

From: [Clare Isabel Abreu](#)
To: [City Council](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Lieber, Sally](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#)
Cc: [Shaila Kotadia](#); [Sur Herrera Paredes](#); [Fatima Alejandra Pardo Avila](#); [Katherine A Preston](#); [Michael Kahan](#)
Subject: Comments on Agenda Item 3
Date: Wednesday, August 4, 2021 11:58:40 AM

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

Dear councilors,

As a Mountain View resident, I am writing to urge you to direct the city attorney not to defend the “Narrow Streets” ordinance, which would ban RV dwellers who have nowhere to go. I am working with the RV community in Mountain View, with financial and moral support from the Stanford School of Medicine CCC & AOP program, the Stanford Latinx Postdoc Association, and others at Stanford University. I hope that you have made an effort to meet your RV neighbors, but if you have not, we built a website (www.RVneighbors.org) with a response to the threatened eviction.

While the ordinance is supposedly about “traffic safety,” I haven’t spoken to anyone, for or against it, who believes this. As a bicyclist, pedestrian, and driver, I can’t even imagine having a safety issue with RVs. The ordinance is clearly meant to outlaw houselessness, which has already been deemed illegal by the courts.

Instead, this ban is an issue of racial and economic justice. It targets a community of color without the means to move elsewhere, and without providing them a place to go. They are families that work low-wage jobs to support their city but cannot afford its monstrous housing prices. Furthermore, the ban has incited vitriolic language against an already vulnerable community, subjecting them to attacks and dehumanization. The ignorant accusations that they are “dirty” and “dangerous” are hurtful. In response, their statement on www.RVneighbors.org says:

In our RVs, we have showers, stoves, tables, bedrooms and bathrooms. We pay a company to provide us with clean water and to collect the soiled water. We aren’t dirty. We aren’t criminals. We are your neighbors.

If you fight this lawsuit, you will perpetuate these attacks. Please negotiate with the plaintiffs’ attorneys, as the city of Pacifica is doing. It will save the city time, effort, and money.

Thank you,

--

Clare Abreu
(she/her)
Postdoctoral Scholar
Petrov Lab
Department of Biology

From: [Eddie Keating](#)
To: [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Lieber, Sally](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#)
Cc: [City Council](#)
Subject: Seek Middle Ground with RV Street Parking
Date: Wednesday, August 4, 2021 12:16:11 PM

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

Dear City Council –

When the Council was hearing input on RV street parking in 2019, much public comment said find middle ground. Find the streets where RVs can park with little impact. But the Council and the City's proposals did not review streets in detail. Instead, the pair of ordinances made RV parking illegal on most city streets.

Now, with the lawsuit, I hope a “middle way” outcome can be achieved.

When the time is right to consider compromises that would make Mountain View more accepting of those who live in RVs, there are many possibilities to consider:

- Your ability to compromise on the narrow streets ordinance may be complicated, since it was passed by the voters. But if a judge finds that the narrow streets ordinance went too far, there may be an opening to change it. What if narrow was modified to be 30 feet? Or instead of street width, what if not near residences became the standard?
- What if only residents/property owners on a street could request that the signs go up, and only on their side of the street? No request, no sign installed. While this would save the aesthetic impact of the signs on some blocks, it would mean that streets by a sound wall or frontage road **would** be available for RV street parking, since there is no business or residence to request that a sign be put up.
- What if RV Safe Parking was improved in number, permanence, and amenities, including providing electricity, or bathrooms with showers?
- Allow RV parking along bike lanes where the area available for parking is wide enough that even an open vehicle door does not reach to the bike lane.
- Change the size restriction - allow smaller RVs to park along bike lanes.
- The City could promote sanitary services that go to RVs where they are parked.
- The City could negotiate on the details and enforcement of its 72 hour parking rule, as well as on enforcement of other parking rules.
- Identify streets like Leghorn and Independence where no parking 2am to 6am signs could come down, to provide new street parking options.
- Seek a state or county law that requires **all** cities to provide a map of where RVs may park on city streets, or that gives a formula of how many RV safe parking or street parking spots each

city must provide.

Why I support finding appropriate locations for RVs to park.

I believe:

- Living in an RV is safer and more dignified than being an unsheltered homeless person in an encampment.
- RVs are legal vehicles. Vehicles which are allowed to drive on our streets should have legal places to park on our streets.
- The alleged or actual bad behavior of a few individuals is not a reason to criminalize a whole class of individuals.
- Those who can no longer afford the traditional shelter of an apartment have many reasons to choose to be homeless *in a city that they know*. The homeless have friends and connections that help them survive.
- There will be a growing number of homeless residents in the coming years. I hope this is wrong, but I watch wealthy landlords keep apartments empty for months while they prepare for redevelopment or as they wait for the return of higher rents. We cannot expect market forces to provide low income housing. Also, the employment side of the economy remains weak, as covid continues to affect us all. Extended unemployment can lead to homelessness. If low income jobs have been lost here, so have low income jobs in other cities. "Look elsewhere" is not an answer.
- Every city should acknowledge its homeless population, and accept them, while seeking to provide them with housing. If Mountain View or any other City takes a step forward in accepting rather than denying its homeless community members, it should not complain or worry, because other cities will be forced to do the same soon, compelled by lawsuits and by our growing number of homeless residents.

Thank you,

Edie Keating

Easy Street
Mountain View