

From: [Cliff Chambers](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 7.2 Update on City/School Collaboration and Challenges
Date: Saturday, April 1, 2023 3:14:55 PM

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

Dear Mayor Hicks and City Council Members:

Thanks to staff for the very informative staff report on this very important agenda item. I am aware of the many successful examples of City/School collaboration identified in the staff report. I have only become aware of the significant challenges in the current collaboration efforts very recently. The five next steps listed at the end of the staff report seem like very reasonable steps as negotiations with the school district continue in earnest.

However, unless there is a continuation of the legacy of successful collaboration between the City and the School Districts, there is significant risks to issues that I care about a lot:

- 1) The necessary infrastructure needed for development of housing in North Bayshore.
- 2) Efforts to mitigate sea level rise
- 3) The shared use of parks by residents and the schools

I will be attending the Study Session in person to learn more on what citizens like me can do to help facilitate the continued successful collaboration among the City and the two school districts.

Sincerely,

Cliff Chambers
City of Mountain View

From: [Shani Kleinhaus](#)
To: [Hicks, Alison](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Ramos, Emily Ann](#)
Cc: [McCarthy, Kimbra](#); [Marchant, John](#); [, City Clerk](#)
Subject: Audubon concerns regarding City/School Collaboration and Challenges (Item 7.2 on the 4/3 agenda)
Date: Sunday, April 2, 2023 12:22:00 PM
Attachments: [20230402_SCVAS - MV Shoreline Community.docx.pdf](#)

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

Dear Mayor Hicks and Mountain View City Council members,

The Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society (SCVAS) submits this letter with great concern for the continuation of the Shoreline Community. Without it, Mountain View may not be able to maintain the Shoreline at Mountain View Regional Park, preserve wetlands and endangered species, protect Mountain View from the environmental hazards of the closed landfill, and adapt to sea level rise. Please find our letter attached.

Thank you,

Shani Kleinhaus, Ph.D.
Environmental Advocate
Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society



April 2, 2023

Title: Concerns regarding Item 7.2: Update on City/School Collaboration and Challenges

Mayor Hicks and Mountain View City Council

The Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society (SCVAS) submits this letter with great concern for the continuation of the Shoreline Community. Without it, Mountain View may not be able to maintain the Shoreline at Mountain View Regional Park, preserve wetlands and endangered species, protect Mountain View from the environmental hazards of the closed landfill, and adapt to sea level rise.

SCVAS promotes the enjoyment, understanding, and protection of birds and other wildlife by engaging people of all ages in birding, education, and conservation. We have a large number of members in the City of Mountain View and our education programs here reach young and old. We have worked with the City on conservation of biodiversity, especially at North Bayshore and Shoreline Park, for decades. Our education program reaches every 4th-grader in the Whisman School District (WSD). We provide in-class programming in all of the District's elementary schools, introducing students to concepts such as adaptations, local conservation, migration and habitats, using local ecosystems and birds as case studies. We help students foster a sense of appreciation and understanding for the complex habitats we are surrounded by. In addition, during the nesting season, we lead educational events at the Egret Rookery of Shorebird Way. We regularly host bird walks around Rengstorff House, and we conduct school field trips to Charleston Slough each year, where elementary students from the south bay area are introduced to wetlands.

As every 4th grader in Mountain View knows, Shoreline at Mountain View is a special place. It provides critical habitats for a large number of endangered species, including some of the most iconic - and threatened - species of our region (such as Ridgeway's rail, burrowing owls and black skimmers.) The programs that benefit these and other species, programs that protect the community from sea level rise and environmental hazards, and the ongoing care and maintenance of Shoreline Regional Park should all be prioritized and safeguarded by both the City of Mountain View and the School Districts.

We hope the City and School Districts work together for a future that serves the community best, stewards the environment, and educates students to be responsible, collaborative and communicative residents in our fast changing world.

Thank you,

Shani Kleinhaus,

Shani Kleinhaus, Ph.D.
Environmental Advocate
Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society
22221 McClellan Rd.
Cupertino, CA 95014
650-868-2114
advocate@scvas.org

From: [Jim Zaorski](#)
To: [City Council](#); [City Manager](#); trustees@mvwsd.org; arudolph@mvwsd.org
Subject: Thoughts on the renegotiation of the MVWSD JUA
Date: Monday, April 3, 2023 6:07:36 AM

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

Mayor Hicks,

I am fully aware that the State's requirements for additional housing within the City of Mountain View has made it very difficult to effectively plan for future growth.

By the same token, as a former member of the MVWSD's Budget Task Force, I am also painfully aware of the many unfunded State mandates which, to a large extent, dictate how a school district's limited resources must be allocated.

While the City takes pride in its AAA bond rating, it is apparent to many that this rating has been built at the expense of decades long failure to adequately address the infrastructure needs of our growing City and by underfunding the school district.

By the same token, while the Mountain View Whisman School District points with pride to its fiscal strength and its successes in meeting the State's mandates. To many, this focus on a too narrow metric misses the larger fact that more and more parents are no longer opting to send their children to our City's public schools, nor are they engaging with the District.

As I see it, the City would be unwise to overestimate the value of renewing the JUA. It would be foolish to overpay for renewing the current Agreement.

Today, with almost all school fields fenced, and access to these areas being severely limited during most daylight hours, the current JUA provides little benefit to the Community. (The nighttime use of Crittenden Field is an exception to this and may provide a guidepost going forward?)

From my perspective the only entity that would currently benefit from the renewal of the JUA is the City.

As currently formulated the JUA provides little benefit to either the Community, nor the MVWSD.

A renewed JUA might help the City maintain the fiction that it has adequate parkspace, but from my perspective, it does little else.

Thus, renewing the JUA in its current format, may be convenient, but in my view it would come at a high price, and it essentially accomplishes next to nothing.

It is difficult to argue with the contention that Mountain View's North Bayshore Special

Development District is anything other than an anachronism.

The land in the North Bayshore District is some of the most valuable in the world. It is highly sought after. Over the 35 years I have worked there, it has become very much developed.

While there are no doubt many projects that still need to be accomplished within this area, these tasks are both quantifiable and finite.

From my view, it is hard to see how these projects justify the continued segregation of the tax resources produced by the North of Bayshore properties.

Still, if given a choice of providing the funds produced by these properties to the MVWSD or addressing the City's infrastructure backlog, I am convinced that most of my neighbors would opt for the latter.

To me this is both unfair, and unfortunate.

From my perspective, it is hard to dispute the District's claim to these funds.

As I see it, it is also hard to dispute the contention that "Great Schools make for a Great Community".

Unfortunately, over the last decade, the MVWSD has taken an approach of Community disengagement. Over this interim, it has seen its enrollments steadily drop while the City's population has continued to increase,

In most cases, I think it has failed to articulate and disseminate a vision of how it plans to serve the City's new, more affluent, residents in a way that would compel them to engage with the District.

Today, I think the City is correct in concluding that the projected influx of new residents will not necessarily result in a large new number of students attending MVWSD schools.

I do not think that this conclusion is immutable, nor do I believe that it cannot be changed by constructive action on the parts of both the City and the MVWSD,

Unfortunately, today I see little in the way of a constructive engagement between the City and the District to facilitate this action.

To be a great City, our City needs great schools.

Our Community also lacks sufficient neighborhood parks. No one I know thinks that renewing the JUA is going to address this issue.

Going forward, the MVWSD will need more funding to articulate a broader vision for a different Community.

The MVWSD has land that can be used to meet many of the community's needs.

I thus think that it is in the City's interests to engage the MVWSD in broader discussions that will truly address the City's needs for infrastructure, while providing the wherewithal to the District to plan for its future.

I realize that to undertake such an endeavor will be difficult but I am also aware of the capabilities of the leaders of both the District and the City.

Sincerely,

Jim Zaorski

From: [Serge Bonte](#)
To: [Hicks, Alison](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Ramos, Emily Ann](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#); [McCarthy, Kimbra](#); [trustees](#); trustees@mvla.net
Subject: re: 4/3/23 Meeting Agenda Item 7.2 Update on City/School Collaboration and Challenges
Date: Monday, April 3, 2023 7:35:31 AM

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

Honorable Mayor and City Council Members

Since I might not be able to attend your rescheduled meeting, I wanted to write a few comments on that agenda item,

First, I applaud the City for (finally) making public some documentation on the Shoreline Community Fund. I hope that this serves as the basis for more disclosure on the City's web site: for instance an example of a typical property tax bill, showing precisely which agency each line item would normally go to and which portion is kept by the Shoreline Community Fund. Also, disclosure of any other agreements with other agencies (like Santa Clara County?) to make them whole (or partially whole).

In terms of the current negotiations, an ad hoc committee with council members and trustees sounds like a good mechanism to come to a mid to long term resolution, To give that committee some room and since the City has the upper hand for the JPA and the school district the upper hand for the Parks, I would suggest a one year extension of the JPA (as suggested in the staff report) AND a one year extension of the current MOU for parks. That way both sides have equally strong hands in the ad hoc committee negotiations.

As to the RDA (err Shoreline Community Fund) itself, while legal and doing a lot of good for our community, the Shoreline tax district is fundamentally unjust as it captures other agencies' revenue and disrupts their fiscal stability.

That fiscal stability relies on a tax base wider than whom an agency provides services to. Imagine a system where businesses or residents with no kids or residents with no kids of school age or residents sending their kids to private school could opt out of school taxes. There would be no public education in our community.

Luckily the Shoreline tax district doesn't cover the whole city but it has created some serious fiscal pain to the affected agencies. School Districts reserves are lower than they could (or should) be; this probably contributed to the loss of dozens of school employees in economic downturns. School districts have had to pass parcel taxes, rely ever more on the generosity of educational foundations, rely on long term leases on closed schools that could otherwise be reopened to accommodate growth....

The same is true to some extent with other agencies, for example:

- We all (including the Shoreline employers) benefited from the Santa Clara Health Services running vaccination centers, yet the Shoreline area probably didn't provide a dime towards these services.
- The City has an upcoming agenda item to look at possible revenue for a Workforce Development Program. These programs can be provided in part by our Community

College or our high schools.... which the City captures revenues from.

While morally the right thing to do, phasing out the tax district would certainly create some financial pain to the City. But that pain would not really be different from the pain it has caused other agencies. And just like schools did, the City can start looking at parcel taxes, more county/state/federal grants, Bond Measures at the ballot box or even a Melloos Ross type district -where the Shoreline community could assess itself-.

One final thought, we should consider the fact that since 1969, land has changed hands many times but now one landowner controls the vast majority of the North Bayshore Precise Plan. Do we want the Shoreline Tax District to morph into a Google Tax District running its own private utility district?

Sincerely,

Serge Bonte

Mountain View Resident

Mountain View/LASD/MVLA/MVWSD/Foothill College/Santa Clara County tax payer