

City Council Questions

June 8, 2021 Council Meeting

ITEM 3.1 Downtown Precise Plan Update (Phase 1)

1. What are the specific advantages/protections afforded to a historic district? Are there any protections provided that currently are not provided under CEQA, the Historic Preservation Ordinance, or the Downtown Precise Plan?

A historic district is treated as a “historic resource” under CEQA and “contributing” properties identified as part of the district also qualify as historic resources. If not for the district, ”contributing” properties may not have the significance to qualify as historic resources individually, so some additional buildings would be protected within a district. In addition, review is required for new construction within a district under Secretary of the Interior’s Standard 9, which advises that new projects should be compatible with the district in terms of materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing.

The HPO would need to be updated to create local criteria for a district. The Downtown Precise Plan is not intended to replicate the HPO, but supplements it to ensure compatible character of new development.

2. Can the Council legally designate Area H as an historic district even if it does not meet the criteria?

State/National Historic Districts can only be designated only with the relevant criteria. The council can designate a local historic district, once the process is added to the HPO. The district would need to meet the local criteria, as established. However, having a local district that does not meet generally accepted criteria for significance or integrity may not confer CEQA protections or State preemption protections, except to historic resources within the district.

3. What historic resources are protected under the City’s existing Historic Preservation Ordinance? And what specific aspects of a resource are protected?

Per the City ordinance, a "Historic resource" shall mean any building, structure, object or site that the city council has designated for inclusion in the Mountain View Register of Historic Resources.

Applicability. No person shall make a significant alteration, redevelop, or relocate any structure or improvement, or any portion thereof, upon a property designated as a historic resource on the Mountain View Register of Historic Resources without first obtaining a "historic preservation permit" or HP permit.

CEQA ensures that any planning permit is reviewed for impacts to historic resources, which could include buildings that are on the local, State or National registers, or not on any register. If there is a reasonable finding that a modification to a building impacts its status as a historic resource, the City has a right to deny the project.

4. Please share the list of historic resources as determined by the City Council resolution.

Please see attached local register of historic resources.

5. What is procedural protection? What is really protected with procedural protection?

“Procedural protection” means that CEQA would require a project to go through a process that allows the City to determine whether a historic resource should be preserved. This is different from the protection itself, which is up to the City. In other words, CEQA does not directly protect the resource; it provides information and a process by which the City can protect the resource. Any modification to any Downtown building could be subject to CEQA, and the City would have an opportunity to deny it if the modification is shown to impact a historic resource.

6. How are structures deemed to be a historic resource at the local, state and national levels? And can a resource be deemed historic at one level and not the others?

There is an established regulatory framework at the federal, state and local levels that define the criteria a property must meet to be eligible for listing as a historic resource. To be listed on the state or national registers a resource must meet one of four of the establish criteria thereby demonstrating historical significance and it must maintain sufficient physical integrity in order to convey its significance. At the local level, the process for listing is outlined in the HPO.

The State Office of Historical Preservation (SHPO) reviews all nominations to the state and federal register. If they agreement with the nomination the SHPO will forward the application to the National Park Service who when then make the final determination.

Yes, a resource can be historically significant at the local level and not be significant at the state or national level. This is dependent on local ordinances. Further properties can be eligible for the state but not the national register. Any property eligible for the national register is also eligible for the state register.

7. Is the criteria the same or different to be deemed a historic resource at the local, state and national levels? If it is different, how is the criteria different?

The criteria are slightly different, mostly differing at the scale of their significance. More detailed discussion is in the attachment.

8. When legislation has a carve out for historic properties, which historic properties are included (i.e., local, state, national historic resources)?

It depends on the specific provisions adopted in each legislation. There is not a standard rule for how carve outs for historic resources are administered. For example, one key provision in SB 35 is that the proposed development must not located on a site where it would require the demolition of a historic structure that was placed on a national, state, or local historic register. (Section 65913.4(a)(7)(C))

9. On page 9, the fourth bullet point does not make sense. Is part of the sentence missing?

It should read:

“Ensure property owners can occupy historic buildings with new tenants, since vacancies have spillover impacts;”

The EPC commented that vacancies may create blight, which may have a negative impact on other buildings, and lead to more vacancies.

10. When previous assessments were done to determine whether buildings on Castro were historic, were those assessments using national, state, or local criteria?

Previous assessments were completed using national, state and local criteria.

11. What is the significance of an area having the designation of a historic district? What protections are afforded a historic district?

Please see response to Question 1.

12. Did TreanorHL work with the property owners of 938-954 Villa Street on their proposed redevelopment? If so, what was TreanorHL's role?

TreanorHL did not do any work on 938-954 Villa Street. They did provide some environmental analysis for 902 Villa as a subconsultant to the City's Environmental Consultant.

13. We will talk about some elements of our historic preservation policy at the June 8 Council Meeting under the Downtown Precise Plan Update, Phase 1. We will talk about other elements later when we talk about the Historic Preservation Ordinance. But historic preservation policy is usually multi-faceted and interactive. Policy specified in a Downtown Precise Plan will interact with policy specified in a Historic Preservation Ordinance. How can we keep the planning open so we can make sure the elements we come up with interact well and come up with a cohesive working whole?

The focus of the Downtown Precise Plan includes standards and uses of new development. In contrast, the focus of the Historic Preservation Ordinance (HPO) is preservation. The Downtown Precise Plan complements, but does not replace, the HPO by including standards to support and maintain the Plan area's character. The City Council included a comprehensive update to the Historic Preservation Ordinance (HPO) in the City's work plan for the next two years. Modifying the HPO to reflect historic preservation policies and standards (including local historic resource criteria, review process for modifications to buildings on a register, incentives allowed thereto, etc.) would maintain the clear roles of each document.

ITEM 4.4 Landfill Disposal Agreement and SMaRT® Station Memorandum of Understanding

1. What is driving the fee reduction from \$75.21 per ton to \$45.30 per ton with Waste Management?

Waste Management (WM) lowered the fee in exchange for a long-term exclusive agreement. The agreement requires the City to exclusively send all of its residual waste to the Kirby Canyon landfill for the next 10 years with an optional 5-year extension. This provides WM a long-term, guaranteed and predictable revenue stream. It should be noted that WM was aware that the City could have pursued other disposal options, which provided an additional incentive to give the City a very competitive fee.

2. Do the fees increase during the term of the new contract with Waste Management? If so, by how much and based upon what?

Yes, the fee will increase by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for "All Urban Consumers: Water and sewer and trash collection services" on an annual basis.

ITEM 4.5 Annual Water Main/Service Line Replacement, Project 17-21 - Authorize Professional Services Agreement

1. How much is spent annually on construction management services?

Construction management services expenditures for capital improvement program projects in Fiscal Years 2019-20 and 2020-21 were \$733,397 and \$244,907, respectively. Fiscal Year 2020-21 was a reduced amount as a result of project delays from COVID-19. Staff expects a return to the higher expenditure amount for these services going forward as more projects go out to bid now that staff has been catching up and finalizing design projects for implementation.

ITEM 4.9 Shoreline Lake Improvements Project-Design, Project 17-52-Adopt Mitigated Negative Declaration

1. When will the actual work start?

After Council adoption of the IS/MND, staff will submit it to the regulatory agencies in order to receive the permits for the project. The project is expected to receive the permits in the summer and staff is anticipating to bring the project to Council for approval of plans and specifications and authorization to bid the project in late August or early September. With the receipt of favorable bids within the project budget, the project is scheduled to start in October 2021 and complete in January 2022. The work will occur outside of bird nesting season.

2. Will it be coordinated so as not to have a negative impact on the businesses (café, recreation) at the lake?

The improvements are requested by the boathouse operator, and the timing of this project is being closely coordinated with the operator. The anticipated fall and winter construction window aligns with the timing of low recreational use of the lake. Portions of the lake would still be available for recreation during construction and the café will not be directly impacted by construction activities.

3. How do the improvements in the Shoreline Lake relate to the refurbishment of the Coast Casey Dam & the restoration of Charleston Slough?

The improvements at Shoreline Lake are maintenance based and are independent of the refurbishment projects for the Coast Casey Dam (also known as Sailing Lake Access Road) and restoration of Charleston Slough.

4. Where is the sediment that has accumulated near the boat launch going to be deposited?

Staff is considering the reuse of the dredged material for landfill maintenance or the South Bay Salt Pond project.

5. Is the island eroding? If so, can the sediment from the boat launch be used to shore up the island?

The island located within Sailing Lake is eroding. According to the City's environmental consultants, the erosion is caused by natural wind and wind-generated wave action.

The reuse of the dredged materials from the Shoreline Lake Improvement Project is not being considered for use at the island. The operation and maintenance of Sailing Lake falls under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Regional Water Quality Control Board as the

lake is considered waters of the United States. The deposition of material to protect the island would be considered a fill, and would require separate environmental clearance that could potentially require mitigation for losing water surface area as well as additional regulatory permits. The construction itself would be a major engineering endeavor requiring detailed design, major shoring, and the import of fill materials to build up to the 15- 18 feet of depth. The estimated amount of material to be dredged is approximately 250 cubic yards, which is a relatively small volume of materials. As a result of the regulatory and design requirements, the costs of reusing such a low volume of materials at the island would be very high.

The Community Services Department is currently in the process of hiring a consultant to prepare a Shoreline Wildlife Management Plan. The consultants will examine the wildlife and habitat within Shoreline. This review will include the benefits of the Sailing Lake Island, and it is anticipated that the consultant will provide recommendations regarding the protection of this habitat.

ITEM 4.10 Continuation of 24/7 Safe Parking Program Operation for City-Secured Sites and Authorization of Associated Agreements

1. How many individuals/families have moved from the safe parking lots to more stable housing since the safe lots opened?

For the most recent reporting period of April 1, 2020 to March 31, 2021, MOVE-Mountain View's placement rate was 29 percent for exits to permanent housing; this is similar to their reported prior year of data. Of the households (vehicle units) who have exited the safe parking sites, four have moved to permanent destinations, 10 have moved to nonpermanent destinations and 82 are still active.

2. What has been the average length of stay in the safe lots before moving to more stable housing?

The average length of stay before exit is 97 days for permanent destinations and 65 days for nonpermanent destinations.

3. How many individuals/families have moved from living in a vehicle/RV in Mountain View to Project Homekey on Leghorn?

There are also five MOVE-Mountain View clients already hosted at the new facility and six referrals in the queue for intake at the new LifeMoves Mountain View site, with the referral process on going to reach capacity. (*This very new data for this project that just opened in mid-May and is not reflected in this placement data shown in the two prior questions).

ITEM 4.11 Accept and Appropriate a Grant to be Equally Distributed for Three Fiscal Years from Destination: Home in the Amount of \$450,000

1. Does staff have a specific recommendation for the use of these funds? If not, should the Council provide direction during the budget discussion?

The report recommends the grant be used to support the City's ongoing and new initiatives that align with the Santa Clara County Community Plan to End Homelessness and the City's homeless response strategy and expenditure plan, which will be developed in the next fiscal year. The funding for the City's current, extensive initiatives is drawn from several sources, including the General Housing Fund, Successor Housing Agency Fund, and American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Funds/Limited-Period Funds.

No direction from Council related to the grant expenditures is needed, as the related programs/initiatives are included in the Recommended Budget. Council will have the opportunity to provide input on the homelessness response strategy and expenditure plan at the appropriate time as it is being developed.

2. Grant from Destination Home- great to see; very welcome! Where is Destination Home getting the money for this grant: Does this constitute funding from Silicon Valley Community Foundation?

This grant funding comes from Destination: Home's Supportive Housing and Innovation Fund. Like other foundations that have reserves or endowments focused on specific interest areas, we use these funds to create new deeply affordable and supportive housing opportunities, prevent homelessness, and increase access to technology. There is more information about the Fund here: <https://destinationhomesv.org/innovationfund/>

While Destination: Home is a supporting organization of Silicon Valley Community Foundation (SVCF), this is a grant directly from Destination: Home, which is a 501(c)(3).

ITEM 6.1 North Bayshore Circulation Feasibility Study

1. On page 3 of the staff report, it says, “The Gateway Master Plan and the proposed Google Master Plan are defining the NBPP final development phase.” What does this mean?

The remaining undeveloped office and housing elements of the Precise Plan are addressed in the two proposed Master Plans.

2. What projects, or what estimated costs, were included in the analysis to set the impact fee in NBS?

The adopted North Bayshore Development Impact Fee (Impact Fee) was established based on the February 2016 North Bayshore Development Impact Fee Nexus Study (Study). The Study focused on the North Bayshore Precise Plan infrastructure improvements (transportation, water and sewer) attributable to serve the growth in the North Bayshore as defined in the 2014 Precise Plan. The Study identified 22 transportation improvements, 34 water improvements and 14 sewer improvements at an estimated cost of \$87.8M, \$22.1M and \$4.1M, respectively, in 2016 dollars. Attached is Table 6 from the Study identifying the 22 transportation improvements. The detailed water and sewer improvements are not attached, but were identified in the Study. Based on these estimated costs, the Study presented a maximum allowable impact fee that could be adopted by Council for commercial land uses. On Feb 23, 2016, Council adopted an Impact Fee that was lower than the maximum allowable fee.

3. How much additional bonding capacity does the Shoreline Regional Park Community have?

The bonding capacity depends on a number of factors that are currently in the process of being evaluated. Staff is updating long-term projected available revenue to be generated from the Community as well as finishing up studies and updates on significant Community obligations such as Sea Level Rise, Landfill Postclosure costs and the North Bayshore Circulation Study which are expected to require a significant amount of funding. It is expected once the financial costs of these issues are better known; staff will be able to provide a more realistic estimate of what can be supported by Community revenues.

4. Some agencies are refinancing their bonds. Would it make sense to refinance the Shoreline Regional Park Community bonds?

There is an outstanding issue (2011 Refunding Bonds) that, due to the decline in interest rates, has become an attractive candidate for refunding and would yield the SRPC a significant amount of savings. Staff will pursue the refinancing and expects to bring back this back to Council in the fall for approval.

5. Would the three-hour peak period be the actual highest volume three-hour peak period, or a set three-hour period as in the past?

It is the highest 3-hour period based on the monitoring. The morning peak was actually shifted one hour later (now 8-11 a.m.) as a result of the monitoring results.

6. What will happen to the projects that are tied to the Google Landings project if the development is never built?

Should the Landings project not move forward, infrastructure projects tied to the project will either not be constructed or require the City to advance funding and identify reimbursement when a project on the Landings site proceeds. Projects requiring advance funding may include the two additional turning lanes at the Charleston Road and Rengstorff Avenue intersection, the additional left turn lane on Shoreline at the realigned Plymouth Street and the associated second vehicle lanes on the realigned Plymouth Street. The latter two improvements at the realigned Plymouth Street are tied to the Alta Garage portion of the Landings project, and a building permit has been submitted for the Alta Garage.

7. New Project #10 - Frontage Road extension from Permanente to Plymouth - have we studied the environmental and particularly the wildlife impacts of a two-way auto bridge over the creek?

Project #10- Frontage Road Extension-Permanente Creek to Plymouth Street is an existing Priority Transportation Improvement and, therefore, is not shown as a new project in the Council Report. This project was included in the adopted North Bayshore Precise Plan (NBPP) as part of project T-11 of the Priority Transportation Improvements. While the NBPP EIR studied the programmatic impacts of the Priority Transportation Improvements, defined projects would need to further study the specific impacts of a particular project during the design phase. Staff has not yet begun the design phase or study of the environmental impacts associated with this project.

8. Congestion Pricing - are we still on track to be included in the Congestion Pricing Pilot Project being spearheaded by San Francisco?

We have coordinated with San Francisco and are using the same Nelson/Nygaard consulting team as San Francisco, but have not planned to be directly included in their project.

9. For funding of future projects, are we still expecting the same split of funding sources- 17% from North Bayshore Impact Fees, 80% from the Shoreline Regional Park Community (SRPC) Fund and 3% from other sources, including community benefits? How can we decrease the amount dependent on City funds?

This is the funding split for the \$140 million that has already been expended or programmed into the CIP. The SRPC percentage is so high because the City used SRPC to advance some major Priority Transportation Improvement projects rather than waiting for the impact fees to accumulate to cover a higher percentage of the costs. For the remaining \$347 million needed for transportation improvements

over the next 20 years, it is estimated that Impact Fees and Community Benefits will pay for up to 38% of the costs, reducing the SRPC's share down to approximately 62% (\$215 million).

10. When I read about congestion pricing it is usually paired with equity policy. Has staff considered such policy?

Yes, equity policy is a key element of the study. There are two aspects: 1) Definition of users who will be charged, including potential exemptions and discounts, and 2) Use of revenues to support equity objectives.

ITEM 7.2 Public Hearing for the Fiscal Year 2021-22 Recommended Budget

1. To clarify the CSA allocation, \$750,000 is for direct financial assistance and \$250,000 for discretionary use, based on the previous Council direction?

Yes, the \$1M in funds for the Community Services Agency (CSA), includes \$750,000 in direct financial assistance and \$250,000 to be used at CSA's discretion to fund priority needs as they deem appropriate (e.g., noted in the recommended budget as direct assistance, rent relief, discretionary uses, etc.).

CSA is the City's designated safety-net provider, and as part of the Emergency Assistance Network (EAN), is the agency designated to serve Mountain View. CSA administers other City programs, including a rent relief program and several COVID-19 response efforts. CSA anticipates providing a broad range of financial assistance that the agency is already providing to the community, including but not limited to help with maintaining housing (rent, mortgage, utilities, etc.), assistance with vehicle repairs, transportation access, medical, dental and eye care assistance, and other challenging costs, such as funeral expenses, etc.

2. Given the state program regarding rent relief for tenants and landlords, are there any gaps in eligibility (e.g., tenant income level, number of units in the complex, etc.) that funding from the city to CSA would cover? Or are all tenants and all landlords able to get rent relief from the state?

Staff have been monitoring the State and County rent relief programs primarily regarding timing and process. Because they are external programs, staff does not have in-depth information regarding potential restrictions or ineligible uses and cannot definitely say at this time whether the City program can cover gaps that external programs cannot. While the portion of the City's program funded with General Fund is particularly flexible and may be able to cover unique or less typical circumstances where external programs might not, based on an initial review, it appears the State and County programs have provisions similar to the City's program and could also include areas that the City's program may not cover. Additionally, the current guidelines and restrictions around the State and County funds may continue to evolve over the next few weeks, and issues are still being addressed through legislative efforts regarding the State program. Therefore, the development of those external programs are still in flux. Current information regarding the State and County programs can be found on the following links and staff will continue to monitor them:

CA COVID-19 Rent Relief Program: <https://housingiskey.com>

County of Santa Clara Homelessness Prevention Program COVID-19 Response: <http://www.preventhomelessness.org/>

- Attachment 3, page 3, indicates that the following action is complete - Compile and evaluate data on policing activity. Can the results of this be shared with the council?

On page 3 of the REI Action Plan (Attachment 3), the Completed Action Items table includes two columns. An objective column, which lists the Action Plan objective, and an action(s) column, which lists the completed actions that correspond to the objective. The completed items are those listed in the action(s) column. Future updates of the REI Action Plan will make this more clear. In this case, the objective “Compile and evaluate data on policing activity” has the completed action that the City has hired a research fellow who is in the process of analyzing MVPD data. The objective is still in process. The research fellow’s findings will be shared with the Council when complete; anticipated in fall 2021.

- Should Public Safety Advisory Board be added to the list of advisory bodies on page 5 of the budget in attachment 1?

Yes, PSAB should be added to the budget document under City Boards, Commissions, and Committees. This was inadvertently omitted and will be added to the list of advisory bodies in the adopted budget document.

- Also on page 5 of attachment 1, should the word citizens be changed to residents?

Yes, the term “citizens” will be changed to “residents” in the final budget document.

- On page 28 of attachment 1, is the first column the sum of the three fiscal years? Or is it the annual contribution for each of the three fiscal years? If it is the sum of three years, why was it so much lower on an annual basis than more recent years?

	Fiscal Years 2014-15 through 2016-17		Fiscal Year 2017-18		Fiscal Year 2018-19		Fiscal Year 2019-20		Fiscal Year 2021-22		Total	
	PERS	OPEB	PERS	OPEB	PERS	OPEB	PERS	OPEB	PERS	OPEB	PERS	OPEB
GOF	\$4.0 M	\$4.0 M	\$4.0 M	\$2.0 M	\$4.0 M	\$1.0 M	\$4.0 M	–	-	–	\$16.0 M	\$7.0 M
GNOF	\$3.5 M	\$2.5 M	\$6.0 M	\$2.0 M	\$2.0 M	–	\$2.0 M	–	\$2.0 M	–	\$15.5 M	\$4.5 M
Other Funds	\$1.54 M	–	\$2.35 M	–	\$1.59 M	–	\$1.59 M	–	\$0.5 M	–	\$7.57 M	–
Total	\$9.04 M	\$6.5 M	\$12.35 M	\$4.0 M	\$7.59 M	\$1.0 M	\$7.59 M	–	\$2.5 M	–	\$39.07 M	\$11.5 M

Fiscal Years’ 2014-15 through 2016-17 are the sum of the three fiscal years. In Fiscal Year 2017-18, the City adopted a funding strategy in response to a policy change approved by the CalPERS Board to lower the assumed discount rate from 7.5% to 7.0% over a three-year phase in period. Because this policy change would cause a significant increase in the City’s future funding requirement as well liability, the City began to set aside additional payments that came from available projected surpluses, for paying down its pension liabilities.

- On page 36 of attachment 1, what is survey monument preservation?

The Public Works Department is responsible for preservation of survey monuments throughout the City in accordance with state law. These monuments are markers set by land surveyors in the public right-of-way to determine exact locations of the right-of-way and property lines. They are often located in the pavement of City streets and are required to be maintained indefinitely in place.

Occasionally monuments are inadvertently paved over or demolished during trenching or other street work and the City is not notified of the incident. Once notified of a buried or destroyed monument, the City is required to expeditiously repair or replace the monuments or be subject to the state's enforcement actions. Public Works does not have the in-house expertise to replace monuments and consultant/contractor services are required. There is no funding source for these services if a notification is sent to the City.

This past year the City received a notice and complaint from the state for eight (8) missing monuments. The recommended funding would provide for contractor and/or surveyor services for the maintenance or re-establishment of the monuments paved or destroyed and the necessary re-filing documents of the monuments with the Office of the County Surveyor.

8. At what % have our GOF reserves been the last 3 years?

FY18-19 = 21.0%

FY19-20 = 21.6%

FY20-21 = 20.0%

9. Please clarify whether CSFRA staff is funded by the City's GF or by fees collected from Property owners that provides for the budget of the RHC. If funding is from the City's GF, please provide reasoning for this option. My understanding is that the CSFRA was supposed to pay for its own budget through fees collected.

CSFRA staff are funded by the fees set by the Rental Housing Committee, not the General Fund.

MOUNTAIN VIEW REGISTER OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

(Last Updated June 19, 2019)

The following table represents those properties that remain on the Register after the April 12, 2005, voluntary removal deadline. Those properties that opted to be taken off the Register have also been included in the table for reference.

MOUNTAIN VIEW REGISTER OF HISTORIC RESOURCES					
	Off Register	On Register	Name	± Year Built	Property Type
1	Ada Avenue, 177			1900	1 unit
2		Bonita Avenue, 1181 (City Property Tax Rebate)		1930	1 unit
3		Bush Street, 206 (Mills Act)	James Shower house	1890	1 unit
4	Bush Street, 445		Haven Mason house	1930	1 unit
5	Bush Street, 469			1934	1 unit
6	Bush Street, 537		Minton house	1911	1 unit
7	Bush Street, 560		Cutter house	1928	1 unit
8		Calderon Avenue, 445	Bakotich house	1880	1 unit
9	Calderon Avenue, 711		E.T. Johnson house	1900	1 unit
10		Calderon Avenue, 725	Willie Garliepp house	1910	1 unit
11	California Street, 696		McDonald house	1906	1 unit
12		California Street, 1560		1900	2 units
13		California Street, 1610		1900	3 units
14		California Street, 1690 (Mills Act)		1920	1 unit
15		Castro Street, 124	Weilheimer Store	1874	commercial
16		Castro Street, 142-156 (Mills Act)	Rogers Building (Mountain View Hotel)	1906	commercial
17		Castro Street, 169-175 (City Property Tax Rebate)	Ames building	1903	commercial
18	Castro Street, 191		Mockbee building	1906	commercial
19	Castro Street, 194-198		Jurian building	1913	commercial
20	Castro Street, 200-206 (aka 819-823 Villa St.)		First National Bank (Odd Fellows building)	1913	fraternal
21		Castro Street, 201 (aka 761 Villa Street)	Farmers & Merchants Bank building	1905	commercial
22		Castro Street, 228	Mountain View Theater	1926	commercial
23	Castro Street, 275		Swall building	1904	commercial
24	Castro Street, 279-299 (aka 762-786 West		Four Stores building	1922	commercial

MOUNTAIN VIEW REGISTER OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

	Off Register	On Register	Name	± Year Built	Property Type
	Dana St.)				
25		Castro Street, 298	Scarpa's Meat Market	1908	commercial
26		Chiquita Avenue, 251 (City Property Tax Rebate)		1915	1 unit
27	Chiquita Avenue, 300			1905	3 units
28	Church Street, 334		Mancini house	1952	1 unit
29		Church Street, 595 (Mills Act)		1930	1 unit
30	Church Street, 890		Masonic Temple	1925	fraternal
-	Dana Street W., 762-786 (aka 279-299 Castro St.)		Four Stores building	1922	commercial
31	Dana Street W., 996			1918	3 units
32		Diericx Drive, 2715 (Mills Act)	Levin Huff house	1925	1 unit
33	Eldora Drive, 185		Dunshee house	1930	1 unit
34	Eunice Avenue, 655		Blue & Gold Kennel Club	1920	1 unit
35		Franklin Street, 350 (Mills Act)		1905	1 unit
36		Franklin Street, 394 (Mills Act)		1890	1 unit
37	Grant Road, 2221			1900	1 unit
38		Hope Street, 403 (Mills Act)		1915	1 unit
39		Hope Street, 425 (City Property Tax Rebate)		1906	1 unit
40	Hope Street, 582		St. Joseph's Church	1929	church
41		Latham Street, 1390 (Mills Act)	James Cochran House	1912	1 unit
-	Leslie Court, 280 (aka 113 E. Middlefield Rd.)			1925	1 unit
42		Lloyd Way, 1655 (City Property Tax Rebate)		1920	1 unit
43		Loreto Street, 302 (Mills Act)		1927	1 unit
44		Loreto Street, 484 (Mills Act)		1924	1 unit
45	Mariposa Avenue, 201-209		Pierre Klein house	1920	1 unit
46		Mariposa Avenue, 336 (Mills Act)	Camp house	1900	1 unit
47		Mariposa Avenue, 496 (Mills Act)		1920	1 unit

MOUNTAIN VIEW REGISTER OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

	Off Register	On Register	Name	± Year Built	Property Type
48	Mercy Street, 596		First Church of Christ Science building	1930	church
49	Mercy Street, 1074-1076			1925	1 unit
50	Middlefield Road E., 113 (aka 280 Leslie Ct.)			1925	1 unit
51		Miramonte Avenue, 1855	Sister's House	1927	convalescent
52		Moffet Boulevard, 157 (on NRHP)	Adobe Building	1934	public facility
53		Mountain View Avenue, 372 (Mills Act)		1905	1 unit
54	Oak Street, 166			1900	1 unit
55		Oak Street, 360 (Mills Act)		1924	1 unit
56		Palo Alto Avenue, 296		1915	1 unit
57	Palo Alto Avenue, 329			1925	1 unit
58	Palo Alto Avenue, 337			1930	1 unit
59	Palo Alto Avenue, 340			1900	2 units
60		Palo Alto Avenue, 390 (Mills Act)		1930	1 unit
61	Pettis Avenue, 508			1920	1 unit
62	Pettis Avenue, 516			1920	1 unit
63	Pettis Avenue, 526			1920	1 unit
64	Pettis Avenue, 540			1920	1 unit
65	Pettis Avenue, 552			1924	1 unit
66		Pettis Avenue, 562 (Mills Act)		1920	1 unit
67	Pettis Avenue, 572			1920	1 unit
68	Pettis Avenue, 604			1880	1 unit
69		Rengstorff Avenue, N. 771	Immigrant house	1888	public facility
70	Rengstorff Avenue, N. 987		Ambra Olive Oil Company	1930	commercial
71	Saint Giles Lane, 2682		Escolle house	1913	1 unit
72		Shoreline Boulevard S., 472 (Mills Act)		1910	1 unit
73		Shoreline Boulevard N., 3070 (on NRHP)	Rengstorff House	1867	public facility
74	Sleeper Avenue, 462			1900	1 unit
75	Sleeper Avenue, 992			1920	1 unit
76		1247 Springer Road	Walter House	1920	1 unit
77		Tyler Park Way, 1531 (Mills Act)		1925	1 unit

MOUNTAIN VIEW REGISTER OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

	Off Register	On Register	Name	± Year Built	Property Type
78		View Street, 322 (Mills Act)	McPheeters house	1910	1 unit
79		View Street, 327		1925	1 unit
80	View Street, 344		Swall house	1908	1 unit
81	View Street, 392		Bates house	1904	5 units
82	View Street, 435			1890	1 unit
83	View Street, 459			1920	1 unit
84		Villa Street, 515		1890	1 unit
-		Villa Street, 761 (aka 201 Castro Street)	Bank Building	1905	commercial
-	Villa Street, 819-823 (aka 200-206 Castro St.)		First National Bank (Odd Fellows building)	1913	fraternal
85	Villa Street, 938 (on CRHR)		Weilheimer house	1905	commercial
86	Villa Street, 1025			1904	1 unit
87		Villa Street, 1043 (Mills Act)		1904	1 unit
88	Villa Street, 1609			1926	1 unit
89		Villa Street, 1643		1915	4 units
90		Villa Street, 1645		1915	1 unit
91		Villa Street, 1655		1915	1 unit
92	Villa Street, 1852			1890	1 unit
93		Wright Avenue, 1074- 1076		1875	1 unit
94		Yosemite Avenue, 680 (Mills Act)		1923	1 unit
	47 TOTAL	47 TOTAL (44 privately-owned properties plus 3 city- owned properties)			

National Register of Historic Places

National Register Bulletin Number 15, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*, describes the Criteria for Evaluation as being composed of two factors. First, the property must be “associated with an important historic context.”¹ The National Register identifies four possible context types, of which at least one must be applicable at the national, state, or local level. As listed under Section 8, “Statement of Significance,” of the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, these are:

- A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important to prehistory or history.²

Second, for a property to qualify under the National Register’s Criteria for Evaluation, it must also retain “historic integrity of those features necessary to convey its significance.”³ While a property’s significance relates to its role within a specific historic context, its integrity refers to “a property’s physical features and how they relate to its significance.”⁴ To determine if a property retains the physical characteristics corresponding to its historic context, the National Register has identified seven aspects of integrity:

Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred...

Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property...

Setting is the physical environment of a historic property...

Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property...

Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory...

Feeling is a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time...

Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.⁵

Since integrity is based on a property’s significance within a specific historic context, an evaluation of a property’s integrity can only occur after historic significance has been established.⁶

¹ National Park Service, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, National Register Bulletin 15* (Washington, DC: United States Department of the Interior, 1997), 3.

² National Park Service, *How to Complete the National Register Registration Form, National Register Bulletin 16A* (Washington, DC: United States Department of the Interior, 1997), 75.

³ National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin 15*, 3.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 44.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 44-45.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 45.

California Register of Historical Resources

California Office of Historic Preservation's Technical Assistance Series #6, *California Register and National Register: A Comparison*, outlines the differences between the federal and state processes. The context types to be used when establishing the significance of a property for listing on the California Register are very similar, with emphasis on local and state significance. They are:

1. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States; or
2. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history; or
3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values; or
4. It has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important to prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.⁷

Like the NRHP, evaluation for eligibility to the California Register requires an establishment of historic significance before integrity is considered. California's integrity threshold is slightly lower than the federal level. As a result, some resources that are historically significant but do not meet NRHP integrity standards may be eligible for listing on the California Register.⁸

California's list of special considerations is shorter and more lenient than the NRHP. It includes some allowances for moved buildings, structures, or objects, as well as lower requirements for proving the significance of resources that are less than 50 years old and a more elaborate discussion of the eligibility of reconstructed buildings.⁹

In addition to separate evaluations for eligibility to the California Register, the state will automatically list resources if they are listed or determined eligible for the NRHP through a complete evaluation process.¹⁰

California Historical Resource Status Codes

The California Historical Resource Status Codes (status codes) are a series of ratings created by the California Office of Historic Preservation to quickly and easily identify the historic status of resources listed in the state's historic properties database. These codes were last revised in August 2003 to better reflect the historic status options available to evaluators. The codes are to be used as part of the 523 DPR form documentation. The following are the seven major status code headings:

1. Properties listed in the National Register or the California Register.
2. Properties determined eligible for listing in the National Register or the California Register.
3. Appears eligible for National Register or California Register through Survey Evaluation.
4. Appears eligible for National Register or California Register through other evaluation.

⁷ California Office of Historic Preservation, *California Register and National Register: A Comparison, Technical Assistance Series 6* (Sacramento, CA: California Department of Parks and Recreation, 2001), 1.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*, 2.

¹⁰ All State Historical Landmarks from number 770 onward are also automatically listed on the California Register. California Office of Historic Preservation, *California Register of Historical Resources: The Listing Process, Technical Assistance Series 5* (Sacramento, CA: California Department of Parks and Recreation, n.d.), 1.

5. Properties recognized as historically significant by local governments.
6. Not eligible for listing or designation.
7. Not evaluated for National Register or California Register through or needs reevaluation.¹¹

City of Mountain View

Division 15 of the City of Mountain View Code of Ordinances addresses the designation and preservation of local historic resources and defines the Mountain View Register of Historic Resources (MVRHR) as “the inventory of buildings, structures, objects and sites designated by the city council as historic resources pursuant to the provisions of this ordinance and adopted by council resolution as amended from time to time.”

The city’s Historic Preservation Ordinance allows designation to the MVRHR upon review and approval by the city council. A building, structure, site or other improvement may be designated as a historic resource and placed on the MVRHR if the city council finds that it meets one or more of the following criteria:

- a. Is strongly identified with a person who, or an organization which, significantly contributed to the culture, history or development of the City of Mountain View;
- b. Is the site of a significant historic event in the city's past;
- c. Embodies distinctive characteristics significant to the city in terms of a type, period, region or method of construction or representative of the work of a master or possession of high artistic value; or
- d. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important to the city's prehistory or history.¹²

The ordinance does not include two of the key aspects of the designation process included in the NRHP and CRHR: there is no requirement for the resource to be of a minimum age nor is there a defined threshold for aspects of integrity. Also, unlike the NRHP and the CRHR, the local ordinance does not provide any specific provisions or guidance for the listing of local historic districts.

Often resources that do not merit inclusion in the national or state inventories, may still have sufficient historical significance to be listed locally.

¹¹ California Office of Historic Preservation, *California Historical Resource Status Codes*, (Sacramento, CA: California Department of Parks and Recreation, 2003), <https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1069/files/chrstatus%20codes.pdf> accessed January 2020.

¹² Ord. No. 18.13, § 1, 12/10/13.

Table 6 Detailed Summary of Transportation Improvements and Allocation to NBPP AIF

Projects	Est. Cost from NBPP (in 2014 \$)	Additional Cost Factor for Stormwater Treatment Facilities	Additional Cost Factor for Major Utility Relocation	Est. Project Total Cost (in 2016 \$)	Existing Deficiencies		Allocation to NBS		(less) Community Benefit Contributions (projected) (1)	Total Transportation Costs Allocated to Fee	
					Applicable?	Adjustment Factor	Percent Allocation	\$ Allocated to NBS			
High-Priority Improvements											
T-1	Shoreline: Hwy 101 to Plymouth	\$9,400,000	10%		\$10,843,000	X	14%	100%	\$9,324,980		
T-2	Shoreline: Plymouth to Amphitheatre	\$5,400,000			\$5,662,000	-	-	100%	\$5,662,000		
T-3	Charleston: Shoreline to Amphitheatre	\$17,100,000			\$17,931,000	-	-	100%	\$17,931,000		
T-4	Garcia Avenue: Amphitheatre to Bayshore Pkwy	\$4,700,000			\$4,928,000	-	-	100%	\$4,928,000		
T-5	Plymouth / Space Park Connection Across Shoreline	\$800,000	10%	20%	\$1,091,000	-	-	100%	\$1,091,000		
T-6	East-West Greenway Connection #1	\$5,100,000			\$5,348,000	-	-	100%	\$5,348,000		
T-7	East-West Greenway Connection #2	\$2,400,000			\$2,517,000	-	-	100%	\$2,517,000		
T-8	Bridge over Hwy 101 West of North Shoreline	\$19,000,000	10%		\$21,916,000	-	-	100%	\$21,916,000		
T-9	Signalized Bike Crossings	\$800,000			\$839,000	-	-	100%	\$839,000		
T-10	N-S Connection Between Pear & Charleston East of Shoreline	\$7,300,000	10%		\$8,420,000	-	-	100%	\$8,420,000		
Subtotal: High-Priority Improvements					\$79,495,000				\$77,976,980		
Medium-Priority Improvements											
T-11	Frontage Road Along Hwy 101 From Landings Drive to Plymouth	\$4,400,000	10%		\$5,075,000	-	-	100%	\$5,075,000		
T-12	North Rengstorff: Charleston to Hwy 101	\$2,000,000			\$2,097,000	-	-	100%	\$2,097,000		
T-13	San Antonio: Bayshore Pkwy to Hwy 101	\$1,900,000			\$1,992,000	-	-	100%	\$1,992,000		
T-14	Amphitheatre: Shoreline to Charleston	\$8,700,000			\$9,123,000	-	-	100%	\$9,123,000		
T-15	Bicycle Facilities Connecting Hwy 101, Shoreline and Plymouth	\$600,000			\$629,000	-	-	100%	\$629,000		
T-16	Shoreline NB off-Ramp	\$6,200,000			\$6,501,000	X	14%	100%	\$5,590,860		
Subtotal: Medium-Priority Improvements					\$25,417,000				\$24,506,860		
Shoreline Corridor Improvements											
T-17	Shoreline Corridor Cycle Track	\$8,000,000			\$8,389,000	-	-	35%	\$2,936,150		
T-18	Shoreline Corridor Bus Lane	\$6,000,000			\$6,292,000	X	14%	100%	\$5,411,120		
T-19	Transit Center Shuttle Improvements	\$2,000,000			\$2,097,000	-	-	35%	\$733,950		
T-20	Other Transit Center Upgrades (Scope TBD)	\$48,000,000			\$50,333,000	-	-	35%	\$17,616,550		
T-21	Corridor Protection/ROW Acquisition	\$20,000,000			\$20,972,000	-	-	35%	\$7,340,200		
T-22	Transit Center Master Plan	\$700,000			\$734,000	-	-	35%	\$256,900		
Subtotal: Shoreline Corridor Improvements					\$88,817,000				\$34,294,870		
Total Transportation Improvements		\$180,500,000			\$193,729,000				\$136,778,710	-\$48,905,195	\$87,873,515

NOTES:

High-Priority and Medium-Priority Improvements are located in the NBS area. Shoreline Corridor Improvements are partially or fully located outside of NBS.

Inflation factor of 4.86% was used to adjust the cost estimates from 2014\$ to 2016\$ (that is 2.4% per year for two years).

Existing Deficiencies are flagged at those locations where the traffic analysis in the NBPP TIA identified an intersection currently operating at LOS E or F.

Allocation: For projects located in NBS or directly serving new NBS development (T-1 through T-16 and T-18), the % allocation is assumed to be solely the responsibility of new NBS development (i.e., project would not be built in absence of demand from new NBS development).

For all other projects, the project would meet Citywide policy objectives and serve growth throughout the City, so the % allocation is calculated as new NBS service population (residents plus employees) as a proportion of new citywide service population (35%).