 Schooner Bay Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065

(650)796-2566

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: CLK-Pamela Aguilar
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 5:27 PM
To: MGR-Alex Khojikian; CD-Sue Exline; CD-Ryan Kuchenig; GRP-City Clerk
Cc: Council-Jeff Gee
Subject: FW: On the Redwood LIFE Evolve Plan: Support

Please see the additional public comment received by Mayor Gee regarding the Redwood Life project proposal.

Pam

City Clerk's Office
Ext. 7222

From: Council-Jeff Gee <jgee@redwoodcity.org>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 5:06 PM
To: CLK-Pamela Aguilar <paguilar@redwoodcity.org>
Subject: Fwd: On the Redwood LIFE Evolve Plan: Support

FYI

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

Jeff Gee, Mayor
City of Redwood City
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA. 94064
650-483-7412
Jgee@redwoodcity.org

From: Dennis Murphy <info@email.actionnetwork.org>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 5:02:25 PM
To: Council-Jeff Gee <jgee@redwoodcity.org>
Subject: On the Redwood LIFE Evolve Plan: Support

Mayor Jeff Gee,

I write in support of the Redwood LIFE Evolve plan. Redwood City and the rest of the Bay Area have a severe housing shortage, displacement, and affordability crisis. Redwood City has shown real leadership and stands alone within San Mateo County on achieving an approved Housing Element. But to alleviate our REGION's housing problem, more affordable homes for various income levels must be built. Unfortunately, one of the biggest barriers to

affordable housing is funding, and it is critical we produce innovative solutions to build affordable new homes.

Some of the benefits of the Redwood LIFE Evolve plan include:

Investment for affordable new homes: The biggest issue cities face when it comes to producing subsidized affordable housing is the lack of financial resources. Longfellow's commitment of \$85 million, \$30 million beyond the required amount for affordable housing in Redwood City, will make a considerable positive impact on the surrounding community. Longfellow has partnered with Eden Housing, a well-known affordable housing producer, to identify potential target projects to fund. Eden Housing estimates that approximately \$10 million of Longfellow's contribution could be leveraged to produce 100 affordable one- to three-bedroom units for extremely low and very low-income families. Based on these calculations, Longfellow's proposed \$85 million contribution could generate as many as 850 affordable units in Redwood City.

Environmental sustainability and open space: The Redwood LIFE Evolve project will transform acres of surface parking into parks with expansive green, publicly accessible open spaces, as well as make visual and scenic enhancements to the San Francisco Bay Trail. The Redwood LIFE Evolve project will update its outdated office park into a modern campus designed to meet LEED Gold Standards. It will also accelerate critical sustainability initiatives for Redwood City, including the City's Climate Action Plan and resiliency goals. This includes transforming Redwood LIFE Evolve into a 100% electric life science campus and eliminating the use of natural gas on-site, drastically reducing carbon emissions.

Creating childcare access: Beyond the housing shortage, we also have a significant childcare shortage. Infant and early childhood care have been shown to deliver tremendous benefits for communities, families, and children. However, according to a 2022 needs assessment conducted by the San Mateo County Child Care Partnership Council, Redwood City lacks the resources to fill 1,103 subsidized spaces for children 0 to 4 years old because of a lack of funding. Longfellow has committed to providing \$2 million to BuildUp San Mateo to support their grant program, which directs resources to the most urgent childcare needs in Redwood City, such as subsidizing low-income infant child care and supporting teacher recruitment and retention.

There is a lot to like about the Redwood Life Evolve plan. I support it and hope you will too.

Dennis Murphy

murphy.dennis@gmail.com

Woodside, California 94062

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Carol Ford <carol_ford@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 5:46 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: RONA GUNDRUM; Contact-Sue Nix
Subject: Don't pollute the BAY!!! Stay with the Westport Plan

You don't often get email from carol_ford@sbcglobal.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

My Main concern is release of heavy metals and other TOXIC waste into the Bay by penetrating the Clay cap already on this site from days before WESTPORT, when this site was a SUPERFUND eligible Toxic Dump site.

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.** The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs
I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on

sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form.**
Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

CAROL FORD

Decades long resident Redwood Shores.

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Lisa Evans <levenchy@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 9:03 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Specific Plan

You don't often get email from levenchy@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Councilmembers,

I urge you to reject the Redwood Life Development Project and stay with the Westport Specific Plan.

I am a 15+ year resident of Redwood Shores. I love this community for its beauty, tranquility, and amazing level of harmony with the abundant natural world just outside my front door.

I oppose Redwood Life because:

-We need to keep Redwood Shores safe and beautiful and prioritize environmental health and safety over the profiteering of Redwood Life.

-The Westport Specific Plan has worked well and is consistent with Redwood City's existing General Plan.

-Highrise buildings don't belong in this unique and small scale community.

-I don't want to see highrise biolabs that present potential hazards to this community.

-The Redwood Life project threatens the sensitive bay wetlands here in Redwood Shores.

-Redwood Shores needs wetlands protection for sea level rise resiliency instead of Redwood Life's hazardous bayfront development.

To maintain a continuation of the good quality of life that is a feature of Redwood Shores, say NO to the Redwood Life development and stay with the Westport Specific Plan.

Sincerely,

Lisa Evens

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Carol Ford <carol_ford@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 9:09 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Cc: RONA GUNDRUM; Contact-Sue Nix
Subject: Re: Don't pollute the BAY!!! Stay with the Westport Plan

Dear Mayor Gee and Councilmembers,

I would like to add to my comments which were shortened due to time.
Lab plumes could cause impacts to aviation.
No effects on aviation from the very close San Carlos Airport have been addressed.
I would like further exploration of this by the City and San Carlos Airport.

The traffic impacts are HUGE. Needs further study.

Thank you.
Carol Ford

On Monday, April 24, 2023 at 05:46:17 PM PDT, Carol Ford <carol_ford@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

My Main concern is release of heavy metals and other TOXIC waste into the Bay by penetrating the Clay cap already on this site from days before WESTPORT, when this site was a SUPERFUND eligible Toxic Dump site.

I stand with Save the Shores and **urge you to *preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form***. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties

- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs
I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to **preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form**. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

CAROL FORD

Decades long resident Redwood Shores.

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Francine <taylor.francine@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 10:10 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: LIFE meeting 4/24

There are federal guidelines for life sciences but none in Redwood City.

We have had no gun ordinances in Redwood City and now we need one.

We should address LIFE concerns now.

Thank you

Francine Taylor

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Sari <sari.hamman@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 9:59 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: Stay with the Westport Plan

Dear Mayor Gee and Members of the City Council,

I stand with Save the Shores and urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. The Westport Plan was designed to minimize the impact of development on the neighboring residential areas and wildlife by capping building height and maintaining open-space views. If approved, I believe the proposed Redwood LIFE development would significantly and negatively affect Redwood Shores' natural ecosystem and quality of life for residents and admirers of the Shores community and its wildlife. I also feel Longfellow has demonstrated they can renovate within the site's existing structure under the Westport Plan to meet their tenants' needs.

I urge you to say NO to the following:

- Massive 100+ foot tall buildings built close to residential properties
- Loud rooftop generators and HVAC systems that would add to the height of buildings
- Decades of noise, light, and sound pollution from construction-related activity
- Lack of comprehensive regulations and enforcement for private BSL3 labs

I am concerned about negative infrastructure impacts, such as safety during natural disasters and emergencies, the burden on overstressed emergency personnel and services, increased power and water use, and the burden on sewer capacity. Harmful environmental impacts, including increased waste generation, gas battery back-ups contributing to greenhouse gasses, increased carbon footprint, and adverse effects on our wildlife from prolonged construction noise and light pollution at night, are also worrisome. Given the property's proximity to residences, schools, and sensitive ecosystems, I oppose unregulated BSL3 labs in this complex that may study infectious agents or toxins that could leak, dump, or otherwise transmit harmful or lethal chemicals or diseases.

Additionally, the proposed development would worsen the existing job-housing imbalance around the region without more affordable housing. Furthermore, I urge that the tenants of the Redwood LIFE campus be encouraged, or ideally required, to prioritize hiring from qualified current residents to help reduce the housing demand, ensure the community is genuinely supported, and reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. Hiring locally also has the added environmental benefit of reducing the need for commuting and reducing traffic in the area.

Again, the current renovation projects at Redwood LIFE demonstrate that Longfellow's goal of creating a life science campus is possible within the existing structure, diminishing their justification for the redevelopment project. A massive development of this scale in the proposed location is incompatible with the health and safety of the people and nature. I believe demolishing the present office complex with abundant space that blends seamlessly into the residential community and wildlife is beyond wasteful.

I urge you to preserve the Westport Specific Plan in its current form. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
sari hamman
Redwood shores residence

MGR-Crystal Tuifua

From: Francine <taylor.francine@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2023 10:10 PM
To: GRP-City Council
Subject: LIFE meeting 4/24

There are federal guidelines for life sciences but none in Redwood City.

We have had no gun ordinances in Redwood City and now we need one.

We should address LIFE concerns now.

Thank you

Francine Taylor

Public Comment
April 24 CC Meeting

April 24, 2023

Honorable Redwood City Mayor Gee and Council Members --

I would like to start with a facts-based discussion and then bring you to my involvement and time in Redwood Shores as I express my support for the City Council to direct staff to initiate the CEQA process for the Redwood LIFE Evolve proposal submitted by Longfellow Real Estate Partners.

The San Mateo County development pipeline remains strong totaling just under 2 million square feet of office space currently under construction. However, the only OFFICE project that was delivered in the Q1 2023 was at 250 California Dr, Burlingame totaling 30,634 SF of office space. Needless to state, there will be limited new development planned beyond this coming year and if projects are approved, there will be substantial preleasing lender requirements. In areas like San Francisco, where office vacancy is high, and there is no appetite to change and modernize space needs to employment trends such as biotech; I heard this weekend from a large developer they are concerned that office vacancy may hit 40% in Q4 2023.

My personal involvement in Redwood Shores goes back to 1989 with serving on the association board managing the buildout of Redwood Shores called the Redwood Shores Owners Association; which in tandem with the Shores Business Center Association approved architecturally most of Redwood Shores; including the build out in the residential area of: schools, a shopping center, a library, a community center, a fire department and at one time a church. Additionally, I was honored to sit on the GID 64

committee as a resident representative. I mention this, because as a community we have had a WELCOMING attitude in the buildout of Redwood Shores. We have not had an entitled attitude, it isn't the way we have rolled as a greater community. I don't mean that everyone liked every project or developer; but we worked collaboratively to achieve the jewel we have today. Along the way we told people to trust the process and have an open mind. I stand before you today, asking the same thing of our potential new neighbors and an exciting industry we should embrace as our workforce evolves and shifts in the region to specialize in biotech. Initiating the CEQA process is the next logical step for this project before you tonight.

Thank you for accepting both my verbal and written testimony and my personal thanks for all that you do for our community.



Mary Morrissey Parden

mmparden@gmail.com

805 Schooner Bay Drive, Redwood Shores, CA 94065

(650)796-2566