

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Lieber, Sally](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Showalter, Pat](#)
Cc: [City Council](#)
Subject: 5/25/21 Council meeting, agenda item 3 (Capital Improvement Program)
Date: Monday, May 24, 2021 9:15:59 PM

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

To: Members of the Mountain View City Council
From: Joel Dean, [REDACTED] North Shoreline Boulevard, MV
Subject:

I applaud the City Council's decision to defer further study of the Automated Guideway Transportation System. This is the first faint ray of sobriety cutting through the "irrational exuberance" of preceding years. I would applaud more vigorously if the AGT were killed off entirely, starting with expunging it from the Capital Improvement Program and quashing any notion of identifying or acquiring rights of way. It is an extravagantly expensive bonbon to be fed to a privileged minority of commuters. It is an abomination to Mountain View residents of the less-favored neighborhoods it would run through. If the economy revives to the point where the City feels it has limitless funds to spend on whimsy, and AGT's enthusiasts return to the Council in future elections, AGT could metastasize and turn half of Mountain view into a nice place to commute through, but where no one would want to live.

The one aspect of the AGT concept with any merit is the segment connecting VTA's Light Rail NASA station to R.T. Jones Road. Combined with bicycle/pedestrian bridges across Stevens Creek at La Avenida, Charleston and Crittenden, it could provide an alternative to the predominant source of traffic congestion on routes to North Bayshore --- the San Jose corridor. There could hardly be a better place to experiment with exotic technologies than right on NASA's doorstep. Put NASA engineers to work on the project, and the most likely conclusion they would reach is that the automated guideways of the future will be wireless, requiring no ROW acquisition or erection of concrete and steel monstrosities that blight adjacent properties.

City Council could best demonstrate its commitment to public transportation by supporting a robust conventional bus system, serving all the residents of Mountain View and not just a scattering of outsiders, financed independently of Google, and providing rational connections to VTA's trunk route. The City should purchase its own fleet of buses, rather than relying on the rattletraps furnished by contractors. Each bus should be adopted by a City Council member, who would ensure the quality of both the vehicle and the service.

Thank you for your attention.

From: [Serge Bonte](#)
To: [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Lucas Ramirez](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Lieber, Sally](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Showalter, Pat](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: re: 5/25/21 Meeting - Agenda Item 3.1 Capital Improvement Program Study Session
Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 7:39:54 AM

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

Honorable Mayor and City Council Members:

I wanted to share some comments on the "Equity Lens" section of the staff report. I am not blaming staff but I think the City Council should revisit and provide better guidance on what using an equity lens means.

The Access MV report -which for unclear reasons you relegated to the consent calendar- and the Community Shuttle Study that Access MV refers to, are better examples of how an equity lens should be applied: as a way to drive projects prioritization and implementation. In both cases, look at the data to see where our most vulnerable residents live and use that data to drive the programs.(in both Access MV and the community shuttle study, the poorer US Census tracts in Mountain View were a priority area).

If you look at the Staff Report for your study session, it's the opposite. Programs are selected and defined without an equity lens focus, and the equity lens seems to be applied as an 'a posteriori' blessing of sorts..

With only a few notable exceptions (the Narrow Street parking ban, repeated efforts to weaken the CSFRA...), the City doesn't devise programs that directly burden " communities of color and/or low-income residents".. Also there will always be some projects that have city wide benefits (i.e. neutral from an equity lens viewpoint) and some projects that happen to be near or in the poorer US Census Tracts in Mountain View.

In other words, you could copy and paste the Equity Lens section from one year to the next with little to no modifications.

Again I'm not faulting City staff but I feel the City Council should provide better directions.

In the case of the Capital Improvement Program, I wish an equity lens would have been applied earlier in the programming:

- Map where all the projects fall and where all historical gaps might exist . And then, instead of assessing each project individually, assess if their distribution is equitable. You might not be able to change the balance this year, but you will have data to try harder for the next cycle.
- When Looking at city wide projects, go beyond a default neutral assessment. See if there are ways to implement them in a more equitable fashion. Consider the "City Hall HVAC GHG Offsets" project which calls for planting 400-500 trees in Mountain View. From a CHG reduction standpoint, it's clearly a City Wide benefit and it also doesn't matter where the trees are planted (they could be planted just outside of Mountain View and provide a similar benefit to our residents). Applying an equity lens to this tree planting project should look at an

equitable distribution of trees throughout the City and as a way to reduce historical gaps in tree canopy or tree lined streets.

Sincerely,

Serge Bonte
Mountain View

From: [Serge Bonte](#)
To: [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Lieber, Sally](#); [Showalter, Pat](#)
Cc: [McCarthy, Kimbra](#); [City Clerk](#)
Subject: re: 05/25/2021 City Council Agenda (general comment and comments on 4.4, 4.8 and 6.2)
Date: Sunday, May 23, 2021 9:50:28 AM

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

Honorable Mayor and City Council Members:

I am writing to share one general comment and some comments on Agenda Items 4.4., 4.8 and 6.2.

General Comment: Can you share with the public when Council Meetings will resume in person even without or with limited public attendance? County Courts have resumed in person jury trials for a few months now (I was called for Jury Duty earlier this month and had to sit in court for a couple of days).. Our High School District has resumed in person board meetings for over a month now; their Board rationale was that it was only fair to meet in person when District was asking teachers to resume in person classes. The sooner the Council resumes in public meetings, the sooner you will send a signal that the City feels confident in returning to normal.

Agenda Items 4.4 and 4.8:

I am surprised to see these two consequential items on the consent calendar.

- Access MV contains lots of valuable data on transportation (of all types) in Mountain View as well as a roadmap for future projects. Even if the City Council doesn't have comments on this item, you are wasting an opportunity for a "prime time" presentation and public education (including press coverage) for an important and well thought out plan for Mountain View. While I understand that item has been approved by a City sub-committee, public attendance to these sub-committees is miniscule and very rarely covered by the press in other words virtually -pun semi-intended- nobody knows about their work.
- TRAO adjustments for a project on Mariposa: While the TRAO technical changes Staff worked out seem reasonable, there are still aspects that the City Council should discuss as this project might set a (potentially bad) precedent for other BMR alternate mitigations in Mountain View. Some questions worth addressing::
 - That alternate mitigation was presented at the last minute by Prometheus in 2019, it was negotiated from the dais and essentially on a handshake (back when physical handshakes were a thing :)), where is the formal agreement?
 - Was the RHC consulted for these adjustments?
 - The non profit partner changed, did the terms of the deal change as well?
 - Staff report mentions that Prometheus would now remain the owner of the property which contradicts the "handshake" deal the staff report describes as " ...a qualified affordable housing developer to acquire and rehabilitate a 48-unit, rent-stabilized building located at 660 Mariposa Avenue (Mariposa) and restrict rents to affordable levels in perpetuity with no displacement of existing tenants." Shouldn't the City Council review and approve such a significant change?

- Staff Report states that " The 1720 Villa Street Project conditions of approval allow a maximum of 4% rent increase a year for Mariposa, but Mariposa is also subject to the CSFRA, which limits annual rent increases to inflation with additional adjustments allowed. Therefore, annual rent increases must comply with CSFRA requirements; however, in no event can they exceed 4%" . What's the exact status of Mariposa after remodel? If deed restricted BMR, isn't the rent set based on an affordability formula? If not the case and since Mariposa would have remained under the CSFRA even without the handshake deal, then how does it improve affordability in Mountain View?

Agenda Item 6.2:

I understand that the process might require City review of this project but it still feels like a complete waste of time and resource to have a 4 single family homes subdivision of a 0.7 acres (*) lot be reviewed by the Council. Especially when some many consequential agenda items are on the consent calendar (like the RPP changes in June).

Sincerely,

Serge Bonte
Lloyd Way, Mountain View

(*) I happen to live in one such sub-division (one large lot divided in 4 for 3 additional single family homes); definitively not worth Council time :)

From: [Cynthia Riordan](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: 773 Cuesta Drive
Date: Thursday, May 20, 2021 5:33:38 PM

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

The huge oak tree on this property is a heritage oak and should not be destroyed. It is in need of trimming of the branches, but there is no area on the tree that is failing or dying. The reason the developers want this tree removed is purely economical because building four houses on the lot will bring them more money than three houses. They should be looking at this oak as a way to make a plain lot more beautiful and desirable. Trees such as this have been alive hundreds of years.

Attached to this email are photos of the same type of oak tree as exists at 773 Cuesta Drive but on Oak Street in Saratoga near the elementary school. If you compare these photos, you will see that the Cuesta Drive tree is healthy and thriving. It looks exactly like the trees on Oak Street in that the leaves are green and there are no dead branches.

Are your arborists fully qualified to make this judgment?

Sincerely,
Cynthia Riordan

















From: [David Shreni](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: 773 Cuesta drive
Date: Saturday, May 22, 2021 9:42:35 PM

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

Dear Good People who I elected to represent my views and carry out the wishes of the people they represent, even when they don't agree with their opinions.

I am a voting resident of the Cuesta Park neighborhood (check the logs).

I am writing to express my strong objection to development proposed at 773 Cuesta Drive. The plans to re-develop this property include the removal of ELEVEN (11) Heritage trees. I understand that one tree is dead and another is diseased but to remove the other heritage trees is absolutely unacceptable! Heritage trees give our town and neighborhood it's beautiful natural character, provide shade (especially important for keeping nearby homes cool), and serve as habitat for many birds and other animals.

I do think that this sets a poor low water mark regarding the privacy of the adjacent neighbors who will be impacted significantly. I ask that the developer works more with an acceptable design for the neighbors.

There's not much more to say here, except that every tree you allow to cut down just continues to contribute to the urban heat island that we're turning mountain view into. If you don't know what that is: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Urban_heat_island

I encourage thoughtful development. This would not be it.

Thanks,

David

From: [Dawn Endico](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: multifamily smoking prohibition
Date: Thursday, May 20, 2021 9:11:00 PM

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

I'm the manager at an apartment complex with 96 units and I have a couple of questions regarding the draft multifamily smoking prohibition ordinance.

1. There are a couple of people whose custom now is to smoke in the carport. They're outdoors and more than 20 feet from any building and there are no windows facing that direction. Is it ok for them to continue smoking there? If they moved they would probably stand on the sidewalk near people's open windows. I don't think I've ever gotten complaints about smoking in the parking lot but I have gotten complaints about smoking on the public sidewalk. We're unlikely to set up a smoking area since there is no extra space.

2. Where are medical marijuana users supposed to smoke? At one point the only place it was legal was indoors, at home. Is that still true?

Thanks in advance.

From: [Vanessa Marvin](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [CarolIne Baker](#)
Subject: Support for Agenda Item 7.1 on May 25 (smokefree housing)
Date: Thursday, May 20, 2021 10:04:31 PM
Attachments: [Tobacco Free Coalition Letter Mountain View May 2021.pdf](#)

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

Carol Baker and I are the co-chairs of the Tobacco-Free Coalition of Santa Clara County. On behalf of the coalition, here is a letter of support for the smokefree multi-unit housing ordinance that will be discussed at your May 25 City Council Meeting (Agenda Item 7.1).

We are excited that you are considering this issue and urge you to move forward with a strong and comprehensive policy that will protect the residents of the city from drifting secondhand smoke in their homes.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Vanessa Marvin & Carol Baker



1775 Story Road, Suite 120
San Jose, CA 95122

Mountain View City Council
City Hall
500 Castro Street, 3rd Floor
Mountain View, CA 94041

May 20, 2021

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

The Tobacco-Free Coalition of Santa Clara County, which consists of more than 20 organizations and individuals interested in promoting the health of our citizens, is urging you to move forward with a strong ordinance to protect Mountain View residents from drifting secondhand smoke in multi-unit housing **(Agenda Item 7.1 at your upcoming May 25, 2021 meeting)**.

Secondhand smoke exposure is harmful and potentially deadly. The U.S. Surgeon General has stated that there is no risk-free level of exposure to secondhand smoke. It can contribute to health problems such as asthma, heart disease, lung cancer and stroke. Children, the elderly and the disabled — our most vulnerable citizens — are also the most vulnerable to secondhand smoke.

While many laws have been passed in both in California and in Mountain View that protect residents from exposure to secondhand smoke, the residents of multi-unit housing are not protected from secondhand in their own homes. The home is a prominent source of secondhand smoke exposure for both young and old multi-unit housing residents. In fact, due to the coronavirus shelter in place order, many more people may be exposed in their homes.

Across Santa Clara County more than 1 in 2 residents living in multi-unit housing are exposed to secondhand smoke in their home. Higher exposure rates are also correlated with different racial groups, lower income levels and educational attainment.

A strong ordinance would include these key provisions to protect all residents of multi-unit housing:

- **Any building with 2 or more units** - so that even duplex residents who share a wall are protected
- **Condominiums and townhomes** - so that residents who own their multi-unit home are protected
- **All smoke** - so that residents are protected from all exposure, not just traditional cigarette smoke

These provisions are common sense and will prevent differing protections for residents. In fact, Los Gatos, Palo Alto, Monte Sereno, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale and Santa Clara County have already passed smokefree housing policies that restrict smoking in multi-unit housing with these provisions.

Our coalition urges you to consider the health of Mountain View residents and protect them from dangerous secondhand smoke in their homes.

Sincerely,

Vanessa Marvin, Co-Chair
vmarvin@me.com

Carol Baker, Co-Chair
carol@carolandcharliebaker.com

From: [Serge Bonte](#)
To: [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Lucas Ramirez](#); [Lieber, Sally](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Showalter, Pat](#)
Cc: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: re: Proposed (un-necessarily broad yet selective) Smoking Ban
Date: Monday, May 24, 2021 6:25:53 AM

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

Honorable Mayor and City Council Members:

I grew up watching my grandfather (who was a coal miner) cope with black lung disease.. This taught me how important it is to keep clean lungs and I never smoked in my life. I also grew up and lived for large periods of my adult life in apartments and I know the challenges that come with sharing walls and air with neighbors as well as with a management company or HOA micro-managing your daily life.

I do support a residential tobacco smoking ban but I think the proposed ordinance is at the same time too broad, too selective and too immediate.

1. Too Broad

Any ordinance (especially a ban) should be based on hard data. There is ample data on second hand tobacco cigarettes smoking. However there is little data on second hand vaping or cannabis smoking. To wit, there is no such data listed in the whereas of the ordinance nor anywhere in the Staff Report. In the absence of real data, I think you are overreaching in including vaping and cannabis. That overreach will have unintended consequences. In the UK, vaping is prescribed by doctors as a way out of smoking cigarettes, by banning vaping, you will make it that much harder for cigarette smokers to quit. Cannabis smoking is already banned in public; the proposed ordinance would essentially ban cannabis smoking city wide...at least for those not fortunate enough to afford living in a 1-2M Single Family Home.

2. Too selective

I live in a single family home and own a condo unit -which we rent-. When it comes to second hand tobacco smoking, I am probably more exposed if my next door neighbor smoked in their backyard than my tenants if another resident were to smoke in the common park area. If the health hazards are so dire that it requires an ordinance, your ordinance should protect all residents regardless of the type of housing they live in.

If housing is governed by a lease, the landlord can already add non smoking clauses regardless of the type of housing. As you are now mandating that non smoking clauses be added to leases in Mountain View, why are you carving out leases for single family homes or ADUs? Health Risks are pretty similar, why aren't you protecting all residents?

The same is true for owner occupied housing, why treat a single family home or an ADU differently than a condo unit?

3. Too immediate

The ordinance is slated to start on January 1, 2022 and the staff report states that the public had plenty of notice to plan changes to their smoking habits or rework their housing situation. I would argue that because of the pandemic, most of the public had many other issues in their mind. Please consider delaying the effective date or at least build a one year transition where

the first

Finally, the ordinance is not clear on who would enforce the ordinance and how. The role of the Fire Department is clear but there is also mention of code enforcement personnel. I plead with you to not have Police Officers enforce the ordinance; this is not a drug bust situation and fire department or building inspectors are a much better fit. The ordinance should also clarify how violations are established. From experience, in a large apartment building it's often difficult to pinpoint where a leak (or smoke) is coming from. The ordinance should do its best to avoid situations where residents are wrongly fined for violating the ordinance.

Sincerely,

Serge Bonte

From: [Margo Sidener](#)
To: [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Lieber, Sally](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Showalter, Pat](#)
Cc: [City Council](#)
Subject: Multi-unit housing secondhand smoke protection
Date: Sunday, May 23, 2021 9:04:58 PM
Attachments: [Mountain View let. sup. 5-21 MUH.pdf](#)

Dear Mayor Kamei, Vice Mayor Ramirez, and Councilmembers: Please find attached our organization's letter of support for the proposed amendment to your secondhand smoke ordinance that will extend protections to residents of multi-unit housing. While we applaud this step, we do want to register concerns about leaving out duplex dwellers and about the confusing language of sections f., g., h., and i. that seem to weaken any redress. Please feel free to call me with any questions that you might have. Sincerely, Margo Sidener

Margo Leathers Sidener, MS, CHES

Chief Executive Officer



of the Bay Area, Golden Gate, and Central Coast

[1469 Park Avenue, San Jose, CA 95126](#)

Phone: (408) 998-5865 | Web: www.lungsrus.org

Breathe California is dedicated to fighting lung disease, advocating for clean air, and promoting public health for *all* its communities.

**Breathe California
of the Bay Area,
Golden Gate, and
Central Coast**

1469 Park Avenue
San Jose, CA 95126
Phone: (408) 998-5865
Toll-Free: 1-877-3-BREATHE
Fax: (408) 998-0578
www.lungsrus.org
info@lungsrus.org

Tax ID#: 94-1156307

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Chairperson

Amresh Prasad

Secretary

Sulochina Lulla, MD

Treasurer

Justin Henry

Directors

Roslyn Bienenstock, RRT,
MPH

Thomas M. Dailey, MD,
FCCP

Frank DeBiaso

Tony Delas

Sogol Karkouti

Ray Mendoza

Rohan Shamapant

Richard Steadman

Abhay Tewari

Chief Executive Officer

Margo Sidener, MS, CHES

A member of the
Breathe America™
Alliance



May 23, 2021

The Honorable Mayor Ellen Kamei, Vice Mayor Lucas Ramirez, and Councilmembers Margaret Abe-Koga, Alison Hicks, Sally J. Lieber, Lisa Matichak, and Pat Showalter
City of Mountain View
500 Castro Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Via email to: city.council@mountainview.gov

Dear Mayor, Vice Mayor, and Councilmembers:

I am writing to express Breathe California's support for the proposed comprehensive ordinance to provide greater protection from secondhand smoke in multi-unit housing. However, we have some concerns: 1) We believe that the ordinance should extend protection to those living in duplexes, as smoke can come through one shared wall as much as through more shared walls. 2) We are confused by SEC. 21.56 –f, g, h, and i. They appear to take away accountability and liability from both the landlord and tenant, diluting the effectiveness of the ordinance and leaving it unclear how to seek remedy.

Breathe California, founded in San Jose in 1911, is dedicated to eliminating the negative health impacts caused by tobacco use and secondhand smoke as part of its clean air and healthy lungs mission. When deliberating, please consider the scientific research, including the US Surgeon General's declaration that there is no safe level of secondhand smoke. Breathing should not be a hazard nor a struggle in one's own home.

Data from our agency's 30-year-old Secondhand Smoke Helpline shows that neighbor's smoking is currently the most pressing secondhand smoke problem. We applaud inclusion of prohibitions on smoking on private balconies and patios in multi-unit buildings, as this is the chief complaint we hear through the Helpline.

COVID sheltering has greatly increased the need for this ordinance, as neighbors who were formerly away all day are instead at home and smoking. It is populations with health equity issues that are most impacted, as they often cannot afford to move to escape secondhand smoke. Post-COVID, working from home is expected to continue for a large part of the population.

We will be pleased to both assist in educating the community about this important measure that will protect Mountain View residents from the deadly hazard of secondhand smoke, and to serve as a resource for residents' cessation efforts.

Thanks for Your Support of Public Health,

Margo Sidener, MS, CHES
Chief Executive Officer

From: [Andre Thomas](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Agenda Item: 7.1 Prohibition of Smoking in Multi-Unit Residences
Date: Monday, May 24, 2021 10:19:27 PM

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

Greetings Council Members,

My name is Andre Thomas and I'm an Mtn. View resident and Assistant Chapter Chief Steward with SEIU 521. I recommend a NO vote on the Prohibition of Smoking in Multi-Unit Residences. Passing this will alienate the members of our community that use marijuana for pain management and as treatment for a myriad of ailments in the privacy of their homes. Property managers/landlords can already prohibit smoking inside their units and on their properties and many do.

What is the objective for approving this type of legislation? The data from the survey on this topic represents less than 1k members of our community and that is if there are protections in place for prohibiting respondents from taking the survey more than once. More importantly, 930 odd something community members are not a clear representation of the over 81,000 current Mountain View residents.

I believe Council should focus on more important and immediate matters such as:

- How are we going to continue to keep the community and public employees safe in the event the mask mandate is rescinded by June 15th?
- Will Castro Street remain closed to traffic or re-open?
- What public services will be available to the community in a post-pandemic environment?
- What are we doing for our community now that the eviction moratoriums have been rescinded?

The list can go on and on. Again, I recommend a NO vote on agenda item 7.1 Prohibition of Smoking in Multi-Unit Residences. Landlords/Property Managers do not require a City Ordinance to enforce rules on their properties. I intend to bring this topic up during my next Leadership Council meeting with SEIU 521.

Andre Thomas


The information contained in this message may be protected by the attorney-client privilege. Please immediately reply to the sender of this e-mail if you have received it in error, then delete it. Thank you.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. Please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail and all attachments from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

From: [sc.j](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Agenda 7.1
Date: Tuesday, May 25, 2021 9:16:27 AM

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

Dear City Council Members:

I would encourage all members of the city council to vote YES on the

7.1 Prohibition of Smoking in Multi-Unit Residences.

As a resident of Mountain View since 2004 and an RN since 1978 I believe it would benefit the majority.

Sincerely,

Susan Johansen