

From: [Betsy Collard](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Gamel Way Housing
Date: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 12:20:25 PM

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

Dear Council Members,

I am a long time resident of Mountain View who has always been proud of our diversity in residents, income levels, types of housing, etc. In the 80s I worked to protect the housing by the library where many low income people rented and I have been very proud of Mountain View for it's leadership in housing preservation and in supporting low-income housing projects.

Please vote to protect the current residents.

Betsy Collard

From: [Gwen Smith](#)
To: [City Council](#); [Kamei, Ellen](#); [Hicks, Alison](#); [Matichak, Lisa](#); [Ramirez, Lucas](#); [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#); [Lieber, Sally](#); [Showalter, Pat](#)
Subject: Very Concerned about Gamel Way
Date: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 10:39:41 AM

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

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

As a long-time Mountain View resident I am very concerned about what is happening with the affordable housing on Gamel Way including the process of review and approval. Maintaining and providing affordable housing in Mountain View is a critical issue for all residents. The proposal to demolish 29 rent-controlled, naturally affordable apartments on Gamel Way is very controversial. Mountain View residents are only now being offered a glimpse of the proposal and the offer being made to tenants. Why have all policy discussions been conducted behind closed doors? The Gamel Way tenants and the community still have major questions about what is being proposed to stop their displacement and to provide affordable units within this development.

The consent calendar item you will vote on tonight sets September 28 as the one and only meeting when all aspects of this development proposal will be discussed in public. Scheduling the Council public hearing on selling the street the same night that it considers Permits for the project will not give concerned members of the public time to understand and comment constructively on the proposal.

I strongly recommend that the Council schedule a study and review session in advance of the night at which it votes on the proposal.

Thank you for your assistance with the important matter.

Sincerely - Gwen Smith

From: [Sonia Menzies](#)
To: city.council@mountainview [REDACTED]
Cc: [Paul gmail](#)
Subject: Project 18-48 objection
Date: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 8:52:11 AM

Dear members, further to my message sent this morning with objections not only to your hearing notification but also to the project. I am requesting specific responses to the following:

I would also like to meet personally with the council member for my area at the earliest possible convenience.

1. Please explain your timing of the notice specific to the hearing and outline the reasons that you believe this to be reasonable and acceptable.
2. Who and at what address initiated the request for this project?
3. What assessment was done of impact on our homes and disabled elderly therein
4. What assessment of access for elderly disabled was done in terms of noise, access and quality pre project decision?
5. What other similar locations were assessed for feasibility?
6. What assessment of alteration to our adjacent property value was done ahead by your team?
7. What assessment as to where the users of said walkway would actually be located and therefore place a walkway at a closer point to there addresses?
8. What assessment for safety, including homeless encampment and inappropriate use of such an entry way, adjacent to our homes that house disabled elderly and young children was done?
9. What assessment of impact to our properties of both parking and foot traffic was done in general and as it pertains to use by employees, not in this immediate vicinity, for access to google and also due for events and concerts at Shoreline Amphitheater.
10. Based on now known infection prevention issues amidst pandemic situations, what has been done to access for increased likelihood of airborne infection transmission, based in the increased known likelihood for gathering at the entry/exit point, the potential for drinking and drug use at this location and cross contamination esp associated with events at Shoreline?

Please respond at earliest convenience. We are extremely concerned!!!

Sonia Menzies

[REDACTED]

94043

[REDACTED]

From: [Menzies, Sonia](#)
To: [Abe-Koga, Margaret](#)
Cc: [City Council](#); [Sonia Menzies](#)
Subject: Request for urgent assistance to pull an agenda item that is before the council tonight Project 18-48
Date: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 12:06:47 PM

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

Good afternoon,

I believe you are my council member for [REDACTED] Mountain View 94043

A letter dated August 17th was sent from the Public Works Office on the 18th of August, arriving at my address on the 20th and regarding meetings occurring on the 19th and tonight.

This particular project target my home and that of my neighbor and we believe our locations were profiled in order to push this through. There are unacceptable and adverse outcomes to our homes, both in value and regarding the impact on the elderly parent at my home, along with the children next door. This is a poorly thought out and rushed through plan that impacts noone but our two homes and we request to meet with you personally and discuss our objections.

Please have this item pulled this evening as the hasting sending and agendizing of this has not allowed us to get the required legal assistance we will require to stop you destroying our quiet and safe cul de sac. I think we are probably the only pacific island and Hispanic families in this area and I believe we were targeted both by last names (my neighbor) and by our older homes to select this as a couple of houses least likely to raise a fuss. You are wrong and we will take this where ever it needs to go not to be victimized in our home setting.

Thank you for attending to this immediately.

I can be reached at [REDACTED]

Thanks you

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

NOTICE: This email message and/or its attachments may contain information that is confidential or restricted. It is intended only for the individuals named as recipients in the message. If you are NOT an authorized recipient, you are prohibited from using, delivering, distributing, printing, copying, or disclosing the message or content to others and must delete the message from your computer. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender by return email.

From: [James Kuszmaul](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [MV YIMBY](#)
Subject: MVYIMBY comments on Lot 12 Development for City Council Agenda Item 7.2
Date: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 11:40:39 AM

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

To Mayor Kamei and members of the City Council

Our city is experiencing a housing crisis and every additional unit of housing, especially subsidized units to provide affordable housing for a variety of household sizes, is a valuable contribution to our city. As such, we are thrilled to see that a parking lot for cars is being replaced with 120 houses for people. In a perfect world, and especially for future projects, we would love to see these developments being built with more housing and fewer parking spots, to ensure that we are fully dedicating our limited resources to building housing rather than building unneeded car storage. However, the project as-is represents a great boon to our community and we look forward to seeing it move forward with an urgency that reflects the severity of our housing crisis.

Thank you for considering our input.



Kind regards,
James Kuszmaul
On behalf of the members of
MV YIMBY

Gutierrez, Jeannette

Subject: RE: MVCSP and Mountain View YIMBY comment on the Downtown Parking Garage Framework to City of Mountain View City Council

From: Mountain View MVCSP <mvcsp.info@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2021 12:02 PM

To: Kamei, Ellen <Ellen.Kamei@mountainview.gov>; Ramirez, Lucas <Lucas.Ramirez@mountainview.gov>; Abe-Koga, Margaret <Margaret.abe-koga@mountainview.gov>; Matichak, Lisa <Lisa.Matichak@mountainview.gov>; Showalter, Pat <Pat.Showalter@mountainview.gov>; Sally Lieber <Sally@sallylieber.org>; Lieber, Sally <Sally.Lieber@mountainview.gov>; Hicks, Alison <Alison.Hicks@mountainview.gov>

Cc: Mountain View MVCSP <mvcsp.info@gmail.com>; Anderson, Eric B. <Eric.Anderson2@mountainview.gov>; Shrivastava, Aarti <Aarti.Shrivastava@mountainview.gov>; McCarthy, Kimbra <Kimbra.McCarthy@mountainview.gov>; Glaser, Heather <Heather.Glaser@mountainview.gov>

Subject: MVCSP and Mountain View YIMBY comment on the Downtown Parking Garage Framework to City of Mountain View City Council

(formal letter attached)

Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning
c/o Aaron Grossman
817 Montgomery Street
Mountain View, CA 94041

Mountain View YIMBY
<https://mvyimby.com/>

August 24, 2021

City of Mountain View City Council
City Hall, 500 Castro Street
PO Box 7540
Mountain View, CA 94039-7540

Re: [7.3] Downtown Parking Garage Framework

Dear Mayor Kamei and City Council members:

The Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning (MVCSP) and Mountain View YIMBY appreciate the opportunity to address the ongoing transportation issues in the downtown area and are glad to see that the Staff proposal looks to take swift action to improve the situation.

We are writing out of a concern that the decision to build a new parking garage in the downtown will be made without a clear-eyed consideration of the full cost and potential alternatives. The potential investment in a new 400 space garage at Lot 5 is substantial—\$24 million in capital costs, three-quarters of an acre of land in the core downtown area (likely worth in the range of \$10 million itself), and \$800k+ dollars / year in ongoing operating costs, and it is our feeling that the current Staff report both inadequately captures these costs and fails to appropriately lay out potential alternatives for these resources. In particular:

- The “Fiscal Impact” section fails to account for:
 - Ongoing operational costs (the agenda materials from the May 11 study session suggest that costs are ~\$2000 / yr per parking spot).
 - The opportunity cost of using City land for a parking garage instead of market rate development (to capture the full fiscal impacts, we should be considering the cost as if the City were to lease out the land at full market value—however, there are plenty of scenarios where it might instead be preferable to use the land for affordable housing, public parks, or some other public good). In contrast, the Staff report for the Lot 12 affordable housing development correctly identifies the implicit subsidy present when the City leases land below market-rate.
- If this garage succeeds at getting more people to drive to Downtown than the no-build alternative, then it will increase VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled) and so should also be judged against:
 - The Vision Zero goals adopted by Mountain View.
 - Mountain View’s greenhouse gas emission targets.
 - The public health impacts of increased emissions (both tailpipe emissions from gas-powered vehicles as well as tire/brake dust particulate matter from all vehicles).
- One of the stated benefits of this project is that “Public parking can improve the quality of the pedestrian and bicycle environment by reducing the number of driveways and providing unobstructed active building frontages,” but no meaningful driveway or on-street parking removal is being tied to this project.
- The stated goal of this project is to use parking in-lieu fees to improve our downtown transportation network, but no alternatives to achieve this goal were analyzed:
 - \$24 million (+the ongoing land and operational subsidies) would be adequate to provide more bus/shuttle service than a single parking garage could ever provide.
 - The potential bike/pedestrian improvements that could be made with a few million dollars is substantial, and such improvements have generally [increased business in other cities](#).
 - We have not yet fully explored the potential for sharing private off-street parking spots to increase overall parking utilization, as discussed in the May 11 Council Study Session. Given that 55% of downtown parking spots (5,887 spots, out of 10,799 total) are privately owned and largely under-utilized, this seems like a more cost-effective means of increasing parking supply than building entire new garages.

To expand on what a bus/shuttle alternative might look like, it is useful to examine the existing Community Shuttle. In 2019, the shuttle carried 750 riders / weekday (presumably ~375 round-trips), running service every half hour from 10am–5pm on a relatively circuitous route with no signal priority or other speed advantages over regular driving. While I have not found the exact costs of our shuttles, at VTA’s operational costs, this corresponds to ~\$1.6M / year to run this service. Running a similar shuttle service to downtown at peak hours is likely even better suited to mass transit—in contrast to the existing shuttle’s destinations, downtown is a single, busy destination where the alternatives to transit are inconvenient (driving requires finding parking; biking requires biking at dark on unsafe streets; taxis/Uber/Lyft are expensive and can take a long time to arrive).

Given this, it seems eminently reasonable that a new shuttle could, for the same cost as the existing Community Shuttle, bring the same number of people to downtown as a new 400-space garage, and, while there is not necessarily a clean conversion between the \$24M of capital costs for a garage and the ongoing operational costs required for a shuttle, it is hard to say that \$1.6M / year would be a higher price to pay than \$24M of capital costs + a large plot of land + \$800k / year of ongoing costs. On top of this, any sort of mass transit system is inherently far more expandable than a parking garage—once the garage is full, we can’t readily add capacity; however, the envisioned shuttle would be operating well below full capacity and it would be relatively trivial to add shuttles to the route if crowding did become

an issue, and because bus stops take up far less space than a parking garage the shuttle can drop people closer to their final destination than any parking garage reasonably can.

To be clear, pure capacity constraints are not the only reason to prefer mass transit or bike/pedestrian infrastructure to cars—we should never discount the increased human and environmental costs of making investments that actively subsidize and encourage car use. However, in this case we feel that it is important to be clear that this is not a binary choice between doing what is most economical and what is most sustainable, but rather that, in this case, the two are aligned and we can make this a win-win situation.

We ask that Council request that Staff come back with a more fully fleshed out set of alternatives for how we can best use our City's money to make the brightest possible future for our downtown.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

James Kuszmaul

for the Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning and Mountain View YIMBY

cc:

Eric Anderson, Principal Planner

Aarti Shrivastava, Assistant City Manager / Community Development Director

Kimbra McCarthy, City Manager

Heather Glaser, City Clerk

About Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning

The Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning is a local volunteer-based organization dedicated to making Mountain View as beautiful, economically healthy, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian accessible, and affordable as possible. MVCSP member interest and expertise covers areas such as housing, transportation, the environment, the economy, and beyond!

For more information, see <http://www.mvcsp.org>.

To contact us, send email to mvcsp.info@gmail.com.



Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning
c/o Aaron Grossman
817 Montgomery Street
Mountain View, CA 94041

Mountain View YIMBY
<https://mvyimby.com/>

August 24, 2021

City of Mountain View City Council
City Hall, 500 Castro Street
PO Box 7540
Mountain View, CA 94039-7540

Re: [7.3] Downtown Parking Garage Framework

Dear Mayor Kamei and City Council members:

The Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning (MVCSP) and Mountain View YIMBY appreciate the opportunity to address the ongoing transportation issues in the downtown area and are glad to see that the Staff proposal looks to take swift action to improve the situation.

We are writing out of a concern that the decision to build a new parking garage in the downtown will be made without a clear-eyed consideration of the full cost and potential alternatives. The potential investment in a new 400 space garage at Lot 5 is substantial—\$24 million in capital costs, three-quarters of an acre of land in the core downtown area (likely worth in the range of \$10 million itself), and \$800k+ dollars / year in ongoing operating costs, and it is our feeling that the current Staff report both inadequately captures these costs and fails to appropriately lay out potential alternatives for these resources. In particular:

- The “Fiscal Impact” section fails to account for:
 - Ongoing operational costs (the agenda materials from the May 11 study session suggest that costs are ~\$2000 / yr per parking spot).
 - The opportunity cost of using City land for a parking garage instead of market rate development (to capture the full fiscal impacts, we should be considering the cost as if

the City were to lease out the land at full market value—however, there are plenty of scenarios where it might instead be preferable to use the land for affordable housing, public parks, or some other public good). In contrast, the Staff report for the Lot 12 affordable housing development correctly identifies the implicit subsidy present when the City leases land below market-rate.

- If this garage succeeds at getting more people to drive to Downtown than the no-build alternative, then it will increase VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled) and so should also be judged against:
 - The Vision Zero goals adopted by Mountain View.
 - Mountain View’s greenhouse gas emission targets.
 - The public health impacts of increased emissions (both tailpipe emissions from gas-powered vehicles as well as tire/brake dust particulate matter from all vehicles).
- One of the stated benefits of this project is that “Public parking can improve the quality of the pedestrian and bicycle environment by reducing the number of driveways and providing unobstructed active building frontages,” but no meaningful driveway or on-street parking removal is being tied to this project.
- The stated goal of this project is to use parking in-lieu fees to improve our downtown transportation network, but no alternatives to achieve this goal were analyzed:
 - \$24 million (+the ongoing land and operational subsidies) would be adequate to provide more bus/shuttle service than a single parking garage could ever provide.
 - The potential bike/pedestrian improvements that could be made with a few million dollars is substantial, and such improvements have generally [increased business in other cities](#).
 - We have not yet fully explored the potential for sharing private off-street parking spots to increase overall parking utilization, as discussed in the May 11 Council Study Session. Given that 55% of downtown parking spots (5,887 spots, out of 10,799 total) are privately owned and largely under-utilized, this seems like a more cost-effective means of increasing parking supply than building entire new garages.

To expand on what a bus/shuttle alternative might look like, it is useful to examine the existing Community Shuttle. In 2019, the shuttle carried 750 riders / weekday (presumably ~375 round-trips), running service every half hour from 10am–5pm on a relatively circuitous route with no signal priority or other speed advantages over regular driving. While I have not found the exact costs of our shuttles, at VTA’s operational costs, this corresponds to ~\$1.6M / year to run this service. Running a similar shuttle service to downtown at peak hours is likely even better suited to mass transit—in contrast to the existing shuttle’s destinations, downtown is a single, busy destination where the alternatives to transit are inconvenient (driving requires finding parking; biking requires biking at dark on unsafe streets; taxis/Uber/Lyft are expensive and can take a long time to arrive).

Given this, it seems eminently reasonable that a new shuttle could, for the same cost as the existing Community Shuttle, bring the same number of people to downtown as a new 400-space garage, and, while there is not necessarily a clean conversion between the \$24M of capital costs for a garage and the ongoing operational costs required for a shuttle, it is hard to say that \$1.6M / year would be a higher

price to pay than \$24M of capital costs + a large plot of land + \$800k / year of ongoing costs. On top of this, any sort of mass transit system is inherently far more expandable than a parking garage—once the garage is full, we can't readily add capacity; however, the envisioned shuttle would be operating well below full capacity and it would be relatively trivial to add shuttles to the route if crowding did become an issue, and because bus stops take up far less space than a parking garage the shuttle can drop people closer to their final destination than any parking garage reasonably can.

To be clear, pure capacity constraints are not the only reason to prefer mass transit or bike/pedestrian infrastructure to cars—we should never discount the increased human and environmental costs of making investments that actively subsidize and encourage car use. However, in this case we feel that it is important to be clear that this is not a binary choice between doing what is most economical and what is most sustainable, but rather that, in this case, the two are aligned and we can make this a win-win situation.

We ask that Council request that Staff come back with a more fully fleshed out set of alternatives for how we can best use our City's money to make the brightest possible future for our downtown.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

James Kuszmaul

for the Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning and Mountain View YIMBY

cc:

Eric Anderson, Principal Planner

Aarti Shrivastava, Assistant City Manager / Community Development Director

Kimbra McCarthy, City Manager

Heather Glaser, City Clerk

About Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning

The Mountain View Coalition for Sustainable Planning is a local volunteer-based organization dedicated to making Mountain View as beautiful, economically healthy, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian accessible, and affordable as possible. MVCSP member interest and expertise covers areas such as housing, transportation, the environment, the economy, and beyond!

For more information, see <http://www.mvcsp.org>.

To contact us, send email to mvscsp.info@gmail.com.