

From: [REDACTED]
To: [City Council](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Lieber, Sally](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Showalter, Pat](#)
Subject: 11/9/21 meeting agenda item 4.4 (Agreement with Rincon Consultants)
Date: Monday, November 8, 2021 9:59:36 PM

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

To: Mountain View City Council
From: Joel Dean, [REDACTED], MV
Subject: Rincon Consultants traffic study

Ho hum. Another consultant report. Press a button on a vending machine, out pops one more cookbook environmental review. In the case of the Shoreline/Montecito/Stierlin intersection, another transportation study is superfluous. The Shoreline Boulevard corridor has been studied and restudied, and will be studied yet again when Google presents the City with its Master Plan.

Despite the flurry of sometimes-conflicting consultant recommendations, City staff developed a proposal for the subject intersection which makes a great deal of sense. The element most beneficial to pedestrian and cyclist safety is to upgrade signal hardware to accommodate protected left turn phases for vehicles coming from Montecito or Stierlin. The staff also wisely eliminated the most ridiculous excesses of the Shoreline Boulevard Corridor Study.

What happens if Rincon comes up with something radically different? I would recommend sending their report to whoever requires these endless reviews and have them stash it in their computers without reading it. Once the low-income housing is built at 1265 Montecito, the Rincon report can sleep with the fishes.

Thank you for your attention.

Gutierrez, Jeannette

Subject: RE: Mandatory Organic Waste Disposal Reduction Ordinance

From: Serge Bonte [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, November 4, 2021 7:00 PM
To: Kamei, Ellen <Ellen.Kamei@mountainview.gov>; Matichak, Lisa <Lisa.Matichak@mountainview.gov>; Hicks, Alison <Alison.Hicks@mountainview.gov>; Abe-Koga, Margaret <Margaret.abe-koga@mountainview.gov>; Lieber, Sally <Sally.Lieber@mountainview.gov>; Showalter, Pat <Pat.Showalter@mountainview.gov>; Ramirez, Lucas <Lucas.Ramirez@mountainview.gov>
Cc: McCarthy, Kimbra <Kimbra.McCarthy@mountainview.gov>; Cameron, Dawn <Dawn.Cameron@mountainview.gov>
Subject: re: Mandatory Organic Waste Disposal Reduction Ordinance

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

Honorable Mayor and City Council Members:

I am fully supportive of properly composting organic waste but the City strategy and the proposed ordinance has some flaws that need to be addressed:

1. The main flaw is how differently single family home residents and multi-family residents are being treated. I own two properties in Mountain View: a single family home where we live and a condo unit that we've been renting.

Our single family home was provided (I believe at no cost) with yard clippings bin to also collect organic waste, we received lots of education via multiple community events, we were even provided with a starter pack of compostable bags and a compost bin for our kitchen. And we've happily joined the organic waste collection family for the past 3 or 4 years?

In contrast, our condo still has nothing in place; no city outreach to us -property owners- or to our tenants. I am not aware of any plans for the management company to implement a organic waste program at this time or to what it would add to our ever increasing common charges.

As I understand the ordinance, multi-family residences will be treated as businesses and unlike single family homes subject to various inspections and enforcement measures. In a way, this feels like all carrots and no sticks for single family homes and no carrots and all sticks for multi-family residences.

I feel the proposed ordinance needs to better balance carrots and sticks.

Sticks:

- single family homes should not be exempt from noticing requirements, Many single family homes are rented either long term or short term via airbnb; long term or short term tenants need to be notified of recycling/composting practices.
- single family homes should be subject to inspection and enforcement. Because all single family homes have been participating in the organic waste program for a while now, they're probably "riper" for inspections and enforcement.
- Single family homes should also be subject to "remote" inspections should the City implement such technologies (fair is fair).

Carrots:

- Multi-family residences should not be subject to inspections or enforcements for the next 3-4 years (however long the program has been in place for single family homes); use that time for education, procuring starter kits for residents...

- To the extent the organic waste program came at little or no extra cost to single family homes, it should also come at little or no extra cost to multi family residences..

2. Another flaw of the ordinance is the lack of cost estimates, especially since all these costs will ultimately be passed to the ratepayers (and ultimately to the renters for apartment complexes)

3. Another flaw is the vagueness of the inspections or enforcement. Their coverage and frequency seems to be left to the whims of complaints or of the city. Until you implement "remote" inspection technology, inspections should be done like fire inspections (e.g. one inspection every 2-3 years, one apartment complex at a time and/or one street at a time for single family neighborhoods). You should also consider not allowing complaints based enforcement (as it can lead to all sorts of abuses and harassment, not to mention co-opting dumpster diving :)).

Sincerely

Serge Bonte

Lloyd Way, Mountain View

PS: It's a fait accompli but I wanted to state how wasteful the deployment of new recycling bins has been. The City had another 10 years to replace the bins as they became unusable. In my opinion, that money would have been better spent on boarding more multi-family residences.

From: [James Kuszmaul](#)
To: [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Lieber, Sally](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [City Council](#)
Cc: [Anderson, Eric B.](#); mvcsp.info@gmail.com; [Shrivastava, Aarti](#); [McCarthy, Kimbra](#); [Glaser, Heather](#); [Whyte, Brandon](#); [Chew, Tiffany](#)
Subject: MVCSP, MV YIMBY, and GreenSpacesMV comments on the Downtown Parking Garage Framework to the City of Mountain View City Council
Date: Monday, November 8, 2021 7:54:37 PM
Attachments: [CC-DowntownParkingStrategyAdoption-MVCSP-20211109.pdf](#)

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

[Formal letter attached]



Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning
c/o Aaron Grossman
817 Montgomery Street
Mountain View, CA 94041

Mountain View YIMBY
<https://mvyimby.com/>

November 9, 2021

City of Mountain View City Council
City Hall, 500 Castro Street
PO Box 7540
Mountain View, CA 94039-7540

Re: [7.1] Downtown Parking Garage Framework

Dear Mayor Kamei and City Council members:

The Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning (MVCSP) and Mountain View YIMBY appreciate the opportunity to address the ongoing transportation challenges of the downtown area, and see the proposed downtown parking strategy as a good framework to build on. We also found the “fact sheets” provided to be extremely helpful in understanding our downtown parking issues. While we believe that the proposed strategy is a good start, we believe that several of the proposed strategies and timelines could be adjusted to better reflect the “Equitability” and “Sustainability” guiding principles of the parking strategy. In general, this means adding provisions to some of the proposed strategies to ensure that the strategies do not result in higher VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled) and adjusting some of the timelines to better prioritize the strategies aimed at promoting

non-car access to the downtown area. Particularly, the City should actively avoid and discourage building any new parking spaces in the downtown area and focus its resources solely on increasing existing parking utilization and on improving transit, bicycle, and pedestrian options.

Our most substantial concerns are that some of the proposed strategies have the potential to increase VMT by increasing car use if not implemented carefully:

- For the shared parking strategies, we recommend explicitly tying increases in the “effective” parking supply to reductions in the actual parking supply, to ensure that we are actively reallocating underutilized surface parking lots to higher uses as we increase the parking available in underground lots. This will ensure that we do not inadvertently increase car use, while allowing us to use the existing surface lots for better uses such as parks, housing, or new public buildings.

- For the downtown parking program update (strategy Z.3), while we are encouraged to see movement towards reducing/removing parking minimums and potentially reducing in-lieu fees, we still feel that in-lieu fees for failing to build parking are fundamentally backwards. Specifically:
 - If we want to encourage sustainable transportation and correctly price the externalities associated with new parking, we should instead be charging developers when they **do** build parking rather than when they **do not** build parking.

 - Figure 4 in Attachment 1 suggests a potential change whereby there would be parking maximums for unshared parking spots, but parking minimums for shared parking. We would encourage the City to ensure that any such requirements are designed such that building zero shared parking spots is permitted, so long as zero private spots are built as well. Phrasing the shared parking minimums as a percentage of overall parking would accomplish this goal.

We would also suggest that Council consider the following:

- For the scheduling (page 84/85 of Attachment 1), consider moving the implementation of new parking standards (strategy Z.3) forwards to allow the new standards to start taking effect for new developments as soon as possible, given that it will already be a long time before new developments adhering to these standards are completed.

- For strategy M.9 (curb management), explicitly consider the potential for using existing parking spots for:
 -

Sidewalk widening

- Installing protected (or even sidewalk-level) bike lanes and provide additional bike parking
 - Planting new climate-appropriate street trees and shrubs, with a focus on native plants. This would help to address the City's biodiversity goals and address climate change
 - Community amenities, such as benches and tables to provide sorely needed open gathering places
 - Restaurant seating or other commercial uses
- For strategy A.1 (multimodal incentives), do not permit public funding to be used to subsidize taxi/Uber/Lyft rides. These modes have consistently been shown to substantially increase VMT in urban areas due to substantial time spent dead-heading between trips, which would directly contradict Council's stated goals. We should focus our limited resources on actually sustainable modes.
 - Strategy M.5 (the Mountain View TMA) currently lacks details and thus is hard to provide feedback on, but we hope that it includes plans to preemptively fund new transit service in the downtown area, especially to support evening service for restaurant patrons and employees, such as by further expanding the Mountain View Community Shuttle, or by negotiating additional service with VTA and Caltrain. Subsidized transit passes are themselves extremely important, but without good service paired with these passes, uptake may not be as rapid or substantial as otherwise possible.
 - For strategy Z.1 (TDM ordinance), consider encouraging the concept of "transit validation" for retail businesses instead of parking validation. There are a variety of ways this could be implemented, but with Clipper 2.0 coming in the next few years and hopefully enabling more sophisticated transit fare management, hopefully we can, at a minimum, establish a rule whereby any business that subsidizes parking for its patrons must also subsidize transit (or bike parking) to the same level.
 - For strategy Z.2 (bicycle parking), consider explicitly reallocating existing public parking spots near destinations to bike racks to ensure that high-value spots near destinations are allocated to the modes that most efficiently use that land.

- For M.2 (revise permit pricing), M.3 (demand-based pricing), and M.6 (revise residential permit program), include provisions to ensure that pricing and parking options are appropriate for disability placard holders.

Overall, the existing staff recommendations are a strong step forwards in improving the vitality and sustainability of our downtown area, but we hope that Council is willing to consider our suggestions to try and make the proposed strategies even stronger in their commitment to the sustainability, health, and safety of our community.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,
James Kuzmaul
for the Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning and Mountain View YIMBY

cc:

Eric Anderson, Principal Planner
Aarti Shrivastava, Assistant City Manager / Community Development Director
Tiffany Chew, Business Development Specialist
Brandon Whyte, Active Transportation Planner
Kimbra McCarthy, City Manager
Heather Glaser, City Clerk

About Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning

The Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning is a local volunteer-based organization dedicated to making Mountain View as beautiful, economically healthy, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian accessible, and affordable as possible. MVCSP member interest and expertise covers areas such as housing, transportation, the environment, the economy, and beyond! For more information, see <http://www.mvcsp.org>. To contact us, send email to mvcsp.info@gmail.com.

About Mountain View YIMBY

Mountain View YIMBY advocates for more housing in Mountain View and beyond. MV YIMBY is a group of pro-housing activists fighting for more inclusive housing policies and a future of abundant housing in Mountain View. MV YIMBY works to drive policy change to increase the supply of housing at all levels and bring down the cost of living in Mountain View. For more information, see <https://mvyimby.com/>. To contact us, send email to Contact@mvyimby.com

About GreenSpacesMV

Our focus is on biodiversity, native, drought-tolerant, and pollinator-friendly landscaping, complete green streets, parks and other open spaces, including Privately owned, publicly accessible (or POPA) park spaces, and so on. For more information, see <https://www.facebook.com/GreenSpacesMV>. To contact us, send email to GreenSpacesMV.info@gmail.com.



Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning
c/o Aaron Grossman
817 Montgomery Street
Mountain View, CA 94041

Mountain View YIMBY
<https://mvyimby.com/>

November 9, 2021

City of Mountain View City Council
City Hall, 500 Castro Street
PO Box 7540
Mountain View, CA 94039-7540

Re: [7.1] Downtown Parking Garage Framework

Dear Mayor Kamei and City Council members:

The Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning (MVCSP) and Mountain View YIMBY appreciate the opportunity to address the ongoing transportation challenges of the downtown area, and see the proposed downtown parking strategy as a good framework to build on. We also found the “fact sheets” provided to be extremely helpful in understanding our downtown parking issues.

While we believe that the proposed strategy is a good start, we believe that several of the proposed strategies and timelines could be adjusted to better reflect the “Equitability” and “Sustainability” guiding principles of the parking strategy. In general, this means adding provisions to some of the proposed strategies to ensure that the strategies do not result in higher VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled) and adjusting some of the timelines to better prioritize the strategies aimed at promoting non-car access to the downtown area. Particularly, the City should actively avoid and discourage building any new parking spaces in the downtown area and focus its resources solely on increasing existing parking utilization and on improving transit, bicycle, and pedestrian options.

Our most substantial concerns are that some of the proposed strategies have the potential to increase VMT by increasing car use if not implemented carefully:

- For the shared parking strategies, we recommend explicitly tying increases in the “effective” parking supply to reductions in the actual parking supply, to ensure that we are actively

reallocating underutilized surface parking lots to higher uses as we increase the parking available in underground lots. This will ensure that we do not inadvertently increase car use, while allowing us to use the existing surface lots for better uses such as parks, housing, or new public buildings.

- For the downtown parking program update (strategy Z.3), while we are encouraged to see movement towards reducing/removing parking minimums and potentially reducing in-lieu fees, we still feel that in-lieu fees for failing to build parking are fundamentally backwards. Specifically:
 - If we want to encourage sustainable transportation and correctly price the externalities associated with new parking, we should instead be charging developers when they **do** build parking rather than when they **do not** build parking.
 - Figure 4 in Attachment 1 suggests a potential change whereby there would be parking maximums for unshared parking spots, but parking minimums for shared parking. We would encourage the City to ensure that any such requirements are designed such that building zero shared parking spots is permitted, so long as zero private spots are built as well. Phrasing the shared parking minimums as a percentage of overall parking would accomplish this goal.

We would also suggest that Council consider the following:

- For the scheduling (page 84/85 of Attachment 1), consider moving the implementation of new parking standards (strategy Z.3) forwards to allow the new standards to start taking effect for new developments as soon as possible, given that it will already be a long time before new developments adhering to these standards are completed.
- For strategy M.9 (curb management), explicitly consider the potential for using existing parking spots for:
 - Sidewalk widening
 - Installing protected (or even sidewalk-level) bike lanes and provide additional bike parking
 - Planting new climate-appropriate street trees and shrubs, with a focus on native plants. This would help to address the City's biodiversity goals and address climate change
 - Community amenities, such as benches and tables to provide sorely needed open gathering places
 - Restaurant seating or other commercial uses
- For strategy A.1 (multimodal incentives), do not permit public funding to be used to subsidize taxi/Uber/Lyft rides. These modes have consistently been shown to substantially increase VMT in urban areas due to substantial time spent dead-heading between trips, which would directly contradict Council's stated goals. We should focus our limited resources on actually sustainable modes.
- Strategy M.5 (the Mountain View TMA) currently lacks details and thus is hard to provide feedback on, but we hope that it includes plans to preemptively fund new transit service in the downtown area, especially to support evening service for restaurant patrons and employees, such as by further expanding the Mountain View Community Shuttle, or by negotiating

additional service with VTA and Caltrain. Subsidized transit passes are themselves extremely important, but without good service paired with these passes, uptake may not be as rapid or substantial as otherwise possible.

- For strategy Z.1 (TDM ordinance), consider encouraging the concept of “transit validation” for retail businesses instead of parking validation. There are a variety of ways this could be implemented, but with Clipper 2.0 coming in the next few years and hopefully enabling more sophisticated transit fare management, hopefully we can, at a minimum, establish a rule whereby any business that subsidizes parking for its patrons must also subsidize transit (or bike parking) to the same level.
- For strategy Z.2 (bicycle parking), consider explicitly reallocating existing public parking spots near destinations to bike racks to ensure that high-value spots near destinations are allocated to the modes that most efficiently use that land.
- For M.2 (revise permit pricing), M.3 (demand-based pricing), and M.6 (revise residential permit program), include provisions to ensure that pricing and parking options are appropriate for disability placard holders.

Overall, the existing staff recommendations are a strong step forwards in improving the vitality and sustainability of our downtown area, but we hope that Council is willing to consider our suggestions to try and make the proposed strategies even stronger in their commitment to the sustainability, health, and safety of our community.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

James Kuszmaul

for the Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning and Mountain View YIMBY

cc:

Eric Anderson, Principal Planner

Aarti Shrivastava, Assistant City Manager / Community Development Director

Tiffany Chew, Business Development Specialist

Brandon Whyte, Active Transportation Planner

Kimbra McCarthy, City Manager

Heather Glaser, City Clerk

About Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning

The Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning is a local volunteer-based organization dedicated to making Mountain View as beautiful, economically healthy, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian accessible, and affordable as possible. MVCSP member interest and expertise covers areas such as housing, transportation, the environment, the economy, and beyond!

For more information, see <http://www.mvcsp.org>.

To contact us, send email to mvcsp.info@gmail.com.

About Mountain View YIMBY

Mountain View YIMBY advocates for more housing in Mountain View and beyond. MV YIMBY is a group of pro-housing activists fighting for more inclusive housing policies and a future of abundant housing in Mountain View. MV YIMBY works to drive policy change to increase the supply of housing at all levels and bring down the cost of living in Mountain View.

For more information, see <https://mvyimby.com/>

To contact us, send email to Contact@mvyimby.com

About GreenSpacesMV

Our focus is on biodiversity, native, drought-tolerant, and pollinator-friendly landscaping, complete green streets, parks and other open spaces, including Privately owned, publicly accessible (or POPA) park spaces, and so on.

For more information, see <https://www.facebook.com/GreenSpacesMV>.

To contact us, send email to GreenSpacesMV.info@gmail.com.