

Responses to EPC Questions

Item 5.1 Housing Element Update

1. *Is Mountain View/Whisman still pursuing the tax? I had heard that they dropped that.*

During the time of the analysis the school assessment was still in consideration. At this time, the School District has not officially notified the City of any new direction, whether to proceed with the vote or not.

2. *It is mentioned that there seems to be a high percentage of rent controlled units that are soft story/earthquake vulnerable buildings. I don't know enough about the CSFRA. How is a seismic refit treated? Is it a straight cost that landowners have to absorb? I am thinking about Program 3.2 and how this is encompassed in preserving units?*

The cost of necessary rehabilitation of buildings and units, including the potential need for seismic retrofits, is an important part of the evaluation of any preservation/acquisition program. Currently, a property owner of a CSFRA unit would be responsible for the cost of the seismic retrofit but if they wanted to pass along the costs, they would have to submit a Capital Improvement petition to request to increase rents.

Previously, in their 2019-2021 goals, the Council included a study to estimate the number of soft-story units in the City. The program would have included the review of cost transparency, limitations and pass-through ability to charge for retrofit of the structures and included as line-item in base rents. As of date, the soft story retrofit program remains on-hold and is not part of the current Council goals.

3. *Page 141 of the HE should include a discussion of the LASD portion of the city, not just MVWSD. Why was this excluded?*

The analysis for LASD that covers Mountain View enrollment will be included in the draft prior to submission to the State.

4. *Page 163 has a number in the middle of the graphic unlike other maps/graphics. I think this is a typo.*

Yes, this map will be revised to eliminate unnecessary data layers.

5. *As part of the approval of 555 W. Middlefield Project, council approved splitting the High Density designation in the General plan into 2 parts High-Low from 35-50 and then High is now just 50-80. The discussion on page 176 should be updated to reflect this new breakout.*

The Public Draft was published before the approval of the 555 W Middlefield project, but this information will be updated prior to submission to the State.

6. *Do we have history on how the BMR housing fees have been each year? How have they fluctuated during recessions? During Covid? Would developing and assessment of additional methods of the city generated funds be part of both new construction and preservation programs?*

Below is a chart of housing fee revenue since June 30, 2017 for both Below-Market Rate in lieu fees for residential ownership and rental developments (BMR) and Housing Impact Fees for commercial developments (HIF). The fees are dependent on commercial and residential development and do fluctuate based on development in the City. Of note, the City changed its guidelines in 2019, to prioritize inclusionary units rather than in-lieu fees.

Assessing the fee programs is a key part of the Housing Division’s program to assess potential revenue sources for affordable housing and is included in the Housing Element under program 4.3.

Housing Fee Revenue		
Fiscal Year	BMR Revenue	HIF Revenue
FY 2021-2022 (Through April 30, 2022)	\$7,580,606.49	\$5,262,849.64
FY 2020-2021	\$7,970,728.32	\$2,657,703.32
FY 2019-2020	\$8,776,206.22	\$3,424,848.95
FY 2018-2019	\$32,188,702.76	\$8,310,788.94
FY 2017-2018	\$10,709,886.46	\$20,699,941.62

7. *Did Council endorse the Google/Lendlease approach of deeding land to the city to deliver 20% affordable units in both North Bayshore and East Whisman rather than providing inclusionary housing? Has the viability of these sites for BMR development been reviewed with any BMR developers?*

Google/Lendlease are proposing two Master Plans within the City (Middlefield Park and North Bayshore) that include proposals for land dedication to the City for future affordable housing development, as a method to meet affordable housing requirements for each of their respective Master Plan projects. City Council has not approved or endorsed either Master Plan or land dedication proposal, as they are currently under review. The North Bayshore Master Plan includes 5% inclusionary housing units in addition to 15% affordable units through land dedication. As part of the development review process, City staff is evaluating the proposals, with the help of consultant teams, to aide in determining compliance with City regulations for land dedication – which

includes consultation with affordable housing developers. The results of the analysis will be shared with City Council prior to the final public hearings on the Master Plans.

8. *Would [Program] 4.3 also include ensuring that City programs and processes align timing with outside funding cycle like the 2022 State of CA "Nuclear" approach where all programs are doing their grants at the same time? Should this be called out?*

The State funding cycle (and other funding cycles) varies, and housing staff work with developers to align their timelines with that of other funding resources so that developers are ready to apply for funding. Note that Program 4.1 includes a review of the NOFA process, and staff will evaluate opportunities to further streamline the process.