

City Council Questions

September 28, 2021 Council Meeting

ITEM 4.5 Approval of Council Advisory Body Work Plans

1. BPAC – What is Local Road Safety Plan?

The Local Road Safety Plan is a document designed to:

- Set a traffic safety vision and mission
- Establish leadership
- Identify stakeholders
- Undertake outreach to the public
- Conduct systemic safety analysis
- Identify and prioritize proven countermeasures to prevent or reduce the severity of crashes on Mountain View roadways
- And then to implement and evaluate roadway and safety improvements

The Local Road Safety Plan will integrate with the City's Vision Zero policy. Vision Zero is a policy statement that we will not accept any deaths or severe injuries as a part of our transportation system. The ultimate goal of both programs is to eliminate traffic fatalities.

Lastly, it is a requirement of eligibility for the Highway Safety Improvement Program. The Highway Safety Improvement Program is a state funding program designed to make roads safer for all users. For a city to be eligible, it must have an approved Local Road Safety Plan. This is a requirement for 2021.

2. EPC – Would the EPC define bio-diversity requirements for city property, as well as new development?

The EPC doesn't typically recommend standards or policies for City properties. They generally only make recommendations regarding development and private property.

3. HRC – What, if any, actions have been taken as a result of the LGBTQ survey done by the HRC?

Staff shared the HRC LGBTQ+ Needs and Assets Assessment findings with the Community Services and Police Departments and the organizations listed below. The City has taken no additional action as a result of the LGBTQ+ survey undertaken by the HRC in 2018.

- CSA
- CHAC
- El Camino Hospital
- YMCA
- Mountain View Whisman School District
- Outlet (Provides Mental Health Services to LGBTQ Youth)
- Santa Clara County Office of LGBTQ Affairs
- City of Palo Alto Human Relations Commission

4. PSAB – Staff indicated that the PSAB could be assigned work by the City Manager or the Police Chief at a recent PSAB meeting. Are any advisory bodies assigned work by the City Manager or Department Heads? Or was this an error?

Based on Council Policy A-23, the language should be clarified to state that additional items may be referred to the PSAB by the City Council, or by the City Manager or Police Chief with approval of the Mayor and Vice Mayor or full Council. This process enables the PSAB to advise and make recommendations to the City Council, City Manager and Police Chief on public safety matters as stated in the PSAB purpose.

Link: [Policy A-23](#)

ITEM 4.8 Amend Professional Services Agreement with Tanner Pacific, Inc., for Construction Engineering Services

1. For how long as the City contracted with Tanner Pacific, Inc. for construction engineering services, and how much money cumulatively has been allocated over this time?

The City has been contracting with Tanner Pacific, Inc. since October 2019 and has encumbered \$2.2M (\$1.15M paid) over multiple contracts to support both development and capital projects.

2. Was a formal RFP conducted? If not, why not, and at what point would a formal RFP be required?

An RFP process was performed in 2019 for construction engineering services and based on this process and their high performance, staff has continued to utilize Tanner Pacific, Inc. for the same services for development and capital projects. The City will typically utilize a consultant for up to 5 years before issuing a new RFP for engineering and inspection services.

ITEM 6.1 Guaranteed Basic Income Pilot

1. Has there been any talk about whether recipients should be able to collect from multiple funds including Federal Stimulus funding, the Solidarity Fund, CSA-administered funding, the GBI and other benefits such as city-provided affordable housing?

Some duplication is expected given the programs will be administered by different organizations. There would be increased administrative requirements for all programs if a system were to be established to track all three programs.

2. Will representatives who may conduct the pilot study be available during Council to answer questions?

Cameron Burns, Deputy Director of Mayors for a Guaranteed Income (MGI) will be present at the Study Session. Staff can also submit any outstanding questions to the University of Pennsylvania, Center for Guaranteed Income Research (CGIR) as needed.

3. Has there been any talk about merging the Solidarity Fund and the GBI in any way at any time, for example working with Solidarity Fund representatives as the GBI lived experience reps?

There has not been discussion of merging the funds as the Council direction was to pursue three separate programs. Staff included the Mountain View Solidarity Fund in the report (see Figure 4) as one of the potential organizations to reach out to for the Lived Experience Advisors, as well as other Community Based Organizations and non-profit safety-net providers.

4. Given that the Solidarity Fund and GBI are listed as two separate agenda items, at what point in the agenda will we be able to talk about the long-term structuring of the various funds and how they might overlap, be consolidated and other questions that involve talking about more than one fund at the same time? Can I assume that would be during both the Solidarity Fund and the GBI item?

Comments may be brought up in either the GBI or Solidarity Fund item. Council can provide alternative direction, but staff does not recommend a long-term ongoing changes at this point because these programs are being accomplished with one-time funding.

5. Would Mountain View have to focus on transition-aged foster youth and pregnant women in order to get matching funds from the state?

The preliminary details indicate these programs are for the two targeted populations. The notice for the State GBI grants (\$35M distributed over five years) is not available, but staff could see if there are any opportunities to compete for funding for the pregnant women option if it is a part, but not sole, focus of the recommended program on families.

To date, SB 739 (Cortese) has been introduced and currently focusses on Transition-Age Youth as part of the State's pilot project. It aims to provide 3-years of \$1000/mo. for foster youth. Staff will continue to monitor the enabling legislation as it develops.

6. Is staff proposing that people have to stay in Mountain View for the entire length of the program? Do other programs require people to remain in the jurisdiction that is providing the GBI for the entire length of the program?

Given the City funding for this pilot, staff is recommending that the participants maintain Mountain View residency throughout the pilot. From a research perspective as much stability with the cohort as possible is recommended, and many philanthropically funded pilot programs will not place limitations on maintaining residency for the entire length of the program.

7. Table 5 shows the census tract with the lowest percent of ELI households has the second highest COVID case rate and the second highest Latino population. So is it really fair to say there are correlations between ELI households and COVID?

The information in Table 5 is a small snapshot of the Mountain View Census Tracts that have the highest percentage of extremely low-income households as a percentage of all households within in the Tract. Table 5 represents six Census Tracts that have a least one household out of every five as noted as extremely low income. There are another 10 census tracts that represent Mountain View all having percentages of extremely low-income household less than 20%.

On Average, when looking at total COVID 19 cases per census tracts, the Census Tracts with a higher percentage of extremely low-income households have higher number of actual COVID 19 cases than those Census Tracts with less extremely low-income households.

8. Please provide the data behind the statement on page 10 “Outcomes from nationwide pilots are showing a direct correlation between GBI programs and the alleviation of poverty and creation of social mobility and equity for residents.”

The Stockton SEEDs initial research findings from their Randomized Control Treatment (RCT) show that:

- Guaranteed income reduced income volatility, or the month-to-month income fluctuations that households face
- Unconditional cash enabled recipients to find full-time employment
- Allowed receipts to choose housing in neighborhoods and communities that were more safe
- Recipients of guaranteed income were healthier, showing less depression and anxiety and enhanced wellbeing.
- The guaranteed income alleviated financial scarcity creating new opportunities for self-determination, choice, goal-setting, and risk-taking.

(Sourced from University of Pennsylvania- The Center for Guaranteed Income Research, Preliminary Analysis: SEED’s First Year, available at: <https://www.stocktondemonstration.org/>)

Staff’s interviews with other Pilot programs in preparation for the GBI Study Session have reinforced similar anecdotal findings. Many programs have not published their initial findings.

9. How would the city be able to evaluate the program if participation in the evaluation component is not mandatory? The data in the staff reports suggests that 66% of participants would be surveyed. What happens if only say 30% agree to participate in the survey?

The research design discussed is to survey 110 GBI participants and 132 non-participants as the control group. Based upon conversations with other Basic Income Pilots underway, there have been a high response rates to the survey when not mandatory. As part of the application process a survey is conducted. There is the possibility of attrition of program participants based upon similar pilots.

10. How could eligibility be without regard to housing status? How would residency in Mountain View be determined for someone who is unhoused?

After Council direction is received, this is a program element that staff would be researching further and working with our nonprofit partners to identify criteria. Staff would consider the following examples and other options when crafting an inclusive program design.

There are different ways to verify residency/eligibility. These can range from current California Driver’s License or Identification cards (through AB 60 – CA offers greater access for residents that are unable to provide proof of legal presence in the U.S., but can meet other criteria); to a recent utility bill, car registration, bank statement, or rental agreement on property management letterhead with a current address; to State criteria used to verify residency that can include, a letter on letterhead from a homeless shelter, shelter for abused women, nonprofit entity, employer and faith-based organization.

11. Could the council allocate \$500,000 to the first year of the pilot and \$500,000 to the second year of the pilot?

The timing of the \$1 million funding authorization is a Council decision. This would reduce the number of residents eligible to participate in the program, and would reduce the financial component by half creating a smaller sample size shifting the research component from a Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT) scale to a survey and storytelling component.

12. How likely are contributions from philanthropic donations?

It is difficult for staff to quantify prospective results of the City outreach for donations, although philanthropic discussions continue. There is growing interest among funders to support guaranteed income pilots, and MGI and others are doing work to encourage funding. As shown, in the Council report there are number of pilots in the Bay Area showing philanthropic support.

13. If GBI was provided to those not receiving support from other government programs, what would be the impact on the program in terms of segment eligibility?

Of the nearly 6,500 Extremely Low-Income households in Mountain View, there are over 1,900 households that are receiving some form of Federal Aid or Assistance that counts towards income.

14. What incentives is staff considering to get GBI participants to participate in the surveys?

Staff is considering participant incentives are nominal such as a \$30 gift card upon survey completion and \$40 for long form qualitative interview.

15. Do the other financial assistance programs the City supports - Rent relief, Small business microloans/grants, CSA's direct assistance and Solidarity Fund also have administrative fees?

Yes, other programs include administrative fees – usually in the range of ~15 percent. CSA’s Board agreed to offset their fee for the recent round of rental relief (\$150,000). The small business microloan program used Main Street Launch as an administrator, and the admin fee was 15% of the loan principal of each loan provided, for a total amount not to exceed \$67,174.

16. If we were to do a second year of GBI, would we have to pay the admin/research/benefit fund/program administration/payment processor costs again or can would be second year be included or at a reduced cost?

Should the program be approved for a second-year, staff anticipates the additional costs will be significantly less. As staff continues to refine the budget and review partnerships, we will strive to maximize resources should a second year be approved.

ITEM 6.2 Mountain View Solidarity Fund

1. Has there been any talk with Solidarity Fund representatives about long term plans?

The Solidarity Fund representatives have shared that their intent is to remain a project of the Los Altos Mountain View Community Foundation (LAMV/CF) for the near future. Long-term plans for the Solidarity Fund have not been shared with the City.

2. Is anyone not eligible to receive back rent from the state (e.g., due to income level, etc.)?

The CA COVID-19 Rent Relief program supports eligible low-income renters and their landlords by providing 100 percent financial assistance for rent and utilities, to prevent housing instability, potential eviction, and financial hardships due to the COVID-19 public health emergency.

Renters who have been impacted by COVID-19, are income eligible (the state will calculate this when renters apply) and have unpaid rent or utilities or need help with future rent or utilities may apply for the CA

COVID-19 Rent Relief program. Applicants will not be asked about their immigration status, nor will they be required to show proof of citizenship.

More information about the program can be found https://housing.ca.gov/covid_rr/program_overview.html

3. When does the state program for rent relief end?

The State began accepting applications for the CA COVID-19 Rent Relief program on March 15, 2021 and applications will be accepted on an ongoing basis until all funds are exhausted although applicants are encouraged to apply as soon as possible.

4. There are 3 zip codes in Mountain View where residential units are located. And there are 3 zip codes for PO Boxes. How would residency in Mountain View be validated if someone is using a PO Box?

Staff inadvertently included the zip codes reserved for P.O. Boxes in Mountain View as a part of the Solidarity Fund eligibility process. Staff's intent in the recommendation is to assist Mountain View residents who reside in the residential zip codes in Mountain View. Staff supports modifying the recommendation to provide Solidarity Fund support to eligible residents who reside in the 94040, 94041, and 94043 zip codes.

ITEM 7.1 Residential Development at 1919-1945 Gamel Way, 574 Escuela Avenue, and 1970 Latham Street

1. What are the proposed sidewalk widths around this development?

The majority of the neighborhood has 5' wide sidewalk widths directly adjacent to the curb. The project will replace all of the sidewalk along the project frontage (Escuela Avenue) with 5' wide sidewalk separated from the curb with a planter strip.

2. How many projects have been deemed complete by law in the past 5 years in Mountain View?

Staff does not have this information due to the fact that the process of getting this information is not automated. Each planning application has multiple resubmittals and responses required and involves multiple departments and divisions providing their responses prior to collating the information and sending it to the applicant. The IT, PW and CDD team will include the collection of such information as part of the new land management and online permitting systems.

3. How many projects that were deemed complete by law are coming to council in the future?

Projects are deemed complete by law when they have provided all the information required to review the project. Additionally, per State Permit Streamlining Act (PSA) if a City does not respond with a request for information within a 30-day deadline of receiving an application, a project is deemed complete on the 30th day per law. Due to reduced staffing and high workloads in the departments and divisions providing input into the response letters, letters were sent later than the 30-day deadline; however, applicants continued to work with the City to meet requirements. In 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic added to the workload due to vacancies and inefficiencies as staff tried to implement a temporary online permit and customer appointment process.

Additionally, through the enactment of new laws (including SB 330) in 2020, the state has reduced review timelines and locked in development standards and impact fees for residential (and certain mixed-use residential) projects, which has increased implications for cities in the review process. Since the

implications of late deadlines were realized last year, staff has been working on filling vacant positions and implementing procedures across departments and divisions to ensure that responses are received and sent out to the applicant in a timely manner.

At this time, staff expects that there may be a few active projects in this category that would be reviewed at the ZA level but will need time to review each resubmittal and letter to provide this information. However, staff has determined that of the projects that will be reviewed by Council, there are no projects that were deemed complete by law due to the missed 30-day deadline.

4. What aspect of this project application was incomplete right before it was deemed complete by law?

The following were considered “incomplete” items:

1. Provide two copies of the current preliminary title report
2. Sustainability checklist
3. Environmental information form
4. Tenant Relocation Assistance Compliance form

5. If the 2nd floor setback is 22’ and the requirement is 20’, isn’t that compliant? (page 7)

This is an error in the table and the second floor 22’ front setback meets the requirement.

6. What is being noted on the line that starts with 50.4% on page 8?

The column description was inadvertently deleted. The column should start with Lot Coverage. Please see revised table below.

Standard	Requirement	Proposed	Compliance
Lot Coverage	35% maximum	50.4%	Waiver requested

7. When did FAR become an element that can be considered a waiver? Has it always been listed in the state density bonus law, or was it added during an amendment to the law? If it was added, what year was it added?

State Density Bonus law allows for density increases (typically regulated as dwelling units or DU/acre) based on the number of affordable units provided and the depth of affordability. In order to be able to achieve the density bonus, the law allows unlimited waivers to development standards such as setbacks, FAR, etc. In some areas of the City FAR is used as the density metric instead of the DU/ acre metric and our Density Bonus Ordinance specifically states that in those cases, FAR cannot be requested as a waiver. However, in the case of this project, which is in the R3 zoning district, the General Plan regulates density through the DU/acre metric. Therefore, the project may request an FAR waiver per State Density Bonus law.

8. How many of the 12 Heritage trees, and 23 non-Heritage trees need to be removed to accommodate the building and the underground parking?

Twenty-nine of the existing trees (7 Heritage trees) slated for removal are within the footprint of the building and underground parking garage. The remainder of the trees proposed for removal are either in poor health and/or conflict with necessary site or utility improvements for the development.

9. It looks like one oak tree is scheduled to be planted. How many oak trees could be planted?

Two Oak trees are proposed to be planted. The applicant could replace the other proposed tree plantings with Oak trees if requested although staff recommends a mixture of tree types.

10. What percent of the plants will be native plants?

61% of the proposed tree and plant species are native.