

David Shreni  
Cuesta Park  
Mountain View, CA  
February 19, 2024

To the Honorable Members of the Mountain View Environmental Planning Commission,

I write to express concerns about the proposed zones for emergency shelters, particularly the sites at El Camino Avenue near Castro Street. This decision, while well-intentioned, overlooks the potential for more strategic urban planning and development opportunities. Below, I outline key issues I find with the current proposal that underscore the need for a thorough reevaluation. I am impressed with the Staff's thoroughness to leave no stone unturned, I'm hoping we can find creative solutions without reducing economic value to the city in the long-term.

**1. Strategic Misalignment and Developmental Constraints (Exhibit A):** The choice of El Camino Avenue at Castro Street as a site for emergency shelters is strategically misaligned with the city's long-term developmental goals. This area is pivotal for future urban development, and its designation for a low-rise emergency shelter could significantly limit its potential for higher-value, multi-story projects. This not only affects the aesthetic and economic appeal of our main thoroughfare but also disregards the possibility of integrating this lot with neighboring strip malls for a comprehensive development plan. Shelters are limited to 2 stories, which would be an underwhelming use of this very prominent land

**2. Alternative Sites with Proximity to Public Transportation:** The rationale for selecting a site near major transportation hubs is understandable. However, this decision neglects other viable locations that do not compromise valuable city land. For example, a parking lot located just 100 feet from San Antonio Road — a mere block from critical transit routes and essential services — presents a more suitable alternative.

**3. Benchmarking Against Other Jurisdictions (Exhibit B):** A comparative analysis of emergency shelter placements in cities such as Menlo Park, Palo Alto, and Sunnyvale reveals a strategic approach to avoiding high-value areas. These cities have successfully located shelters in less commercially critical areas without sacrificing access to essential services. This approach not only preserves valuable urban land but also aligns with state guidelines, suggesting a more balanced strategy is both possible and preferable.

**4. The city still has better options:** While State Law says that we must make bona fide attempts to identify viable shelter sites, it does not specify that we must follow through on exactly the zones we included in the Housing Element. You could imagine that 6yrs from now, if all the sites within this part of the El Camino PP became unavailable for use as a shelter, through development or otherwise, the city would be compelled to look at other precise plans with viable sites to meet the spirit and letter of the law. Whether we are 6 years or 6 months from when the Housing Element was written, the city can still choose alternate precise plans that are not in the Housing Element. That is our right under California Law and AB2339, in my read, does not dictate our effort. There is no material difference between exploring sites 3

blocks from El Camino vs sites on El Camino as any homeowner could attest. The city could also look at the leases for certain sites to see if they come due during the Housing Element period, which could attest to the availability of the property.

The selection of emergency shelter sites necessitates a balance between immediate social needs and long-term urban development goals. As such, I urge this Commission to reconsider the proposed zones in focus in favor of alternatives that better serve Mountain View's comprehensive interests. A more strategic approach, informed by thorough site analysis and comparative benchmarks, will ensure that our efforts to support vulnerable populations also enhance our city's developmental trajectory.

Thank you for considering this critical matter. I trust that through deliberate and informed decision-making, we can identify solutions that uphold the best interests of Mountain View and its residents.

Sincerely,

David Shreni

**Exhibit A**

## Palo Alto limits Emergency Shelters to Light Industrial areas! Not anywhere near their transit centers. And they need to find 200 beds!

Source: [Palo Alto Housing Element](#)

### EMERGENCY SHELTERS

An emergency shelter is a facility that houses persons experiencing homelessness on a limited, short-term basis (six months or less), and may involve supplemental services. Supplemental services may include, but are not limited to, meal preparation, an activities center, day care for homeless person's children, vocational rehabilitation, and other similar activities. The City of Palo Alto allows emergency shelters for the homeless as a permitted use in the Research, Office and Limited Manufacturing-Embarcadero (ROLM(E)) district, on properties located east of Highway 101. This area is a light industrial zone that ~~permits contains~~—such uses as religious and educational institutions, offices, research facilities, light manufacturing, as well as residential sites. Retail support services are located nearby.

Pursuant to Government Code § 65583(a)(4), the Housing Element must demonstrate that sufficient capacity exists to accommodate the identified housing need for emergency shelters. The City's unmet

4-39

---

homeless need is 299 beds ~~(based on 2019 point-in-time survey results~~ (point-in-time survey results for 2022 were 274; 2023 results were not available at time of publishing this document). There are approximately 68.58 acres of land within the (ROLM(E)) district that allow by-right approval of emergency shelters. The sites are mostly underutilized commercial buildings on typically 1-4 acre lots. The area is in the 100-year floodzone but there are no other environmental hazards. The area is served by a few surface streets and bike lanes for easy access to the area. Edgewood Plaza is within .5 mile of the area. Edgewood Plaza has a grocery store, bank, gas station and other services. ~~crosstown shuttle route that terminates near the City's Opportunity Center, which provides affordable housing and a wide range of services to the homeless population.~~ Embarcadero Road, which forms the southern border of Edgewood Plaza, is served by AC Transit. The City recently initiated its own on demand shuttle system (Palo Alto Link) which serves the entire City. Through the City Link app, the shuttle charges \$3.50 per ride but discounts are available, and the Palo Alto Free Shuttle.<sup>10</sup>



Menlo Park’s Housing Element is nowhere near as aggressive as ours, includes no specific sites and is only proposing specific changes within a specific area. Not on their most important land!  
[Source](#)

## Emergency Shelters

Emergency shelters are defined as "housing with minimal supportive services for homeless persons that are limited to occupancy of six months or less by a homeless person. No individual or household may be denied emergency shelter because of an inability to pay" (Government Code § 65582). AB 2339 (2022) updated the definition of emergency shelters to include other interim interventions, including but not limited to, navigation centers, bridge housing, and respite or recuperative care. Program H3.G directs the revision of the Municipal Code to incorporate this updated definition. Additional provisions under AB 2339 include: a) requirement that zoning designations identified to allow emergency shelters as a "by right" permitted use must allow residential uses; b) requirement

Menlo Park 2023-2031 Housing Element  
Actual and Potential Constraints to Housing | Page 5-11

---

that the zoning designations allowing emergency shelters by right have sufficient capacity to accommodate the number of persons experiencing homelessness; and c) requirement that the zoning designations allowing emergency shelters by right are in proximity to services and amenities that serve people experiencing homelessness. Each of these requirements is addressed in this section.

Menlo Park's zoning code includes an Emergency Shelter for the Homeless Overlay. This overlay can only be applied to specific parcels identified in Municipal Code § 16.99.020 and ensures that the development of emergency shelters do not adversely impact adjacent parcels or the surrounding neighborhood.

The Emergency Shelter for the Homeless Overlay (Municipal Code 16.99) consists of 26 parcels zoned R-3 that are near the Menlo Park VA Medical Center. The latest Point-in-Time count, in 2022, identified 56 individuals experiencing homelessness.<sup>57</sup>

In its review of Menlo Park's Housing Element, the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has identified the City's standard

## Exhibit B

Assembly Bill 2339 states that the city only has to demonstrate adequacy of sites identified that are suitable.

**FROM:** Megan Kirkeby, Deputy Director  
Division of Housing Policy Development

**SUBJECT:** **Assembly Bill 2339 - Legislation Effective January 1, 2023:**  
***Housing Element: Emergency Shelters***

Chapter 654, Statutes of 2022 (AB 2339), adds additional specificity on how cities and counties plan for emergency shelters and ensure sufficient capacity for low-income housing in their housing elements. Generally, AB 2339 amends State Housing Element Law regarding identification of zones and sites for emergency shelters and transitional and supportive housing as follows:

Amendments to Government Code section 65583, subdivision (a)(4)

- Expands the definition of "emergency shelters" to include other interim interventions, including but not limited to, navigation centers, bridge housing, and respite or recuperative care.
- Requires that zoning designations identified to allow emergency shelters as a permitted use without a conditional use or other discretionary permit must allow residential uses. This could include zones that allow mixed uses that permit residential.
- The local government must demonstrate the adequacy of sites identified to accommodate emergency shelters. Specifically, if a vacant site is zoned for a nonresidential use but allows residential development, the site must be located near amenities and services that serve people experiencing homelessness. If the site is nonvacant, the analysis must provide substantial evidence that the existing use is likely to be discontinued during the planning period.

---

Assembly Bill 2339 - Legislation Effective January 1, 2023:  
*Housing Element: Emergency Shelters*  
Page 2

- Sites owned by the local government can be included if the analysis demonstrates that the sites will be made available for emergency shelters during the planning period, are suitable for residential use, and are located near amenities that serve people experiencing homelessness.
- Provides a calculation methodology for determining the sufficiency of sites available to accommodate emergency shelters in the identified zoning designation.
- Requires analysis of any adopted written objective standards for potential governmental constraints.

## **From the Menlo Park Housing Element- How they handle this**

### **Human Habitability**

Many of the parcels in the overlay area have active residential uses, which demonstrates an ease of habitability, and most are located near Willow Road. The area of the VA Medical Center is on the west side of Willow Road. On the east side of the road, there are parks, grocery stores, affordable restaurants, and a laundromat among other services.

### **Feasibility**

Menlo Park 2023-2031 Housing Element  
**Actual and Potential Constraints to Housing** | Page 5-15

---

Many of the 26 parcels in the existing Emergency Shelter Overlay Zone are built out with residential uses. In order to improve the feasibility of an emergency shelter development substantial enough to support Menlo Park's current (2022 PIT count) homeless population, Program H3.G directs expanding the Emergency Shelter Overlay Zone to include the entire VA campus. This 90-acre site includes ample space for an emergency shelter (both open space and buildings that could be reused as a shelter). The Veterans Affairs administration has supported local homeless populations, with a recent development – Willow Housing – and current plans for a new development (Site #64 in the Site Inventory). An additional emergency shelter would be feasible and in line with recent development history and ongoing projects on the campus.



**From:** Mainini Cabute [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 21, 2024 4:28 PM  
**To:** [epc@mountainview.gov](mailto:epc@mountainview.gov); , Planning Division <[Planning.Division@mountainview.gov](mailto:Planning.Division@mountainview.gov)>  
**Subject:** 2/21 EPC Meeting: Item 5.1 Public Hearing- 2023 Housing Element Annual Progress Report and Emergency Shelters Amendment

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

Dear Environmental Planning Commissioners and MV City staff,

I am writing this letter to request that the EPC and City of MV staff provide a complete list of potential sites for emergency shelters in Mountain View. At this time, there are two locations on the staff report that are both on El Camino in between Castro Street and Miramonte Ave. There should be an analysis of all of the potential locations and explanations as to why those locations are or are not suitable for the emergency shelters. Or at the very least, a matrix that shows the criteria being used so that community members are able to quickly see why certain locations are being recommended. At this time, the staff report only points to only two possible locations. This type of change will impact many property owners who should be given more information about the significant changes proposed to our existing community. At this time, the evaluation seems premature or biased or both. Has a comprehensive evaluation been done with all potential locations? If so, what other locations have been considered and why are they not on the staff report? Below is a quick example of a simple matrix that shows the criteria being used to help with transparency:

Location Address	APN	City owned	Within zoning designation(s) where emergency shelters are allowed by right	Available Transit Options	Amenities available and services near sites	Projected vacancy date	Current uses	Incentives for shelter development	6400 sq feet of land (200 sq ft per person)
1098 West El Camino Real,	158-07-028	No	X	X	X	2024	Vacated Residential	x	x

Additionally, before the EPC recommends to the City Council which locations these future emergency shelters should be placed, the report should provide the types of emergency shelters that will be built at these Mountain View locations. Will these shelters be traditional 24 hour emergency facilities? Will they be navigation centers, bridge housing, or respite/recuperative care or all of the above? Listing the type of shelters will help existing community members know what to expect and can help us understand what is potentially going to happen in the future. The current locations proposed are near Eagle Park, Pioneer Park, Graham Middle School, McKelvey Park, and on the walking and biking routes of our school-aged children. In my mind, if the recommended shelters are 24-hour facilities that invite a transient population to stay in our community near where our children hang out, I am confident that the City will receive push back from many neighborhoods who will be directly impacted--and these are community members who live farther than 750 feet away from the proposed locations.

My final request to all City commissioners, City staff and City Council members is to really practice more engagement and transparency with your existing community members. Please take the time to understand our concerns and not make assumptions about our intent for transparency. Please take the time to be more thoughtful in your staff reports to show us that this issue has been evaluated properly and thoroughly and that it matters to you that we will be impacted. I understand when state laws mandate local cities to offer services or programs. But I also understand that there is a process that needs to be vetted so that all stakeholders feel heard and that there was a real attempt to achieve a win-win solution for everyone. A state law does not give City staff the ability to make unilateral recommendations without fully vetting it with community members and voters.

Sincerely,  
Mainini

---

**From:** Salim Damerdj

**Sent:** Tuesday, February 20, 2024 8:24 PM

**To:** [epc@mountainview.gov](mailto:epc@mountainview.gov); William Cranston <[wcranstonmv@gmail.com](mailto:wcranstonmv@gmail.com)>; Jose Gutierrez <[mv.epc.jose@gmail.com](mailto:mv.epc.jose@gmail.com)>; Hank Dempsey <[hankdempseymv@gmail.com](mailto:hankdempseymv@gmail.com)>; Alex Núñez <[alex.nunez@pm.me](mailto:alex.nunez@pm.me)>; Joyce Yin <[yin.mvepc@gmail.com](mailto:yin.mvepc@gmail.com)>; Chris Clark <[chrisclarkmv@gmail.com](mailto:chrisclarkmv@gmail.com)>

**Cc:** , City Manager <[city\\_mgr@mountainview.gov](mailto:city_mgr@mountainview.gov)>; City Clerk <[cityclerk@mountainview.gov](mailto:cityclerk@mountainview.gov)>; [HousingElements@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:HousingElements@hcd.ca.gov)

**Subject:** 2024.02.21 EPC Item 5.1 Emergency Shelters Amendment

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

Dear Environmental Planning Commissioners,

Homelessness is a profound moral issue of our time, and the city took a step towards doing its part by committing to allow homeless shelters by-right in the El Camino Real Precise Plan. What is before you is an ordinance that is a step backwards and that carves out **95.4%** of the El Camino Real Precise Plan.

This 95.4% reduction is not just heartless but illegal. First, it's reneging Program 1.1f, a legally binding housing element commitment to allow by-right shelters in the El Camino Real Precise Plan "[a]t minimum" (p. 35 of HE). No reasonable reader would think a proposal where conditional use permits are required in 95.4% of the El Camino Real Precise Plan is compatible with the city's original promise that "Program 1.1 will amend the El Camino Real Precise Plan consistent with AB2339, allowing emergency shelters without a conditional use permit" (p. 357 of HE) Second, the proposed zoning ordinance amendment would prevent shelters from the homeless from securing by-right permits, an apparent violation of SB 330's prohibition on restricting intensity of land use. Third, staff's recommendation does not comply with a plain reading of GOV§65583(a)(4) from AB2339, which requires cities to identify or create "one or more zoning designations" where "emergency shelters are allowed as a permitted use without a conditional use or other discretionary permit". A subsection of a sub-area of a zoning designation is not a zoning designation and clearly does not suffice to meet the text or spirit of §65583(a)(4).

The staff report portrays a 95.4% cutback as 'balancing' historical preservation and combatting homelessness. First, this so-called 'balancing' is illegal and so the policy aim is beside the point. Second, there is nothing 'balanced' about obstructing shelters for the homeless nearly everywhere just to protect dubiously historical structures on a small number of parcels. Third, El Camino Real is a major arterial and growth area for the city that is hardly historic: there is not a single address on El Camino that's listed on the city's [historic register](#) as of September 2022. Fourth, our historical legacy will be our failure to combat homelessness if we don't do the bare minimum and legalize shelters for the homeless.

In a bid to block potential avenues for solving homelessness, staff is recklessly jeopardizing compliance with housing element law and risking revocation of the city's pro-housing designation. We ask the Environmental Planning Commission to emphatically oppose this recommendation and to direct staff to take our housing element commitments both seriously and literally.

Thank you,  
Salim Damerdj On behalf of Mountain View YIMBY

---

From: Serge Bonte [REDACTED]  
Sent: Monday, February 19, 2024 11:43 AM  
To: epc@mountainview.gov; City Council <City.Council@mountainview.gov>  
Cc: Cameron, Dawn <Dawn.Cameron@mountainview.gov>  
Subject: re: EPC 2.20.24 Meeting - Agenda Item 5,1 Emergency Shelters

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

Honorable Chair Yin and Commissioners,

I understand that the zoning changes for emergency shelters are required by law and by the City's commitments in its recently approved Housing Element.

Even without these mandates, removing barriers to set up emergency shelters seems to me like the right humane thing to do.

I do have some questions however on the location. To be clear, I'm not opposed to having shelters in that part of El Camino (which is near my neighborhood: St Francis Acres). But,

1. Why only that part of the El Camino Precise Plan ? The staff report indicates that other sections of El Camino Real have historical buildings but I'm hard pressed to identify any of them (lots of buildings along El Camino Real are old but can't see any of true historical significance). City should really provide that information publicly before excluding so much of the El Camino Precise Plan.

2. Why only the El Camino Precise Plan? Many other parts of the City seem suitable for emergency shelters (the East Whisman area has decent transit, Downtown has even better transit than El Camino , close access to CSA and Hope's Corner has already operated as a shelter). Also other precise plans might include churches (providing shelter seems aligned to many churches' mission) and public land (much easier to establish a shelter).

I am urging you to expand the scope of the areas where emergency shelters can be established by right (more precise plans). This would further remove barriers by providing more options for a public or non profit organizations wanting to set up a shelter. This would also be fairer to your residents (more of a shared burden if you will).

Sincerely,

Serge Bonte  
Lloyd Way, Mountain View

---

**From:** Sebastian Brisbois [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 21, 2024 12:57 PM  
**To:** [epc@mountainview.gov](mailto:epc@mountainview.gov)  
**Subject:** February 21 Agenda Item 5.1

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

Hello Environmental Planning Commission Members,

I'm writing to express my support for policies that make it easier to establish shelters. I live in Old Mountain View near El Camino Real. I know some people might oppose shelters due to negative assumptions about unhoused people but these are merely unfounded fears. I've never had a negative interaction with an unhoused member of our community, and I've never heard of any from other people I know. I also haven't heard of anything major in the news that would suggest there is that type of problem in Mountain View. All members of our community should be welcome here. We're in a housing crisis, so anything we can do to address that should be encouraged. Limiting shelters to only certain areas will limit the cities ability to combat these issues. Affordable housing should be prioritized, as well as getting people into housing.

Thank you,  
Sebastian Brisbois

**From:** Ali Sapirman [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 21, 2024 3:59 PM  
**To:** [epc@mountainview.gov](mailto:epc@mountainview.gov); William Cranston <[wcranstonmv@gmail.com](mailto:wcranstonmv@gmail.com)>; Jose Gutierrez <[mv.epc.jose@gmail.com](mailto:mv.epc.jose@gmail.com)>; Hank Dempsey <[hankdempseymv@gmail.com](mailto:hankdempseymv@gmail.com)>; Alex Núñez <[alex.nunez@pm.me](mailto:alex.nunez@pm.me)>; Joyce Yin <[jyin.mvepc@gmail.com](mailto:jyin.mvepc@gmail.com)>; Chris Clark <[chrisclarkmv@gmail.com](mailto:chrisclarkmv@gmail.com)>; Hagan, Lindsay <[Lindsay.Hagan@mountainview.gov](mailto:Lindsay.Hagan@mountainview.gov)>; , City Manager <[city\\_mgr@mountainview.gov](mailto:city_mgr@mountainview.gov)>; City Council <[City.Council@mountainview.gov](mailto:City.Council@mountainview.gov)>; , City Clerk <[city.clerk@mountainview.gov](mailto:city.clerk@mountainview.gov)>; Kamei, Ellen <[Ellen.Kamei@mountainview.gov](mailto:Ellen.Kamei@mountainview.gov)>; Matichak, Lisa <[Lisa.Matichak@mountainview.gov](mailto:Lisa.Matichak@mountainview.gov)>; Showalter, Pat <[Pat.Showalter@mountainview.gov](mailto:Pat.Showalter@mountainview.gov)>; Hicks, Alison <[Alison.Hicks@mountainview.gov](mailto:Alison.Hicks@mountainview.gov)>; Ramos, Emily Ann <[Emily.Ramos@mountainview.gov](mailto:Emily.Ramos@mountainview.gov)>; Ramirez, Lucas <[Lucas.Ramirez@mountainview.gov](mailto:Lucas.Ramirez@mountainview.gov)>; Abe-Koga, Margaret <[Margaret.abe-koga@mountainview.gov](mailto:Margaret.abe-koga@mountainview.gov)>  
**Cc:** City Clerk <[cityclerk@mountainview.gov](mailto:cityclerk@mountainview.gov)>; Housing Elements@HCD <[HousingElements@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:HousingElements@hcd.ca.gov)>; Woodman, Leslie@HCD <[Leslie.Woodman@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:Leslie.Woodman@hcd.ca.gov)>; [Reid.Miller@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:Reid.Miller@hcd.ca.gov); Corey Smith <[corey@housingactioncoalition.org](mailto:corey@housingactioncoalition.org)>  
**Subject:** HAC Comment on EPC Item 5.1 Emergency Shelters Amendment

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

Dear Environmental Planning Commissioners,

I am writing on behalf of the Housing Action Coalition (HAC), a member-supported nonprofit that supports housing at all income levels in order to alleviate Mountain View and the Bay Area's displacement, housing shortage, and affordability crisis.

HAC was one of the stakeholders deeply invested in the housing element process. We were very excited to see the City's commitment in Program 1.1F, a legally binding housing element commitment to allow by-right shelters in the El Camino Real Precise Plan “[a]t minimum.”

However, the proposed ordinance in the staff report requires conditional use permits in 95.4% of the El Camino Real Precise Plan. This directly conflicts with the intent of Program 1.1F, as well as, the objectives outlined in the 6th Cycle Housing Element 2023-2031.

The staff interpretation of Program 1.1F is not aligned with the goals of the program to increase the production of much-needed shelters for our most vulnerable residents.

We ask the Environmental Planning Commission to oppose this recommendation and to direct staff to follow the commitments they certified in the housing element.

In solidarity,

--

**Ali Sapirman** | Pronouns: They/Them  
South Bay & Peninsula Organizer | Housing Action Coalition  
555 Montgomery St, San Francisco, CA 94111  
Cell: (407) 739-8818 | Email: [ali@housingactioncoalition.org](mailto:ali@housingactioncoalition.org)



To opt out of all HAC emails, respond to this email with "unsubscribe all".

-----Original Message-----

From: Lenny Siegel [REDACTED]  
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 12:34 PM  
To: epc@mountainview.gov  
Subject: Item 5.1 February 21

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

The staff report doesn't make clear which historic properties on El Camino Real would be put at risk by the "by-right" emergency shelter designation. Please ask staff to identify them and explain why they believe they are at risk.

Lenny

—

Lenny Siegel

[REDACTED]

<http://lennysiegel.users.sonic.net/web/>



February 20, 2024

Re: February 21, 2024, Agenda Item 5.1-2023 Housing Element Annual Progress Report and Emergency Shelters Amendment

Dear Chair Yin and Members of the Environmental Planning Commission:

The League of Women Voters (LWV) supports the building of shelters, policies that increase the stock of affordable housing, and the government providing adequate notice of proposed actions.

The League encourages the City to retain the existing zoning for shelters in the general industrial (MM) district, given that adding discretionary processes may violate SB 330. We suggest the City include all of El Camino Real for by-right provisions, as Housing Element program 1.1 specifies "[a]t minimum, this will include the El Camino Real Precise Plan" in its entirety. In addition, under AB 2339, the staff report also should include an analysis of the standards.

The League requests greater detail on Housing Element implementation in the Annual Progress Report, such as on timeline updates (1.10 on Density Bonus) and Council meetings results (1.13f-g on Gatekeeper). We also ask for additional details on 4.1.a (Streamlining), in particular whether all relevant departments have staff trained to handle affordable housing projects. We also understand that 1.1 is not finished, given that in December the staff reported that precise plan changes were not yet complete.

The League also requests improved outreach notification, as the postcard sent did not mention who was receiving the postcards or why, failed to provide a summary understandable to the public, and was not in languages other than English.

Please send any questions about this letter to Kevin Ma, Co-Chair of the Housing Committee, at [housing@lwvlamv.org](mailto:housing@lwvlamv.org).

Si h:e\_  
Ka 1 oglm  
President

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Si h:e\_" with a stylized flourish.

Los Altos-Mountain View Area LWV

C: Madelyn Faul  
Krisha Penollar  
Eric Anderson  
Dawn S. Cameron

---

**From:** , Planning Division <Planning.Division@mountainview.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 21, 2024 8:22 AM  
**To:** Pancholi, Diana <Diana.Pancholi@mountainview.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Emergency Shelters Action

Nancy Woo-Garcia  
Office Assistant /CDD-Planning  
Main 650-903-6306

---

**From:** RoseBill T [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 20, 2024 8:03 PM  
**To:** [epc@mountainview.gov](mailto:epc@mountainview.gov); , Planning Division <Planning.Division@mountainview.gov>  
**Subject:** Emergency Shelters Action

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

Hello,

I would like to understand better the reason for placement of Emergency Shelters along El Camino near the intersection with Miramonte Ave.

I guess I understand the need for readily available transportation but that is the only reason that I see at this time for that location.

I am concerned about the closeness to schools and parks where children will be transiting past and near the shelters. Of course, I am also concerned about the nearness to neighborhoods.

I oppose the setting up the shelters for the above reasons; however, to be better informed I want to know the reasoning for the placement in the mentioned location(s) and what other options you have explored.

Thanks.

Bill Taylor  
[REDACTED]  
Mountain View, CA 94041



---

**From:** James Kuszmaul [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 21, 2024 11:48 AM  
**To:** epc@mountainview.gov; wcranstonmv@gmail.com; mv.epc.jose@gmail.com;  
hankdempseymv@gmail.com; alex.nunez@pm.me; jyin.mvepc@gmail.com;  
chrisclarkmv@gmail.com  
**Cc:** HousingElements@hcd.ca.gov  
**Subject:** 2024.02.21 EPC Item 5.1 Housing Element Update

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

Dear Environmental Planning Commissioners,

In addition to our comments on Emergency Shelters, Mountain View YIMBY would like to provide some comments on the Housing Element Annual Progress Report.

We are excited to see the various Housing Element programs begin to be implemented. Given their complexity, we have several requests for additional information and corrections on the draft Report to aid the public and HCD in understanding how implementation is going.

- As noted during the zoning ordinance updates for Programs 1.1a-e, there are some updates still to be done for precise plan areas; these are not mentioned in the report.
- There does not appear to be any specific timeline for Program 1.3.f (providing additional Gatekeeper exemptions for some residential projects). Additionally, direction provided by Council during the study sessions should be reported.
- For Programs 1.3a-c, e, and h, the schedule for when the various sub-items are planned to be completed is missing. For 1.3.c, a listing of expected zoning code updates would also help.
- For Program 1.4, what is the nature of the “Outreach to church sites and affordable housing developers” referenced, and are there any early indications of how much interest there will be in the program? Additionally, how does the city anticipate that SB4 will interact with the Program?
- For Program 1.5, when will the details of the proposed zoning update be released?
- For Program 1.9, there is no summary of the direction provided by Council for the BMR update.
- For Program 1.10, when are the next set of code updates expected to be put

forward?

- Regarding Program 1.11 and more broadly, the inventory of sites and RHNA progress, the report should detail any significant changes in the prospects of the large developments in North Bayshore and East Whisman. These projects are critical to achieving our overall housing production goals and, as such, warrant mention to ensure transparency and inform community engagement.
- Program 2.6 specifies “Develop and adopt incentives and zoning changes [for AFFH] by December 31, 2024.” When can the public expect more detail on the proposed incentives and changes, beyond the BMR alternative?
- For Program 3.1, it is unclear how many of the “199 units of rapid rehousing/permanent supportive housing” are completed versus under construction.
- Program 4.1.a includes many separate line items and is an important part of improving the city’s ability to approve housing; however, the update only indicates that “NOFA process updates is in progress.” What are the statuses of the other items?
- For Program 4.1.c: It is great to hear that the new permitting system is making good progress. When does the city expect the full transition to occur?
- There is no specific update on Program 4.2.b (support for a regional funding measure for affordable housing).

We do look forward to seeing the TDM ordinance updates, further parking minimum reductions, and the many other changes that will take effect over the course of 2024.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,  
James Kuszmaul, on behalf of Mountain View YIMBY

