

May 2, 2023

EPC Chairperson Joyce Yin and Commissioners,

I am writing this letter in my personal capacity.

I would like to provide comments on EPC Agenda Item 5.1 Google North Bayshore Master Plan for the Environmental Planning Commission meeting on May 3, 2023. I will not be able to attend this meeting due to a business commitment but will plan to participate virtually.

I have carefully read the Staff Report and scanned Exhibits 1-10.

I specifically would like to comment on the provision for schools and for public park space.

### **Schools**

The proposal provides for the allocation of a 4.1 acre parcel valued at approximately \$43M for potential use as a school. The applicant would dedicate the parcel as a community benefit to meet the Bonus FAR requirements and the City would explore the use of this site for a future school in which case the City would lease the parcel to the school district.

The parcel is small for the size of a typical elementary school in Mountain View of about 500 students. State law will now require that school districts also provide pre-school programs. The district's experience with Vargas Elementary School confirms that four acres is inadequate.

The proposed arrangement to have the City lease the land to the district prevents the school district from planning. The future of the elementary school will be at the discretion of the city. I would like to see the 4 acre parcel be dedicated directly to the district, or at least have clearly defined conditions under which the parcel would be leased to the district.

There has been much discussion about schools in North Bayshore and not just associated with Google but also with the other developments. Some will say that there will be no students, others will say that there will be many, and one can select a demographer to get the answer one wants. The Mission Bay Development in San Francisco is instructive. See the attached links following this letter.

In short, with UCSF and various biotech firms moving into the area, housing was included. A 2.2 acre parcel was set aside for a school expecting never to be used and any way what few kids there were could take a 30-minute walk to nearby K-5 or K-8 schools. Chase Center got built but no schools. There are currently 300 students living in Mission Bay and the number is expected to rise to about 1,000 over the next few years. The school has not even been finished and there is a waiting list. This makes perfect sense when you think about it. The cost of housing is so expensive that young professionals still cannot afford to move into a condo or house, and will make do with what they can afford and raise a family.

Right now there is perhaps a plan for a single elementary school in North Bayshore. The district expects North Bayshore to generate enough students for 3 elementary schools and 1 middle school. Of course this will not happen over night but during the 20 years of the build out. If there are very few children then we have nothing to worry about. But if it turns out there will be many students, what are the plans. Where will new schools go. We can't predict the future, but we can plan for contingencies. We are talking here about the education of our children and the health and well-being of our families.

### Parks and Open Space

Google has set aside 35.7 acres of park land of which 26.1 acres will be public parks and opens spaces, which includes 14.8 acres dedicated to the City as public parks, and 11.2 acres as POPAs. Of this 4.1 acres will potentially be used as a school site. Note that this amounts about 1.8 acres of park land per 1,000 residents (26/14) (assuming 7,000 units generates 14,000 residents give or take), which is below the City target of 3 acres/1,000 residents, and means that the city is loosing park and open space with this project.



It is instructive to look at what kind of “parks” the 26.1 acres is use for. This can be understood by referring to the map, above, and Table 3 of the Staff Report.

**Table 3: Parks and Open Space Proposal**

Park or Open Space Name	Neighborhood	Phase	Size (acres)	Description
Greenway Park (West and East) POPA	Shorebird	Phase 1	±1.8 ac	A combination of open space pockets could provide opportunities for recreation, gathering, informal seating, and spill out from adjacent buildings.
Greenway Park (East) POPA	Shorebird	Phase 3	±0.7 ac	
Eco Gem Public Park	Shorebird	Phase 2	±10.8 ac	Envisioned as an ecological reserve and to be prioritized.
Shorebird Wilds POPA	Shorebird	Phase 2	±4.5 ac	A transitional open space and urban meadow that could bridge the urban character of Greenway Parks and wilder character of the Eco Gem. Could provide opportunities for nature play, public art, botanic display, and social seating.
Shorebird Square Public Park	Shorebird	Phase 2	±0.3 ac	A neighborhood pocket park could accommodate community-serving programs such as playscape and community garden allotments.
The Portal POPA	Joaquin	Phase 1	±0.8 ac	An intimate corridor along the Green Loop framing an arrival and entry experience to Joaquin Commons.
Joaquin Grove POPA	Joaquin	Phase 4	±1.4 ac	A flexible and multifunctional outdoor space could provide privacy to residential frontages while hardscaped social gathering areas and program decks along office frontages enable spill out activation.
Joaquin Commons Public Park	Joaquin	Phase 5	±2.6 ac	A large flexible open space that could accommodate a variety of programs and

Park or Open Space Name	Neighborhood	Phase	Size (acres)	Description
				users for year-round activation.
Joaquin Terrace (east) POPA	Joaquin	Phase 7	±1.3 ac	A sequence of social gathering spaces that could provide spill-out opportunities to the adjacent office block.
Joaquin Terrace (west) POPA	Joaquin	Phase 7	±0.9 ac	
Gateway Plaza Public Park	Joaquin	Phase 8	±0.9 ac	A small, corner open space in dialogue with neighboring Gateway Plaza that could host rotating pop ups, kiosks, or events on a program deck.
Shoreline Square Public Park	Joaquin	Phase 8	±0.3 ac	Envisioned as a quiet neighborhood pocket park lined with tree groves could buffer adjacent streets and social seating along building interfaces.
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>±26.1 ac</b>	

Now, 10.8 acres is an ecological reserve (Eco Gem Public Park) and 4.5 acres is an urban meadow (Shoreline Wilds POPA). That leaves about 40% of the park land left. Of this, 3.9 acres are spread among six (6) micro-parks of less than 1 acre in size. At 2.6 acres, only Joaquin Commons Public Park qualifies as a “large flexible open space.”

Where are the tot lots, the swings, the picnic areas, the soccer fields, the baseball and softball diamonds, the tennis courts, the frisbee fields, the trees and open space, and not to forget the pickle ball courts, etc. We talk about building a community, a place where people can work, recreate, raise a family, and nurture our mental and physical health. Yes, this is all next to the Shoreline Wildlife Preserve, the golf course, and the lake, but these are other types of open space and serve other purposes.

When you look at it this way, Google (and the City) are only providing about 0.8 acres/1,000 residents worth of recreational area.

This is not right.

I look forward to hearing tomorrow night’s discussion.

Bill Lambert

Mountain View, CA 94043

## MISSION BAY

"The neighborhood plan set aside a 2.2-acre parcel for a school, a fenced-in lot bordered by Owens Street, Sixth Street and Nelson Rising Lane."

<https://www.sfusd.edu/schools/schools-community/school-mission-bay>

Note that the City of SF made the same assumptions Google is for North Bayshore when doing the planning for Mission Bay. Also, did not build enough three bedroom units, just like at North Bayshore. People want that third bedroom for a study or a guest bedroom but the builders don't build a lot of them.

From 2016 when first apartments were opening:

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/nevius/article/New-kids-on-the-block-weren-t-in-the-plans-for-6922874.php>

"For instance, there's no elementary school nearby. Two schools — Bessie Carmichael, a K-8, and Daniel Webster, a K-5 — are 30-minute walks away, according to Google Maps."

2019 - Chase center but no school

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/As-Warriors-Chase-Center-opens-Mission-Bay-14376639.php>

"Currently, about 300 SFUSD students live in Mission Bay, and the district expects that number to rise to 764 to 1,100 over the next five years, according to a study by Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographic Research."

From 2019 as the number of families increased:

<https://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/In-SF-s-Mission-Bay-the-surprise-and-draw-13657106.php>

Excellent example of what North Bayshore should not do: assume families won't live there.



# **CARPENTERS LOCAL UNION 405**

**SERVING SANTA CLARA & SAN BENITO COUNTIES**

April 20, 2023

City Hall, First Floor  
Attn: Diana Pancholi, Principal Planner  
500 Castro Street  
Mountain View, CA 94011  
VIA EMAIL: [diana.pancholi@mountainview.gov](mailto:diana.pancholi@mountainview.gov)

**Re: Comment in support of Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for Google North Bayshore Master Plan**

Dear Ms. Diana Pancholi,

The members and officers of Carpenters Union Local 405 (“Local 405”) appreciate the opportunity to offer **comment in support** of the City of Mountain View’s Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Google North Bayshore Master Plan.

Our members have a direct interest in securing high-road job opportunities and investments in their local communities. Local 405 is proud to count many Mountain View and Santa Clara County residents among its membership ranks, including those who live and/or work in the vicinity of the project. This transformational project will create sustainable work for our members, whose skills will help build a robust, interconnected development for the community.

Numerous mitigation measures that the City has identified in relation to the project’s construction phase will rely on effective collaboration between contractors and the various public agencies implicated by topics covered in the FEIR. The selection of responsible contractors for this project gives Local 405 confidence that these mitigation measures will be successfully implemented. Indeed, **Local 405 commends the City’s analysis of both the construction and operational phases of the project in its FEIR**, and looks forward to the economic and social benefits that this project will bring to the community.

The North Bayshore project is a unique project that can address pressing community needs in Mountain View while investing in a long-term, sustainable, economic future. Local 405 looks forward to helping build this transformational project.

Sincerely,

Douglas M. Chesshire  
Senior Field Representative  
Carpenters Local 405  
CC: Planning Division: [planning.division@mountainview.gov](mailto:planning.division@mountainview.gov)

---

**From:** Kristina Pereyra  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 3, 2023 8:09 AM  
**To:** [epc@mountainview.gov](mailto:epc@mountainview.gov)  
**Subject:** Agenda item 5.1

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

With kind regards to the Environmental Planning Council:

My family and I have lived in the Shoreline West neighborhood of Mountain View since before 2000. We've witnessed our neighborhood lose many working-class families as the rents and housing prices escalated. We only barely managed to stay in our home, thanks to rent control enacted in 2015.

When Google presented its plan for additional housing, it seemed it was finally taking responsibility for the jobs-housing imbalance that it helped create. City government was also responsible for the lack of housing. The project gave both an opportunity to correct their mistakes. Now we learn that Google is revising its plan and recinding the affordable-inclusionary housing contribution they had promised.

The city has two options here. 1) Continue the mistakes of the past which drive out working families, or 2) hold fast to their duty and provide homes for their residents. Some of my former neighbors are still in Mountain View, sleeping on couches or in vehicles, keeping their jobs and friends and support system. Our city just needs to provide housing - as required by state law. If Google wants city-provided concessions for its project, it should be required to provide the affordable-inclusionary housing the city needs.

Kristina Pereyra  
Shoreline West resident



May 2, 2023

Re: Item 5.1 – Google North Bayshore Master Plan

Dear Chair Yin and Members of the Environmental Planning Commission:

The LWV supports increasing the stock of affordable housing to reduce the number of residents at risk of becoming homeless.

While we are supportive of faster timelines for housing projects and affordable housing land dedications, we are concerned about the removal of the inclusionary units (previously proposed) in the public benefit package. The removal reduces the opportunity to integrate people of different income levels in the project.

The City has already made a strong effort, through the Housing Element, to streamline and reduce costs to meet its RHNA goals. A critical factor in achieving the low income RHNA targets is that the developer selected can secure additional funding (through State grants or tax credits) in time to build the project by 2030 and avoid an additional financial impact on the City.

Funding and timelines are uncertain, but the inclusionary units are critical to make this an equitable project. We ask the applicant and the City to find a way to restore some of the inclusionary units.

Thank you for your consideration.

(Please send any questions about this email to Kevin Ma at [housing@lwvlamv.org](mailto:housing@lwvlamv.org))

Karin Bricker, President of the LWV of Los Altos-Mountain View Area

cc: Diana Pancholi      Aarti Shrivastava

Dear Environmental Planning Commissioners

I am writing to express the Los Altos Mountain View Community Foundation's concern with Alphabet's decision to revise its plan for the North Bayshore project, particularly its reduced contribution of affordable housing. The original plan proposed a contribution of 20% affordable housing, with a quarter of that being constructed as inclusionary units. However, the revised plan only includes a 15% contribution for affordable housing, which does not include actual building construction, but rather only deeds land.

As you know, Mountain View is in dire need of affordable housing, a need that has been exacerbated by the presence of Google in our city. The proposed 15% contribution may meet the minimum legal obligation for the new development, but it does not fulfill the city's actual need for affordable housing stock. Furthermore, it does not compensate the city for the significant concessions it has made to this development, including the 30-year development agreement.

We don't feel it's appropriate for 5% inclusionary units, which had been promised as part of the Public Benefits Package in the 30-year Development Agreement, to just evaporate. Rather, we suggest that the City of Mountain View and Alphabet continue to explore ways to meet this goal - either partially or in its entirety. We recognize that Alphabet faces continued financial pressures. However, stepping away from the commitment to provide 5% inclusionary housing - approximately valued at \$50M - at the last moment, means the City will have to address this gap on its own.

We urge the Commission to continue to work with Alphabet in meeting its original commitment to affordable housing. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Adin Miller

CEO

Los Altos Mountain View Community Foundation



Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning  
c/o Aaron Grossman

May 3, 2023

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

Re: Google North Bayshore Master Plan

Dear Chairperson Dempsey and Environmental Planning  
Commissioners:

The Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning (MVCSP) appreciates the opportunity to respond to the Google North Bayshore Master Plan. After over 10 years of advocacy for transforming North Bayshore from a typical auto-oriented suburban business park to a vibrant, walkable mixed use place, MVCSP strongly supports the Google North Bayshore Master Plan (Master Plan) and urges the City Council to expeditiously move forward to implementation as soon as possible. The following are our primary reasons for our strong support:

- Google has done an exemplary job of community outreach over a very long period of time. MVCSP appreciates the numerous opportunities to review and comment on various iterations of the Master Plan. Our comments, along with those of our affiliated organizations, have been responded to and often incorporated into the product before you tonight.
- The planning process has exceeded the vision of the North Bayshore Precise Plan. Google planners have crafted an outstanding blend of urbanism and ecology into a strong sense of place. All of the urban design of the planned built environment and connected open space networks with almost 36 acres of integrated public and private open space successfully blend into an “ecology of place.”
- The inclusion of 7,000 new residential units with 15% or approximately 1,050 affordable units will make living and working in North Bayshore a real possibility in three complete neighborhoods.

While we are disappointed that the 5% inclusionary affordable housing is not included in the final Master Plan, we are pleased that Google is planning to dedicate approximately 50% of affordable housing acreage in Phase 1, including the largest parcels. Thanks to staff for including Exhibit 9 which provides an excellent assessment of the Affordable Housing in the Master Plan

- Internally within the North Bayshore Project Area, the active transportation network is very well thought out, and residents and employees can easily walk or ride a bike to the many exciting destinations. The social spine when completed will be an award winning feature of the plan.

As the implementation of Master Plan goes forward with implementation, we would like special attention paid to the following:

- While it is difficult to see the removal of almost 2,900 trees, the fact is that 40% of the trees are not in good health and many are non-native trees. The replanting of trees integrated with the development of the pedestrian and bicycle network provides an opportunity to develop a green street network with significant biodiversity that will be a model throughout the Bay Area.
- In our December 2021 letter to the City Council, we stated: “We have asked the Google development team to consider new lighting standards as provided by the International Dark-Sky Association (<https://www.darksky.org/>) and others. These new standards are essential to support both wildlife and human health needs. While not required by the North Bayshore Precise Plan, we ask Google to voluntarily adopt these standards as phases are developed. We have found the team to be very open to this direction. Ultimately revisions to North Bayshore and East Whisman Precise Plans should incorporate the new lighting standards
- It is disappointing the Development Agreement has not been included for review by the EPC. We look forward to providing comments on it before the City Council, but EPC members should have been able to provide their comments as part of this review process.

Finally, while the Master Plan was developed during the pandemic, there is not sufficient recognition in the April 2023 update of the current and projected changes to travel patterns that remain after the pandemic. Obviously, Google was able to come in well below the trip cap standards over the past several years primarily due to remote work. While there is significant uncertainty on what the long term impacts will be, it does highlight how effective telecommuting and remote work can have on travel to and from North Bayshore. There is not sufficient discussion in the TDM Plan on flexible work schedules and remote work as a TDM strategy.

Prior to the pandemic, the Google Commuter Shuttle program was utilized by 31.3% of employees. In Condition 264 in Exhibit 2, shuttles to transit hubs are a required TDM measure, but commuter shuttles are NOT included as a required TDM program. A condition on development approval should be included that requires Google to sustain existing 2019 commuter shuttle levels or expand service levels if the trip cap is not met. This free bus service is a principal reason why Google has maintained such a low SOV

rate, and there needs to be a condition of approval language added to ensure this important program continues after all entitlements have been granted.

Yes, there are many challenges in moving this master plan into reality. We are confident that both Google and City Staff will continue to provide community input and solutions in overcoming future obstacles. Our primary message is that the planning process has been very long, and we would like to see this Master Plan vision implemented as expeditiously as possible.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,  
Cliff Chambers  
for the Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning

cc:

Diana Pancholi, Principal Planner

Aarti Shrivastava, Assistant City Manager / Community Development Director

Martin Alkire, Advanced Planning Manager

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](mailto:mvcsp.info@gmail.com).

**From:** [Rutherford, Roxanne](#)  
**To:** [Rutherford, Roxanne](#)  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 5.1 Google Master Plan @ North Bayshore  
**Date:** Thursday, May 4, 2023 8:54:29 AM

---

**From:** Serge Bonte  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 3, 2023 4:59 PM  
**To:** [mv.epc.jose@gmail.com](mailto:mv.epc.jose@gmail.com); [chrisclarkmv@gmail.com](mailto:chrisclarkmv@gmail.com); [jyin.mvepc@gmail.com](mailto:jyin.mvepc@gmail.com);  
[wcranstonmv@gmail.com](mailto:wcranstonmv@gmail.com); [hankdempseymv@gmail.com](mailto:hankdempseymv@gmail.com); [preeti.hehmeyer@gmail.com](mailto:preeti.hehmeyer@gmail.com);  
[alex.nunez@pm.me](mailto:alex.nunez@pm.me)  
**Cc:** [epc@mountainview.gov](mailto:epc@mountainview.gov); Pancholi, Diana <[Diana.Pancholi@mountainview.gov](mailto:Diana.Pancholi@mountainview.gov)>; Shrivastava, Aarti <[Aarti.Shrivastava@mountainview.gov](mailto:Aarti.Shrivastava@mountainview.gov)>  
**Subject:** re: 5/3/23 Meeting - Agenda Item 5.1 Google Master Plan @ North Bayshore

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

Honorable Chair and Commissioners:

First I wanted to thank the Mountain View City Staff for their professionalism, hard work and perseverance in bringing close to conclusion a multi-decades long endeavor: through Precise Plan 1.0 sans housing, then Precise Plan 2.0 avec housing, through a "beauty contest" to allocate FAR, through countless transportation, environmental impact studies and now finally through the "Google" North Bayshore Master Plan and despite many conflicting changes demanded by City Council, EPC, the community...and Google.

Second, I wanted to share some concerns about the Master Plan:

1. It is very disappointed that Google seems to walk back on its promise of 5% inclusionary affordable housing. As a result, the proposed neighborhoods will be more segregated (by building) and it puts bigger pressure on Mountain View and us taxpayers to find more funds to build the affordable housing we committed to in our Housing Element.
2. The Master Plan should also clarify (and mandate) that affordable housing on the dedicated parcels will be fully integrated with the not so affordable buildings.

- Full and equal access to Popa, Private Streets, Private Utilities District -more on that later-
- Bike lanes, sidewalk, transit serving these affordable housing parcels as well as non affordable housing parcels.
- Full Access to the "two district parking garages for residential, retail, hotel, community, and visitor parking;"
- Same interim parking standard for affordable housing as allowed in master plan "Interim residential parking rate of 1.25 spaces per unit, with an average of 0.6 space per unit at full

build-out, to **address the absence of improved transit services at the beginning of project development"**

3. The Master Plan should have language at the time of approval stating clearly that POPAs will remain accessible to the public (including residents in separate affordable housing) in perpetuity. Somewhat recently and because of security concerns, Google closed some access to its own campuses or to the periphery of its campuses, Master Plan should prohibit such actions with the POPAs.

4. The Master Plan should clarify the status of private streets; and whether private simply means paid for and built by Google or means subject to restrictions for public access. The latter would not be in the spirit of complete and open neighborhoods

5. The Master Plan should better defined how a "private" utility district would function. Currently all Mountain View properties pay into a shared public system (for water, sewage....) both at the time of development but also via paying our utilities (a portion of which goes to maintenance, expanding recycling operations...). As with any tax or fees, we pay for things that benefit the whole community not necessarily just ourselves. For instance, I pay into "purple" water even though my neighborhood is not connected to the "purple" pipeline. I am concerned that a private utility district might result in Google no longer pay into the shared public system leaving the rest of the tax/rate payers fund maintenance and improvements ...that would also benefit Google :( The financials are further complicated because of the Shoreline Tax District.

6. The Master Plan should clarify who pays for City services in these new neighborhoods. For instance, MVPD if funded via the General Fund which received the City portion of Property Tax. However, since the Shoreline Tax District keeps all tax increments within its own fund, it's really unclear if Shoreline Tax District property fully funds MVPD or partially defunds the police. Same with utilities (see above) and all services provided by the City.

7. The Master Plan should also dedicate the 4 some acres directly to the Mountain View Whisman District (the financial negotiations around the Shoreline Tax District are complicated enough, let's put at least that school land dedication to bed). This could be in form of a separate resolution from the City concomitant to adopting the Master Plan.

Finally, unrelated to the Master Plan per se, the City should really be more transparent on what taxes are diverted and what tax bases are used in Shoreline for school bonds, housing bonds... it's clear as mud. Does the Shoreline Tax District keep property taxes that would normally fund County Health , Homeless or Housing services? If so, it would be shifting some costs to the rest of the community. Also, the City is now on the hook to find financing for ALL the affordable housing in the Master Plan. Among other sources, this will require leveraging County Measure A bonds (if any left) or the upcoming Regional Bond Measure. As a taxpayer, I'd like to be sure that properties in the Shoreline Tax District pay their full share (based on full accessed value) into these bonds.

Sincerely,

Serge Bonte, Mountain View

May 3, 2023

Dear Members of the Environmental Planning Commission,

As the City considers its environmental plans, we wanted to share information about the impact of enrollment growth, the Shoreline Regional Park Community Redevelopment District and the Joint Use Agreement for school fields that may be helpful in your discussions. We appreciate the opportunity to open dialogue with you about these important community issues.

**Enrollment Growth:** As development continues across the City, the District has to prepare to house an influx of students. We are expecting more than 1,400 students to come from North Bayshore development. This does not take into account the East Whisman Development, as well as the various developments along El Camino and throughout the city.

In addition to the expected growth, MVWSD is now faced with funding pre-kindergarten for all students; an unfunded state mandate for school districts like MVWSD. The age of pre-kindergarten students requires specialized facilities that include dedicated bathrooms and a higher student to teacher ratio than our current kindergarten classes. Currently, MVWSD is seeing the highest rate of enrollment for transitional kindergarten at Theuerkauf and Vargas; schools that are intended to help to mitigate increased enrollment from East Whisman and North Bayshore developments.

MVWSD staff routinely acknowledge that the predicted numbers ebb and flow as developers work to make projects “pencil out,” however there is no denying that more students are coming. By 2030, a majority of MVWSD schools are expected to exceed their available capacity. This will be particularly acute for schools supporting North Bayshore and East Whisman where long-term and large-scale residential redevelopment has either been approved or is moving closer to approval.

**Leased space:** Naturally, MVWSD Trustees and staff, hear criticisms from the public, City staff and other elected officials that the District has several school properties that it leases out. Some ask why we don't use these for increased enrollment. The fact is, without additional resources, this lease revenue is critical to supplement what we are not getting from Shoreline. In fact, the \$7 million we receive

in lease revenue for district properties very roughly equates to the additional amount we would have received if the full amount of Shoreline funding was allocated to MVWSD. Thus, MVWSD is dependent on lease revenue to meet our current students' needs.

Up until the pandemic, MVWSD was one of the few districts in the state that consistently demonstrated increased student performance, which has earned us numerous awards from the California Department of Public Education, the United States Department of Education Blue Ribbon commission as well as repeated recognition by Dr. Reardon and the Stanford Center for Education Policy for closing the achievement gap. If MVWSD were to end its leases and the Shoreline RDA continued to divert tax revenue that we are entitled to, MVWSD would be forced to make tough choices between mental health services, class size adjustments, homeless student supports, competitive salaries for all staff, and strategies to close the student achievement gap. MVWSD is already at a disadvantage compared to its neighboring districts, as we have less money per pupil than Sunnyvale, Los Altos and Palo Alto.

**Resources Needed:** The District continues to work with the City on the allocation of the Shoreline Regional Park Community funds. Our schools operate at a financial disadvantage with respect to Shoreline Regional Park Community, a special tax district. Tax revenue from Shoreline goes first to the City rather than coming directly to Mountain View schools. The City Council then decides what portion comes back to the schools. The lost revenue is significant. Last year the City Council provided MVWSD with only 38% of what we would receive in a normally taxed district. This year, MVWSD's share would have been \$13.9 million, but the district received only \$5.3 million. Redevelopment districts were ended by the state legislature in 2012, but Mountain View schools continue to face the financial impact of the special tax rules associated with the Shoreline Regional Park Community.

An increase in Shoreline funds to MVWSD is crucial to not only accommodate student growth, but also address the severe needs that have arisen since the pandemic; mental health, homelessness, food insecurity, and of course academic supports that help to eliminate the achievement gap. We recognize that the City has considerations for Shoreline funds too, however, our environment and our education system are not mutually exclusive. Mountain View owes its young people both an exceptional public education and a thriving natural environment where they can learn

and grow. City Council is capable of prudent and fiscally responsible policies that meet the needs of both. Moreover, this additional revenue opens up the possibility of utilizing our current leased sites which in turn would almost eliminate the \$1.2 billion needed to house new students.

**Other Funding Models:** Other methods, such as eminent domain or Mello-Roos financing, have trade-offs for our community that are not ideal. For example, TDRs that were transferred from San Antonio to East Whisman had an adverse effect on our schools. A Mello-Roos, as noted by city staff and developers, would essentially quell any possibility for addressing the job-to-housing inequity that our City currently faces. For these reasons, our district is focusing on full funding from Shoreline. Our District does not want to stop housing development - our families and staff need homes - and we believe if we work together, we can find a solution. We are looking for leadership from EPC to help with these issues.

**Green Space:** If MVWSD is forced to continue to rely on leased revenue to help supplement the loss of revenue, then the only short-term option is to place portables on our campuses. While many ideas have been offered to accommodate additional students, nothing has been committed formally. However, everyone should be aware that school fields may eventually have classrooms placed on them. We recognize that this is not ideal and will limit programming for students during the school day and will additionally strain use of open space for the community. Typically, it takes 6 years to plan, construct and open the doors of a new school. The California Board of Education recommends a minimum of 13 acres for an elementary school. Time and resources are critical for MVWSD to prepare for the influx.

**Public access to District green space:** It is worth noting that regardless of the status of the Joint Use Agreement for the use of school district fields, MVWSD has no intention of limiting public access outside of school hours. We have consistently welcomed the public onto our fields after school hours as was especially evident during the COVID shutdown when our fields were a place where the community could come to exercise and enjoy open space. We are fortunate to have a supportive community that has consistently funded our bond measures, thus our schools belong to the community, regardless of who is managing the rentals.

**Park Space:** Whether the City can count school fields as park space can be determined as part of joint use negotiations. MVWSD is interested in helping the City

meet the minimum required acreage as long as the District's legal and financial responsibilities are met.

**Potential Solution:** MVWSD has kicked off an initiative that will green school campuses and fields for both students and community members. Additionally, the District is adding public restrooms at Imai, Landels, and Castro/Mistral with a partial contribution from the City because MVWSD fully supports community access to our campuses. No other school district in the area provides public restrooms on school grounds.

We welcome the opportunity for continued collaboration with the City, its committee leaders and with our community groups.

Respectfully,



Ayindé Rudolph, Ed.D.  
Superintendent