

Flynn, Allison

From: William Lambert
Sent: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 12:08 PM
To: prc@mountainview.gov
Subject: Agenda Item 5.2 Dec-8-2021

CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL - Ensure you trust this email before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Park and Recreation Commissioners,
I would like to comment on Agenda Item 5.2 on this evening's agenda.

In the Park Mid-Year Update as in previous park/open space accounting, school property is included in the accounting of city park and open space.

I question whether this is an accurate way to present the information. School property is not accessible to the public between 7 AM to 4 PM during the weekdays or during other hours as needed for school use. This restriction has been reinforced by the recent installation of locked perimeter fencing around each of the schools (with at the present time the exception of Monta Loma). MVWSD property represents a substantial (around 66%) amount of park and open space within walking distance of resident's home. In north Mountain View, the MVWSD properties represent nearly all of the park and open space. Also, particularly in north Mountain View, after school hours and during the weekends, the fields are heavily used by youth sports teams, thereby limiting use of the fields to local residents.

The accounting gives residents a conflicting message. On the one hand the City's accounting suggests that school property are city parks and there is if not ample, at least more park space than there otherwise would be. However, these "parks" are not available to the public much of the time. Furthermore, to my knowledge there is no long term Joint Use Agreement in place, which means that the MVWSD could at any time need to use their properties, and make the green spaces completely unavailable for public use as city parks. In view of the projected growth in Mountain View, the MVWSD will also certainly need their land to expand the school campuses.

The City's accounting does a disservice to the community because it suggests that there is a substantial amount of city park and open space, when in fact there is much less, i.e., 66% less.

I suggest that there is no need to delve into this issue now, as it deserves to be addressed in full during the Park and Open Space Plan Update.

Thank you for your service to the community.
Bill

William Lambert

Attention: This message is sent by a law firm and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If you received this transmission in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message and any attachments.