

From: [Marguerite Nguyen Lehman](#)
To: [City Council](#); [City Clerk](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#)
Subject: Item 6.2 – Amendments to Mountain View City Code 19.72
Date: Monday, February 13, 2023 5:58:06 PM

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

Dear council members,

I would like to voice my strong opposition to the proposed amendments to city code 19.72. The proposed 24-hour-no-return would end up disproportionately targeting people living in vehicles and those living in apartments with insufficient parking spaces for residents, thereby criminalizing poor and non-landowning residents of Mountain View.

The spirit of 19.72 is to prevent abandoned vehicles from accumulating on the streets, and if someone moves the vehicle every 72 hours, or lives in their vehicle, that vehicle is clearly not abandoned. The proposed amendment is not in line with the spirit of 19.72.

I think the proposed amendments empowers vigilantes who simply don't want vehicles regularly parked on a particular street. I've seen that on my own street, Ortega, where my landowning neighbors have targeted people living in RVs using the 72-hour rule, photographing RVs' locations and surveilling them. And they have specifically named their reason being to improve property values and get rid of vehicles they deem undesirable due to their age, size, and/or function (housing). Notably, the properties that are not rentals on Ortega have designated parking lots and, previous to RVs moving to Ortega, have not invoked the 72 hour rule--so it seems they're not worried about scarce parking, but truly only interested in penalizing and displacing RV residents, and weaponizing 19.72 to do so.

I urge you to not adopt the proposed amendments to 19.72.

Best,

Marguerite



Mountain View

--

Marguerite Nguyen Lehman
(they/she)

From: [Maxwell Sutton](#)
To: [City Clerk](#); [City Council](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#)
Subject: Item 6.2 – Amendments to Mountain View City Code 19.72
Date: Monday, February 13, 2023 8:25:01 PM


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

Dear Council Members,

I am strongly opposed to the proposed 24-hr-no-return amendment to city code 19.72. I believe this altered interpretation of the code will negatively impact folks living in their vehicles and renters that often depend on street parking adjacent to their residence. People living in their vehicles will face the greater disruption to their lives, the risk of forced displacement every 3 days.

My understanding is that 19.72 was intended to help manage/deter the accumulation of abandoned vehicles on public streets. If the new amendments come to pass, 19.72 could instead be weaponized to criminalize and displace people that live in their vehicles. I have already seen similar behavior taking place on the street that I live, Ortega Ave. Several of my home-owning neighbors have used the current interpretation of the 72-hour rule to target people living in RV's on my street. The proposed amendment to 19.72 would only serve to further embolden this targeted harassment of poorer residents.

I emphatically suggest you not approve the proposed amendments to code 19.72.

Best,
Maxwell

Mountain View

From: [Valerie Fenwick](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [, City Attorney](#)
Subject: Re: Item 6.2 – Amendments to Mountain View City Code 19.72
Date: Monday, February 13, 2023 9:03:21 PM

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

Dear Mayor Hicks and esteemed Mountain View Council


I am speaking on my behalf, neither as a member of the MV B/PAC nor as a representative of my employer.

I am writing to express my deep concerns about the proposed changes to the 72-hour parking restriction and the addition of the "no return" clause.

- Many homes in my neighborhood are multi-generational and have vehicles in the driveway and on the street. Are we not allowed to park in front of our homes and complexes?
 - Several homes in my neighborhood have converted garages into bedrooms, further limiting the parking at the residence.
- Complaint-based enforcement will unfairly target people who are living in their vehicles. I see the threads on Next Door already targeting people in my neighborhood.
- I see inhabited vehicles every day, and I see those same individuals driving to work. Finding a safe place to park is the number one priority of most vehicle dwellers. With our "Narrow Street" ordinance already in place, there are fewer places to park.

I moved to the Bay Area in 1997. At that time, I had a good-paying, high-tech job and used up one entire paycheck each month to rent a small one-bedroom apartment. Behind the Lucky grocery next door to my apartment, the street was full of vehicle dwellers. Then and now, these were working people. I saw them head out & return every day, and they had a safe place to park, near groceries and restrooms. They were my neighbors.

Please do not enact this confusing ordinance. It isn't helpful for any of the residents in Mountain View.

I appreciate your consideration
Valerie Fenwick


From: [James Kuszmaul](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Item 6.2 72-hour rule update
Date: Monday, February 13, 2023 9:13:15 PM

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

Mayor Hicks & Councilmembers,

While updating the so-called "72-hour rule" to clarify some of the language to make it clearer and allow for easier and more consistent enforcement is not unreasonable, it is (a) unclear that the proposed changes meaningfully improve the rule and (b) if we are inclined to revisit the rule, there are better options.

In particular, given that it is not clear that Mountain View has a significant abandoned vehicle problem, it seems like a far more straightforward **short-term** improvement would be to simply extend the 72-hour parking limit to, e.g., 3-6 months. Doing so would still allow the police department to cite and tow truly abandoned vehicles while avoiding penalizing our RV neighbors for trying to live their lives. The status quo is one where RV residents must go through an absurd rigamarole every few days to be allowed to live our streets--complicating their lives and needlessly burning gasoline. There are likely also other minor tweaks to the rules that could be made to allow for simpler and easier to understand enforcement (e.g., it's not clear what a 1,000ft radius in particular achieves), but I would leave discussion of those particulars to those who better understand the on-the-ground situation.

With regards to a **longer-term** strategy (where we can perhaps consider more substantial changes to our city's parking strategy), I can only hope that over the next 5-10 years there will no longer be a significant need for people to use RVs parked on city streets to find affordable housing in our city. As that happens, and as our city grows by >30% in the next 8 years, we will need to be considering how best to manage our street space, especially what is current on-street parking. There are already areas of the city with significant parking congestion, and the number of areas with parking congestion will only increase over time. Additionally, as density increases, the value of using street-space for other uses will only increase, including (but not limited to):

- Adding designated loading-zones separate from parking (to prevent double-parking by delivery vehicles).
- Improving bus stops.
- Widening sidewalks (whether along their whole length or just in targeted spots to, e.g., allow for more clearance around telephone poles, fire hydrants, and electrical boxes).
- Improving, adding, and protecting bike lanes.
- Adding street-side public amenities like benches, water fountains, bicycle parking, trash cans, restrooms, trees, parklets etc.
- Leasing the space for outdoor dining/seating for businesses; or, equivalently, selling permits to street vendors to be able to do business on the street.
- Narrowing the street right-of-way and using the freed land for development (whether for city buildings, building bigger parks, or selling/leasing land to developers).

Ideally, any long-term strategy would both encourage these higher uses while also ensuring that parking is available for those who need it. The standard method for doing this would involve placing some minimum price on parking on city streets, with the price equal for everyone (and then if someone did really want to live in their vehicle, or abandon their vehicle on the street, they could do so but would be paying for it); any unused spots would be repurposed for the aforementioned uses (on the basis that if people aren't willing to pay an appropriate price for parking, then valuable city land is better put to other uses rather than subsidizing car use).

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,
James Kuszmaul

From: [Alexander Gotsis](#)
To: [City Clerk](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Matchak, Lisa](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#)
Subject: Item 6.2 – 72 Hour Rule
Date: Monday, February 13, 2023 9:59:51 PM

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

Hi City Council,

I won't be able to make tomorrow's meeting. I wanted to articulate my opposition to the proposed amendments to city code 19.72.

I believe that the existing code is sufficient, and that enforcing a 24 hour non-return requirement is nonsensical. I do believe existing code allows for the requirement that the vehicle has moved - and odometer is sufficient.

I live on [REDACTED] in Mountain View - and more often than not I end up parking my vehicle in the same 1-2 spots on the street closest to my apartment. I don't have issues finding parking most of the time. I don't need to have the additional mental overhead of remembering which spot I was in yesterday after spending Fri- Sun parked outside.

Additionally, I believe that recent neighborhood discussions have made clear that this amendment is a maneuver to be able to more easily harass those legally parked oversized vehicles. I have confidence that my vehicle would not be harassed, but there are those around who call and report only specific vehicles.

Again, I implore you to reconsider this amendment. I don't see any benefit to those it affects, at least in my corner of Mountain View, and I believe it is clear that any proponents are not being truthful about all of their motives.

Thank you,
Alex Gotsis

From: [Sebastian Brisbois](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 6.2 - Amendments to Mountain View City Code Section 19.72
Date: Tuesday, February 14, 2023 7:00:32 AM

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

Mountain View City Council Members,

I oppose the proposed amendments to the 72-hour parking regulation because they will strengthen an already unjust law. I had never heard of the 72-hour parking regulation until after the enforcement of Measure C was started. It is clearly being used to target people living in their vehicles. If the spirit of the law is to clean up abandoned vehicles on city streets then it should never be used to tow peoples' vehicles if they are living in them. A vehicle cannot be abandoned if someone is living in it. This is just going to continue the displacement of low income people from Mountain View.

This law also goes against the way things are going and need to be going in the world at this time. Many people now work from home due to the pandemic and so they don't need to drive everyday. Why should they be inconvenienced to move their car if they are staying home? Additionally, we should not be encouraging people to move their vehicles and drive because of the contribution vehicles have on climate change. Leaving vehicles parked for more than 72 hours is actually a good thing.

This law is also frustrating for me personally. Although I drive to work most weekdays there are still times I would like to leave my car parked on the street for more than 72-hours. This complicates taking vacation without my car. I live in an apartment and share a parking space with my partner so I do not have the luxury of always having a place to park my car off the street. I'm sure there are many other Mountain View residents in this type of situation.

The 72-hour parking regulation should instead be amended to not harass all Mountain View residents who aren't fortunate enough to have a parking spot for their vehicle. I question if it should even exist in any form because of the way some in Mountain View want to weaponize it for purposes it wasn't originally intended for. It has an especially bad impact on people who are forced to live in their vehicles. Imagine if you had to change where you were living every 72 hours.

Sebastian Brisbois
Mountain View Resident

From: [i-](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Public comment on agenda item 6.2
Date: Tuesday, February 14, 2023 9:43:07 AM

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

Any law which relies on community complaint will be enforced inequitably.

The 72 hour parking restriction cannot be enforced proactively. It is not practical. So it necessarily relies on complaints from the community to be enforced. It will be enforced selectively.

Council should consider other solutions which are easier to enforce and can be enforced proactively and equitably. For example the RPPP would be much easier to enforce as vehicles in violation are easily identifiable.

Thanks,
Isaac Stone

PS. Agenda was missing the usual blurb about emailing this address for public comment. I hope my comment is valid and the email instructions were left off by mistake.