

## City Council Questions March 19, 2019 Council Meeting

### ITEM 3.1 MOUNTAIN VIEW TRANSIT CENTER GRADE SEPARATION AND ACCESS POINT

1. Does this design preclude the future possibility of an east-west bike/ped separated facility adjacent to the Caltrain right-of-way?

The project includes a bike/pedestrian facility extending east from the easterly edge of the station to the Stevens Creek Trail connection at SR 85 as well as a pathway from Franklin Street under the existing Shoreline overcrossing of Evelyn.

This design does not preclude closing the gap (from Franklin Street through the station), though extending such a facility through the station itself is challenging as it should not conflict with boarding platforms and the vehicle and pedestrian circulation within the station.

2. How will the AGT project integrate with this design?

Phase 2 of the Automated Guideway Transit (AGT) feasibility study would refine the alignment and station configuration. The Phase 1 feasibility study identified a potential station location on the northwest corner of Central Expressway/ Moffett Boulevard, between the Caltrain tracks and Central Expressway. This area is still available for a station.

3. Is there a reason left turns from the W. Evelyn Ave ramp to SB Shoreline Blvd are prohibited? Since this will redirect traffic to Villa St., is there an opportunity to get a protected left turn from Villa to SB Shoreline Blvd to mitigate this impact?

To reduce the impact of the new signal on Shoreline Blvd, the movements were limited to those that replaced the movements at Castro Street and Central Expressway. This results in a half signal, which does not restrict southbound traffic on Shoreline Blvd. It is expected that trips going southbound on Shoreline Blvd from Castro Street would use Villa Street or other cross-streets as they do today. A protected left turn from Villa Street to southbound Shoreline Blvd will soon be under construction as part of the Shoreline/Villa intersection and signal improvement project that is in the final stages of design.

4. Would it be possible to turn Santa Rosa Ave into a cul-de-sac and use some of the Willowgate St. right-of-way to extend the undercrossing, reducing Adobe Building parking impacts?

This option was not explored, in part due to community concerns raised about parking and traffic issues in the Santa Rosa/Willowgate neighborhood. Staff can explore this alternative if directed to do so by Council.

5. It appears that the protected bike lanes on Moffett Blvd in Figure 10 (p. 14) are part of this project. Could the protected bike lanes cut through the bulb-out on the Stierlin Road side and connect directly with the bike lane on WB Central Expy, avoiding potential conflicts with vehicles?

This could be explored as the design progresses.

6. For the 100 Moffett Blvd entrance, where is the ramp-user traffic most likely coming from? If Option 2 is selected, could wayfinding be placed from the Moffett side to assist ramp-users coming from that direction (so they don't go all the way to Central Expy, only to have to back track to the ramp, if they weren't familiar with the location of the entrance)?

Staff anticipates most trips will continue onto Stierlin Road and Shoreline Boulevard in line with the expected increase in bike use in that corridor leading into North Bayshore. There will also be bike/pedestrian trips from Moffett Boulevard and wayfinding signage along Moffett Boulevard can be included in the project.

7. Is a "pedestrian mall" feasible and within the scope of work of this project?

Staff assumes the question is about the concept of creating a pedestrian mall along the 100 block of Castro. A pedestrian mall on Castro is not within the scope of work for this project; however, the project does not preclude a pedestrian mall being implemented in the future.

8. Can you please share the results of the traffic study done to assess the impact of closing the Castro Street crossing of the tracks and rerouting the vehicle traffic to a new access ramp for Evelyn Ave to Shoreline Blvd?

A preliminary traffic study was conducted as part of developing the Transit Center Master Plan approximately three years ago. The Grade Separation and Access Project preliminary engineering/environmental work currently underway includes an updated traffic study, which will soon be finalized. The March 19, 2019, Study Session memo provided some preliminary results for the Castro Street closure and new ramp to Shoreline compared to existing conditions (see page 24). A table of these preliminary results is shown below:

Existing Plus Project  
Diverted Traffic Added to Street Segments

Segments	AM Peak			PM Peak		
	NB/WB	SB/EB	Total	NB/WB	SB/EB	Total
Shoreline (north of Evelyn)	223	308	531	240	514	754
Evelyn (west of Franklin)	168	186	354	167	309	476
Villa (west of Franklin)	104	24	128	65	70	135
Dana (west of Franklin)	23	0	23	27	0	27
California (west of Franklin)	21	19	40	0	11	11
Villa (west of Shoreline)	83	7	90	80	40	120
California (west of Shoreline)	32	-3	29	29	-2	27
Shoreline (south of California)	0	37	37	0	39	39

It should be noted that the existing conditions do not include the interim Central Expressway/Castro/Moffett intersection project which includes eliminating the left turns from Castro Street to Central Expressway as a bike/pedestrian safety improvement. Some of the traffic diversion shown above will occur when the interim project is constructed this year.

9. Could you provide cost estimates for each of the elements?

**Cost estimates for the project are still under development and will require completing the 35% design to firm up. Preliminary cost ranges for the various improvements included in the project are as follows:**

- **Bike/Pedestrian Undercrossing (Caltrain tracks and Central Expressway) - \$30 million to \$40 million**
- **Ramp from Evelyn to Shoreline - \$8 million to \$12 million**

**Streets Improvements (shuttle pick-up/drop-off areas, protected bikeways, traffic signals) - \$8 million to \$12 million**

10. As a point of reference, how wide would an automobile underpass have to be?

**An automobile underpass with the current two through lanes in each direction, no connection to Central Expressway, and with bike lanes and wide sidewalks for the high bicycle/pedestrian traffic, would be 60 to 80 feet wide. An automobile underpass would also be much longer than a bicycle/pedestrian underpass, with the underpass having to start just north of Villa Street on Castro and extend north of Central Expressway on Moffett.**

#### **ITEM 7.1 UPDATE ON INITIATIVES TO ASSIST HOMELESS AND UNSTABLY HOUSED RESIDENTS, AND CONSIDERATION OF PARKING ENFORCEMENT STRATEGIES**

1. Under the "Housing Programs" section (beginning p. 12, with details in Attachment 8); the data suggest that these programs are quite successful. However, it is not clear whether these funding allocations are the optimal amounts. Would increasing funding for these programs, and for the other services listed (beginning p. 21), proportionally increase the number of instances in which homeless individuals and households are successfully rehoused or more effectively served? In other words, would increased funding beyond what is proposed here necessarily mean that the programs would be more effective or successful?

**Additional funding would assist in serving more clients.**

2. In the Police Community Outreach Metrics (p.18), why are so many fewer homeless "subjects" being referred to CSA for assistance? What is the alternative?

**The reason for a decrease in referrals to CSA is that a majority of homeless population in Mountain View are already aware of CSA and do not need to be referred.**

3. In the Police Community Outreach Metrics, what is the difference between the "homeless individuals or residents living in vehicles that have been arrested" metric and the "arrests related to vehicle dwellers/homeless subjects sleeping on the streets or encampments" metrics?

**"Homeless Individuals or residents living in vehicles that have been arrested" is referring to the number of actual people that have been arrested. It combines the number of different people who live in vehicles or on the streets/encampments. "Arrests related to vehicle dwellers" and "Arrests related to homeless subjects sleeping on the street or encampments" is referring to the total number of arrests per category. The arrests related to**

vehicle dwellers is 176 total arrests. Some of these subjects may have been arrested once, or multiple times. The total arrests with subjects sleeping on the streets/encampments is 102. Some may have multiple arrests as well. The total number of arrests made is 278 total arrests within the population as a whole.

4. Some cities have apparently been able to dramatically reduce homelessness through effective data collection: (<https://www.fastcompany.com/90316607/3-cities-in-the-u-s-have-ended-chronic-homelessness-heres-how-they-did-it>). Is this a strategy the City and/or the County of Santa Clara would consider?

Though Mountain View efforts are new, staff understands this and seeks to supplement the County HMIS which tracks coordinated data from assessed individuals with the addition of our own GIS location based software and app (recommended in the March 19 report). Here are some links to the type of system staff recommends:

- [Combating Homelessness In Los Angeles County](#)
- [Applying a Geo-Centric Workflow to Homelessness in NYC](#)

5. Roughly how many safe parking spaces could be made available on City property?

As discussed in the report, safe parking is usually kept at a moderate number for each site. Staff estimates capacity for service delivery is approximately 20 vehicles (e.g., for Shoreline Lot B, or the prospective property discussed in the report). This could potentially be supplemented with fewer vehicles (one to five) at City parks (such as Eagle, Cuesta and Rengstorff). City sites would supplement the approximately 20 vehicles expected to be hosted by MOVE by the end of the FY 2018-19.

6. How would a Citywide Oversized Vehicle Parking Prohibition work alongside a Safe Parking Program? Since RVs wouldn't be able to remain in the safe parking site during the day, where would they go?

The day parking is a challenge with no easy answer. If a prohibition were adopted Citywide, the oversized vehicles would need to find parking at their places of employment or some other daytime location. The City of Santa Barbara has a large scale safe parking program and OV prohibition and they were able secure only approximately eight daytime spaces.

7. How many children live in RVs and vehicles? How many are MVWSD, LASD, or high school district students?

It is difficult to obtain definitive data about the number of children that live in RVs/cars. Children tend to be camouflaged living with other family, friends, and this is compounded with parent concerns about Child Protective Services (CPS) engagement. It is important to note that CPS does not engage just because a family is homeless.

The best data we have is on overall homeless. According to Santa Clara County Office of Education the data for FY 2017-18 is:

- Mountain View Whisman is 89 total homeless youth
- Mountain View Los Altos High School District is 84 homeless youth
- LASD is one homeless youth

- You can access info here: <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/filescupc.asp>

8. How much more likely are RV dwellers to engage in criminal activity than the general public?

While crime trends, especially property crimes, have been increasing locally and regionally over the period of time the number of homeless have also been increasing, there is no empirical data that shows people living in vehicles or homeless are any more or less likely to engage in criminal activity than the general public.

9. When is the Palo Alto Housing site expected to come on line and accept vehicles? How many vehicles? And what time period (number of months) do we expect to use it in total?

The Palo Alto Housing Corporation has recently hired a contractual resource that will assist on this project. The estimate is currently April 2019, but is more likely later in the spring. PAHC is committed to working in cooperation with MOVE. As discussed in the October/December 2018 report, the number of vehicles that will be hosted at the site is approximately 8 to 11 depending on type. This will be allowed once they have an approved TUP, approved for a maximum of 360 days (180 days with another 180 days with reapplication).

10. Do we expect continued growth in the number of vehicle residents in 2019 and the next years?

This is hard to forecast, as growth depends on a myriad of economic factors like the cost of rent in the Bay Area (which is occurring statewide) wages keeping pace, employment opportunities, personal decision making, etc.

11. How many vehicle residents are there in our surrounding cities - Palo Alto, Sunnyvale, Cupertino, Santa Clara, and Los Altos?

Staff doesn't have accurate data on all the surrounding communities. We are unaware if they do street-by-street counts like Mountain View. We do know some data from a survey of the Santa Clara Cities Association:

Morgan Hill	~10-15
Gilroy	~50
Los Altos	~4-8
Los Altos Hills	~0
Santa Clara	~50-100

Another example with some concentration is Palo Alto where news accounts have estimated 30-50 vehicles along El Camino Real.

12. The report says there's some illegal waste dumping at Rengstorff Park. How much is that?

The waste has been related to debris and other matters at Rengstorff Park. The park staff have noticed this specifically in relation to the bathroom usage and in and around the trash cans and near the barbecue area. In addition, on a nearly a bi-weekly basis PD-NES, takes a truck load of dumped material off of Crisanto Avenue along the dirt area just north of where the vehicles park.

13. Why have the Dignity on Wheels hygiene services recently experienced a drop in number?

**The drop is unexplained, but the timeframe at mid-day may be a complication for those who work or are in school. The timeframe was based on availability of Dignity on Wheels (DOW). DOW is adding truck capacity which will allow them to have greater service delivery and CSA is looking at securing funding for the service on an ongoing basis and potentially expanding or adjusting hours.**

14. What's a parking access program for city owned lots?

**A parking only program is in response to questions about the City offering just a place to park at night without services. It is not a recommended model for providing assistance as it does not provide links to services.**

15. Mountain View's Housing Data Summary shows 557 homes demolished to make way for building new homes. Were most of the demolished homes naturally affordable ones?

**While Community Development does not track the rents of the demolished units, based on Tenant Relocation Assistance Ordinance staff interaction with displaced tenants from many of the demolished units, it is a rational assumption that many of the demolished units were naturally affordable units. In addition, since many of the demolished units were probably older housing stock and thus proposed for redevelopment, it can be assumed that the older units could not charge market rate rents.**

16. Page 7 of the staff report - what activity is the no interest loan for?

**This is for the construction of the commercial kitchen at Trinity United Methodist Church (TUMC).**

17. Page 9 of the staff report - can you share the data on homeless in the surrounding communities for 2013, 2015 and 2017?

**2015 and 2017 data available online:**

- Palo Alto: 291 (2015), 276 (2017)
- Sunnyvale: 288 (2015), 253 (2017)
- Los Altos: 18 (2015), 6 (2017)

18. Page 11 of the staff report - is there insight into why case management appointments rose substantially in the 6 months from July - December 2018, from the prior 12 month period?

**Due to the onboarding of a new CSA Outreach Worker, after the prior Outreach Worker transitioned to a new position at another non-profit.**

19. Page 11 of the staff report - is there insight into why one-on-one interactions with a case manager rose substantially in the 6 months from July - December 2018, from the prior 12 month period?

**Same answer as above.**

20. Page 17 of the staff report – what is the estimated rate of arrests for vehicle dwellers? Could it be assumed to be 101 arrests / 290 vehicles = 35% for the 6 month period July-Dec 2018?

**PD cannot give an estimated rate of arrest, as some vehicle dwellers have been arrested multiple times. The “101” arrests is the total amount of arrests within the vehicle dweller population, not the number of people arrested.**

21. Page 17 of the staff report – can the arrests be broken out by RV dwellers and car dwellers so that the rate of arrests for each can be estimated?

**PD does not count RVs separate from standard vehicles which are being resided in. The RV data collection combines all vehicles being resided in.**

22. Page 21 of the staff report – how many times has the biohazard waste cleanup been used?

**The City contracts with a contractor to respond and clean up biohazard waste. Since December 2017, we have called and paid for their services ten times.**

23. Page 27 of the staff report – Does Los Altos post signs on every block regarding the 2 am to 6 am parking ban?

**Staff is not aware of Los Altos’ signage program, but there are not signs on every block.**

24. Page 27 of the staff report – For Sunnyvale, what is the time period for which the code authorizes the removal of stored vehicles? And, does this include vehicles in which people might be living?

**From Sunnyvale MuniCode: In the event a vehicle, including a boat or trailer, is left standing upon a street, alley or public parking facility in excess of a period of seventy-two consecutive hours or more, any public safety employee authorized by the director of public safety may remove the vehicle from the street, alley or public parking facility in the manner and subject to the requirements of the [Vehicle Code](#) (link).**

25. Page 29 of the staff report – Would adjacent to a park include both sides of the street adjacent to the park, or just the side of the street immediately next to the park? Or, would this need to be defined?

**Staff’s assumption was just the side immediately adjacent to the park, but this could be defined by the Council.**

26. Page 29 of the staff report – What are the state health and safety codes related to RV occupancy?

**Health and Safety Code Sec. 18871 of the Special Occupancy Parks Act prohibits the use of an RV for occupancy outside of a special occupancy park (including located on public streets) that is in an unsafe or unsanitary condition or that is structurally unsound and does not protect its occupants against the elements amongst other requirements. The Department of Housing and Community Development issued regulations (25 CCR 1607) that deem RVs substandard and a nuisance when any of the following conditions exist that endanger the**

life, limb, health, property, safety, or welfare of the occupants or the public (portions of this code section are included here for reference): health hazards including lack of adequate ventilation; dampness of habitable rooms; infestation of insects, vermin or rodents; or general dilapidation; structural hazards including defective flooring; walls, partitions or other vertical supports that split, lean, or buckle due to defective material or deterioration; ceiling and roof supports that sag or buckle due to defective material or deterioration; nuisance, which includes anything injurious to health or indecent or offensive to the senses, or an obstruction to the free use of property so as to interfere with the comfortable enjoyment of life or property; electrical hazards including equipment that did not conform with applicable laws at the time of installation, equipment not maintained in good and safe condition, or not being used in a safe manner; or electrical conductors that are not protected from physical damage; plumbing hazards including plumbing that does not comply with applicable laws at the time of installation, not maintained in good or safe condition, or has cross connections and siphonage between fixtures; or broken, unsanitary or leaking plumbing, pipe or fixtures; hazardous mechanical equipment including equipment that did not conform with applicable laws at time of installation or has not been maintained in good and safe condition, or is not being used in a safe manner; unvented fuel burning heating appliances unless otherwise permitted by law; unsupported, loose, or leaking fuel supply piping; or defective heating (when provided); faulty weather protection; any RV or portion thereof which is in such a condition as to cause a fire or explosion or provide a ready fuel to augment the spread and intensity of a fire or explosion; or RVs or portions thereof without adequate exit facilities.

27. Page 30 of the staff report – Why has adding a second stripe on Shoreline been added to a CIP if the Council has not decided to do this?

The second stripe is being added as part of a planned resurfacing of Shoreline Boulevard. When streets are resurfaced, staff routinely evaluates the street for opportunities to improve bicycle facilities. A second stripe is typical of such improvements.

28. Page 32 of the staff report – Why is the 2 am to 6 am parking time limit not enforced city-wide? When did it stop being enforced?

The 2 a.m. to 6 a.m. time limit and permit process was never enforced citywide. Under the City Code, to park in excess of one hour during this timeframe requires a permit, which was found to be administratively and law-enforcement resource intensive. Some locations in the City have been posted restricting the hours of parking from 2 a.m. to 6 a.m. and where posted, the parking restriction is enforced.

29. Page 37 of the staff report – Is the \$260,000 for police outreach for one year?

Yes, one year (fully loaded).

30. Can businesses currently allow RVs to park in their parking lots? If not, why not?

Businesses can allow RVs to park in their parking lots if they are on private property for parking purposes.



31. Attachment 11 – can you please provide the survey responses from just Mountain View residents? Does anything prevent people from taking the survey more than once?

We currently have no way to certify residency status for an on-line survey. The City survey is not gated like NextDoor with an address certification process. The survey followed the same distribution methods as the 2016 survey, and all other on-line surveys and promoted to those living and working in Mountain View and we did not specifically ask for the residency of the respondents, but we asked our survey provider to assist us in getting the aggregated data of the un-registered users IP and from this we are estimating that 344 respondents (29 percent) did not take the survey from a known Mountain View IP address. Of those, nine respondents (three percent) registered information on the survey to indicate that they lived inside of Santa Clara County; however, of the 844 online respondents, only 288 (34 percent) claimed ownership of their responses while 556 (66 percent) opted to remain anonymous. The IP address prevents duplicate takers. The site has map tools to show by location responses and staff has copies of all hard copy surveys taken.

32. Please provide more detail on Palo Alto's residential preferential parking districts and Sunnyvale's residential permit parking boundaries.

The City of Palo Alto has a RPP district on residential streets surrounding the downtown area. The Downtown RPP district is bounded by Palo Alto Avenue, Guinda Avenue, Lincoln Ave, Alma Ave. and Embarcadero Ave. Staff is not aware of a program in Palo Alto to establish new areas that is similar to Mountain View's program.

Sunnyvale has a program that is very similar to Mountain View's RPP Program. Residents can request an RPP zone and if the request meets certain established criteria, then Council can approve the zone by an ordinance.

33. Could you provide a breakdown of the 71 safe parking spaces in the County by City - San Jose, Saratoga, Morgan Hill, and Cupertino?

- Six to eight MOVE Mountain View
- Twenty-five Amigos de Guadalupe in San Jose
- Seventeen Life Moves in San Jose
- Eight Gilroy Compassion Center, Morgan Hill
- Fifteen Winter Faith Collaborative that rotates in Cupertino, Saratoga

34. In the staff report, it says that RVs can park in certain nonresidential zones. In the Santa Barbara ordinance it says that the RVs can park in certain nonresidential zones on a paved portion of a property owner's property. Does this mean that no RVs can park on public streets?

Staff can respond at the meeting.

#### ITEM 8.1 PRELIMINARY 2017 COMMUNITY GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS INVENTORY

1. Page 15 of the staff report – can you share the Census Bureau data that shows the percent of people commuting to Mountain View by SOV, carpooling, public transit, etc.?

2015 and 2017 Census Bureau data from the American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates is attached. The ACS estimates suggest that over 5,600 more Mountain View employees and 1,215 residents chose to travel by sustainable modes in 2017 compared to 2015. Mode share of these modes increased approximately 3% for employees and 2% for residents, while mode share of single occupancy vehicles decreased 2% for employees and 3% for residents.

2. Page 18 of the staff report – what is the definition of employees? Is that people who do not live in Mountain View but work in Mountain View? If not, what is the definition?

The definition of employees is anyone employed in Mountain View. There is some overlap between residents and employees, since some residents also work in Mountain View. The American Community Survey (ACS) indicates about 33% of employed residents are also employees, which means about 16% of employees are also employed residents.

3. Will the 2020 GHG Emissions take into account the new information from the upcoming 2020 Census?

Every GHG emissions inventory uses the most recent Census Bureau data regarding population and employment. The Census Bureau collects information on many topics every year, not just during an official census year. In between decennial census years, the Census Bureau uses statistical sampling to create estimates through the American Community Survey (ACS). Due to use of statistical sampling rather than community-wide counts, there is a much larger margin of error for the American Community Survey than the decennial Census. However, the ACS is broader in scope and asks different questions than the Census, so while there is some overlap for basic population and housing counts, not all data is available from both sources. The ACS estimates are available each year, and have been used in prior GHG inventories, since Mountain View's inventory years have not previously coincided with a census year. For any data where direct census counts are available for 2020, they can be used instead of the ACS estimates for calculating the 2020 GHG inventory. If the census counts deviate significantly from ACS estimates in previous years, staff may choose to compare the results from both data sources to provide context to Council.

#### ITEM 9.1 DOWNTOWN PAID PARKING STUDY

1. The transportation needs of businesses in North Bayshore and East Whisman are significantly different from those in downtown. For instance, NBS and EW are transit deficient, and operating a shuttle fleet may be desirable to supplement existing service. Downtown is transit rich, but service workers may not utilize transit because it is expensive, or first-mile challenges preclude use of transit. Would it not make more sense for the Downtown area to be served by its own TMA, rather than participate in a Citywide TMA?

The Mountain View TMA is working on expanding its TDM services beyond shuttles to serve new members from throughout the City who will have varying access to transit and various travel patterns (e.g., residential vs office). If that is Council's direction, staff could study both TMA options but generally feels one central administration would be more efficient.

- On average, how many downtown parking permits are sold annually? Quarterly? Monthly? Daily?

Below is a comparison of permit sales from 2016 to 2018. Overall, 2018 sold the highest number of annual permits, but 2016 sold the most permits across all permit types.

	2018	2017	2016
Annual Permit	1,741	1,631	1,357
Quarterly Permit	476	471	798
Monthly Permit	210	90	403
Daily Permit	103	123	179
<b>Total Permits</b>	<b>2,504</b>	<b>2,315</b>	<b>2,737</b>

	10 a.m.	Noon	2 p.m.	4 p.m.	6 p.m.	8 p.m.
Wednesday 11/14/2019	238 (76%)	235 (75%)	188 (60%)	157 (50%)	56 (18%)	19 (6%)
Thursday 11/15/2019	235 (75%)	232 (74%)	194 (62%)	153 (49%)	47 (15%)	25 (8%)
Friday 11/16/2019	219 (70%)	200 (64%)	178 (57%)	91 (29%)	31 (10%)	6 (2%)
Average	228 (73%)	222 (71%)	188 (60%)	135 (43%)	44 (14%)	16 (5%)

- How many cars with downtown parking permits are parking in Lot 1?

The demand for permit holder parking at Structure 1 (135 Bryant Street) peaks at 10 a.m. with an average of 228 vehicles parked, followed by noon with 222 vehicles parked and 2 p.m. with 188 vehicles parked. Below provides information about the demand with the number of permit holders parked at Structure 1 and percent of spaces occupied:

- Page 7 of the staff report – how was residency determined and validated for the online survey?

Survey respondents self-reported where they reside.

- The blue valet program signs at lot 11 do not indicate the days/hours for the program. Can this be fixed? Also, the pink signs do not indicate the days/hours for the program. Can this be fixed?

Staff is working on improving the signage and the overall valet service.

- Do we consistently enforce the current parking regulations? If not, how does enforcement vary throughout downtown?

Parking violations are consistently enforced. The Police Department currently has four police assistants in the Traffic Unit and their primary duty is parking enforcement. Their schedules vary because they are part-time employees but they work up to 29 hours per week and the bulk of their time is focused on downtown enforcement. Our Traffic Unit is also staffed by four motor officers, one sergeant, and a community services officer and parking

**enforcement is part of their duties. Our Neighborhood and Event Services Unit also deals with parking issues. Patrol officers and patrol community services officers respond to parking complaints and find violations on their own.**

7. Is there any information about when San Mateo, Redwood City, and San Jose moved to the paid parking model? I saw the Downtown Parking Action Plan and wondered if there was a bit more background aside from just the parking rates/fees.

**Staff does not have additional background information about the implementation of paid parking in San Mateo, Redwood City or San Jose.**

March 19, 2019

### Commuting Mode for Employees Working in Mountain View

Transportation Mode	2015	2015 %	2017	2017 %
Car, truck, or van:	62,060	80.6%	69,472	78.6%
Drove alone	53,929	70.0%	59,758	67.6%
Carpooled	8,131	10.6%	9,714	11.0%
Public transportation	7,963	10.3%	11,085	12.5%
Bicycle	2,519	3.3%	2,745	3.1%
Walked	1,161	1.5%	1,402	1.6%
Taxicab, motorcycle, or other means	1,796	2.3%	1,752	2.0%
Worked at home*	1,514	2.0%	1,946	2.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>77,013</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>88,402</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Commuting Mode for Mountain View Residents

Transportation Mode	2015	2015 %	2017	2017 %
Car, truck, or van:	34,883	80.3%	35,238	77.7%
Drove alone	31,408	72.3%	32,133	70.9%
Carpooled	3,475	8.0%	3,105	6.8%
Public transportation	2,619	6.0%	3,325	7.3%
Bicycle	2,627	6.0%	2,884	6.4%
Walked	1,091	2.5%	1,281	2.8%
Taxicab, motorcycle, or other means	707	1.6%	668	1.5%
Worked at home*	1,514	3.5%	1,946	4.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>43,441</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>45,342</b>	<b>100%</b>

*\*This data set represents Mountain View residents only*

All data was obtained from the American Community Survey 5-year estimates.