

City Council Questions

February 22, 2022 Council Meeting

ITEM 4.3 Fire Station No. 4, Internal Modifications, Project 20-65-Various Actions

1. How long will the modular building be used? In my experience, these have a way of becoming semi-permanent.

The modular office is needed until the offices being displaced by the expanded bathroom facilities can be replaced. The plan is to construct a stand-alone training building at Fire Station 4 and then remodel the current training classroom inside Fire Station 4 into private offices and an exercise room for Fire personnel. The five-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) includes developing a site plan for Fire Station 4, to be followed by a CIP for the design and construction of the new training building and interior training classroom remodel. It will be several years before all this work is funded and completed; therefore, the contract for the current construction project is written to provide the City with the option to buy or rent the modular office at construction completion.

ITEM 4.4 Programmatic Memorandum of Understanding Between County of Santa Clara and City of Mountain View

1. Would the city still have the option to contribute a greater amount than the county to the projects listed so that the city owns the land?

Yes. It would likely involve \$2-\$3 million per project to do so (potentially more for Crestview). The County would likely decrease their funding so the total project funding remained the same.

2. How does the option for the city to acquire the site limit the possibility of the land being sold to another public agency that could exercise intergovernmental immunity and pursue uses not subject to City land use authority?

If the County chooses to sell, the City has the first option to acquire. If the City chooses to exercise this option, it prevents another public agency - who may use the site for uses that are immune from the City's land use authority - from acquiring instead of the City.

3. Ownership of sites, since the City is putting more \$ into the Lot 12 project than the County, but also already owns the site, is it possible to have the \$2.5M difference applied to the Montecito site so that the City can own that site as well?

Lot 12 needs the City's funding of \$12.25 million for the project's financial feasibility. Currently there is no funding source identified that would fill a \$2.5 million gap if it were redirected to Montecito. Additionally, the \$12.25 million funding is included the project's Lease Disposition, Development, and Loan Agreement (LDDLA), which has been fully executed by the Developer and the City. To change the funding would require the Lot 12 Developer to agree to a different amount. Finally, the County's contribution for Lot 12 was based on the City's commitment of \$12.25 million. Lowering the City's funding could cause an even bigger gap i.e.(i) a gap resulting from the diversion and (ii) potentially reduced County funding below its original commitment due to the City's reduced funding.

4. Wouldn't it be less expensive for the City to put in more funds now to retain ownership of the sites than in 50-99 years when the land would be appraised as future values?

The additional cost of owning land now is likely to be less than in 50-99 years and the City has the ability to contribute more for projects in order to own the land. However, this would reduce funding from the County so the total funding for the project would remain the same. . This would reduce the ability of the City to fund other projects. If the City does not own the land in the initial transaction, and it continues to stay as affordable housing, there may not be a reason to do so. The only reason to do so would be if the County wanted to sell the land for another use.

ITEM 4.8 Additional Expenditures for Consultant Services for JHS Consulting, LLC

1. Is the amount for this environmental evaluation so small because it's adding on to existing evaluations?

The amount is to review and manage the various CEQA consultants and not the actual preparation of CEQA documents.

ITEM 6.1 Fiscal Year 2021-22 Midyear Budget Status Report and Adjustments, Strategic Roadmap Action Plan Update, and Fiscal Year 2022-23 Preliminary General Operating Fund Forecast

1. Didn't see anything on the renovation of the Lakeside Cafe. What is the status of that?

Renovation of the Lakeside Café is a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) project. The Shoreline Boathouse Expansion Project 20-39 will expand and remodel the kitchen, along with other improvements. This project is currently in design. More funding will be needed for construction, which Council will consider as part of approving the FY 2022-23 CIP.

ITEM 7.1 Guaranteed Basic Income Pilot Program-“Elevate MV”

1. Which cities and how many cities have completed GBI research with U Penn so far?

The co-founders of the Center for Guaranteed Income Research (CGIR) at the University of Pennsylvania were the lead investigator and are considered some of the leading academics on guaranteed income, due to their role in the completed pilot in Stockton. The Stockton Economic Empowerment Demonstration (SEED) was a two-year pilot that began in 2018 and was completed in 2020. It has reported out preliminary data at this time with final reports pending.

To date CGIR has completed 2 of 32 pilots with no more survey information being captured. The remaining are still collecting survey data and need further analysis.

2. Which cities and how many cities are in the process of doing GBI research with U Penn now?

CGIR is leading research studies for basic income programs in the following communities: Durham, NC; Newark, NJ; Los Angeles, CA; Tacoma, WA; Santa Fe, NM; Providence, RI; New York, NY; Ulster County, NY; San Diego/National City, CA; Oakland, CA; St. Paul, MN; Gainesville, FL; Cambridge, MA; Paterson, NJ; Columbia, SC; New Orleans, LA; Richmond, VA; Ithaca, NY; West Hollywood, CA; and Madison, WI.

Mayor's for a Guaranteed Income (MGI) California cities that have announced their pilots include Compton, Los Angeles, Long Beach, San Diego/National City, San Francisco, West Hollywood and Oakland.

3. Which cities and how many cities is U Penn talking to about doing research in the near future?

This information cannot be shared publicly at this time.

4. At an earlier Council meeting we were told that one benefit of doing GBI research was that we would be able to engage in the national discussion about the GBI movement. How would working with U Penn help Council engage with that discussion? In what formats would that discussion take place?

Mayors for a Guaranteed Income (MGI) spearheads the advocacy functions and the Center for Guaranteed Income Research (CGIR) does the independent evaluation of pilots. MGI worked together with the University of Pennsylvania, School of Social Policy & Practice to establish the Center for Guaranteed Income Research (CGIR). The overarching goal is to consolidate the critical learnings from GBI pilots taking place in MGI member cities to use data to inform policy change. Advocating for basic income at the local, state, and federal level; the aim is to develop and invest in narrative change efforts, highlighting the lived experiences of economic insecurity. MGI has flexible levels of engagement based on each city's time and resources.

5. What are the specific questions that the research is trying to answer?

The research questions captured through the randomized control trial are designed to better understand the effects of providing an unconditional guaranteed income at \$500 per month. The core survey includes measures of physical functioning, mental health, income volatility, spending, consumption, employment, education, job status, family dynamics and parenting, stress, coping, hope and mattering, household food security, and COVID-19 variables. The core survey design includes standard questions allowing comparison and analysis across all participating GBI pilots and will have two specific areas of questions and analysis reflecting Mountain View's areas of interest aligned with the Strategic Roadmap.

One the amazing things about the United States is the terrific amount of diversity contained within the Country—what this means, though from a research perspective, is that there is tremendous variation, whether it is related to the administration of the social safety net, the experience of financial volatility, or even every day needs. This means that as we work to determine what role guaranteed income may play in addressing needs, it is imperative that we understand how guaranteed income works (and for whom) in a variety of contexts, from coast to coast and in between. Mountain View, like other GBI pilot cities, is an important part of this picture and whether the experiences of Mountain View residents prove to be similar or dissimilar to those of people living elsewhere. This body of research is imperative to build evidence-based policies and programs that will work for people everywhere.

6. Did staff consider reducing the number of participants in order to only use ARPA funds to fund this program?

Staff based the recommendations from feedback at the study session to maximize the number of recipients with the appropriated \$1 million. While the cash payments were approved for funding from ARPA monies, the funding sources for the additional costs was noted as likely to use the unallocated General Non-Operating Fund balance or budgetary savings or a combination of these two sources.

7. How will income of the applicants be verified?

Income sources, like wages, will be verified by CSA, as well as benefits or other forms of assistance. Verification can include a pay stub, bank statement demonstrating consistent deposits or letter from employer may also be used (for those paid in cash).

8. Are the findings from the Stockton pilot listed on page 10 of the staff report survey results or anecdotes?

The bulleted information on page 10 is from the preliminary report of qualitative survey findings from the Stockton Economic Empowerment Demonstration (SEED) basic income pilot.

Link:

https://static1.squarespace.com/static/6039d612b17d055cac14070f/t/603ef1194c474b329f33c329/1614737690661/SEED_Preliminary+Analysis-SEEDs+First+Year_Final+Report_Individual+Pages+-2.pdf

9. What is the role of the focus groups referenced on page 11 of the staff report?

Internal and external feedback was sought to provide additional perspectives and to prevent any gaps or blinders. They helped staff refine the outreach plan, decisions associated with application support, and research questions.

10. How much do individuals/families typically receive from CalFresh and CalWorks on a monthly basis? How much of this is at risk if the family is a participant in the GBI pilot?

The individual families' benefits vary, and they range in the hundreds of dollars of value per month. For every ten dollars of net income the household has, the CalFresh office will reduce the CalFresh allotment by three dollars. Thus, a \$500 increase in net income from GBI will result in \$150 deduction of benefit assuming the benefit does not exceed income thresholds. The following are links to two data sets from the State of California that offer additional details related to specific family size, etc.

Links:

<https://www.cdss.ca.gov/inforesources/data-portal/research-and-data/calfresh-data-dashboard>
<https://www.cdss.ca.gov/inforesources/research-and-data/calworks-data-tables>

Staff has so far focused on securing the largest benefit waiver for potential loss, which was housing subsidies which are valued in thousands. After the program research component is approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB), we will be applying for the other benefit waivers.

ITEM 8.1 Introduce an Ordinance Requiring the Safe Storage of Firearms in Residences and Vehicles

1. Given the number of vehicle break ins, not just in Mountain View but throughout the Bay Area, why does the ordinance only require that the locked box be permanently affixed to the vehicle if the vehicle does not have a trunk? Why not require vehicles with a trunk to also have a locked box permanently affixed to the vehicle in the trunk?

If a vehicle does not have a secured trunk, the opportunity to steal an unsecured firearm is far greater, because a burglar can quickly gain access by breaking a window to access the passenger area. There is less opportunity to observe a firearm in a trunk and trunks are more difficult to access, so staff recommends requiring a locked container within a secured trunk rather than a permanently affixed container given the additional level of security provided by the trunk.

2. This ordinance applies to all vehicles in Mountain View meaning vehicles that are not owned by Mountain View residents but are in Mountain View, whether driving through or parked in the city, correct?

The ordinance will apply to all unattended vehicles in the City of Mountain View.

3. Will all residents be notified of the new ordinance or just residents who own firearms?

Following adoption of the ordinance, the postcard mailer will be sent to all residents, regardless of gun ownership.

4. Approximately how much does a gun safe cost and how large are they?

Vehicle gun safes range from \$40.00 to \$800.00 based on the size, quality, and included safety measures. This does not include the cost to secure the gun safe to the vehicle, for vehicles without a trunk.

A vehicle gun safe that can store multiple handguns or rifles, on average, are as large as: 7.00" H x 42.00" W x 13.00" D. A vehicle gun safe that is meant to store a single handgun, on average, is as small as: 3.00" H x 7.00" W x 8.00" D.

ITEM 8.2 Commercial Development at 756 California Street

1. Do the TDM programs aim to reduce overall vehicle usage, or vehicle usage at peak hours?

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs provide incentives or requirements for travelers to make the most effective use of transportation networks by shifting travel by mode and time of day to take advantage of available roadway capacity and reduce congestion. Peak hours are where the most roadway congestion occurs so shifting vehicle trips to a different mode or to off-peak hours reduces congestion during these peak hours. Some TDM measures may reduce total vehicle trips as well, such as employee telecommute options.

2. Is Condition 14 relevant? Or is this just a standard condition that is left in all conditional approvals and is just ignored if it doesn't apply? 14. PARKING MANAGEMENT PLAN: Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall develop a parking management plan describing parking allocation for the commercial uses on the project site, subject to administrative approval by the Zoning Administrator prior to building permit issuance.

Correct, this condition does not apply to this project and is a standard condition of approval.

3. Will the dentist continue to practice in MV during the construction? Has he found a temporary place to move?

The applicant is currently renting an existing dental office at 471 Castro Street and would continue to do so until the project is completed and ready for occupancy.