

# City Council Questions

## June 14, 2022 Council Meeting

### ITEM 3.1 Draft 2023-2031 Housing Element

1. Why does the city need to be involved in a community land trust? Can a community land trust happen without city involvement?

Staff's understanding is that a community land trust (CLT) can be set up in different ways for different purposes, depending on the goals and objectives of a CLT for a particular community. Once a city determines that a CLT may be helpful in advancing certain housing goals, a city may get involved for a few reasons, such as:

- Providing funding
- Establishing a partnership
- Entering into a service agreement
- Other

Staff's initial research is that there is not a CLT undertaking activities in Mountain View. Therefore, in addition to in-depth research about the topic, staff will at minimum contact potential external organizations about the potential for a CLT to be setup and undertake activities in the City, what the needs and goals are, what a partnership might entail, etc. If there is additional City involvement that would be needed, the information would be included in staff's analysis and be brought to Council for consideration.

2. Does the CSFRA allow the RHA to spend money on legal services for tenants? Or, does this all fall to the city to fund?

The Rental Housing Committee (RHC) sets the CSFRA budget and per-unit fee levels on an annual basis. It is within the RHC's authority to consider and approve funding for legal services to tenants that are covered under the CSFRA. In FY2021-22, the RHC provided \$40,000 in one-time funding for legal services for tenants to cover impacts due to the COVID-19 crisis. FY 2022-23 does not include such funding since it was not requested by the provider of legal services, Community Legal Services East Palo Alto (CLESPA).

City funding could also be used to support and/or supplement the services for CSFRA tenants and could include non-CSFRA tenants. An example of such a City-RHC joint funded effort is the Housing and Eviction Help Center, which was setup during this fiscal year to provide eviction prevention counseling, resources, and assistance, as well as assistance with other housing needs such as filling out rent relief applications, applications for affordable housing units, etc.

3. I have heard conflicting information on how to evaluate whether or not a city's RHNA has been met. It is simply the total number of units with building permits (?) vs the RHNA number? Or does it somehow factor in meeting the allocation by income levels?

The City reports on building permits issued to HCD in the Annual Progress Report and the income levels for those units are considered when determining whether a city's RHNA has been met. In other words, a jurisdiction's full RHNA has been met only if it meets its RHNA in all income categories.

Additionally, there are consequences for the City under certain non-attainment scenarios. For example, the City must maintain a full inventory at all income levels under “no net loss” – if the RHNA is not met in a given category (for example, a site is developed with less than the presumed affordable income levels), the inventory must include adequate sites to accommodate the remainder. In addition, SB35 looks at RHNA attainment for above-moderate and lower-income categories specifically and requires ministerial review of housing projects with 10% and 50% affordable units if those categories are not met, respectively.

4. Will staff automatically forward all stakeholder letters and public comments to HCD with the submittal of the draft Housing Element?

No, it is not standard practice to forward all stakeholder letters and public comments to HCD with the submittal of the draft Housing Element. However, we can include public comment letters as part of Appendix F if directed by Council.

5. Members of the public have asked how the park fees can be deemed a “constraint” when projects have been approved with the current requirements. Can staff provide more information about the constraints analysis and their conclusions?

The park fees can be deemed a constraint despite projects being approved with the current requirements because constraints do not necessarily prevent all new development from occurring. If a requirement unduly constrains development and may be a barrier to the City's ability to meet its RHNA, this requirement should be analyzed as a constraint, even if some developments are feasible despite the requirement. In the case of Mountain View, park fees constituted up to 8.5% of the development costs and were therefore identified as a major cost factor.

6. Will the draft be updated to reflect City Council and public input prior to submission to HCD in July?

Yes, the Draft Housing Element submitted to HCD will include changes that reflect majority City Council direction. In addition, the project team will make minor changes to the document narrative to better tie pieces of the Housing Element together and to better describe activities the City is already carrying out. Lastly, minor modifications to the Sites Inventory will be made to format it per HCD requirements and to integrate new information from property owners. While the draft is under review, staff will continue to: (i) refine the language to tie pieces of the Housing Element together, (ii) monitor the pipeline projects and update the list and (iii) develop options for EPC and Council consideration after HCD review.

7. Will the “final” draft, with the changes directed by Council, be made available to the public when it is submitted to HCD?

Yes, the Draft Housing Element submitted to HCD in July 2022 will be made available on the Housing Element webpage.

8. Why isn't staff capacity identified as a constraint?

The analysis focused on constraints from the developers' perspective. In that sense, staff capacity is inherently part of “Processing and Permit Procedures” starting on page 189. Staff capacity, in terms of the number of staff and turnover, may contribute to review timelines and costs. However, the programs focus on training, tools and process improvements, which are necessary to support the efficacy of staff.

9. In the constraints analysis, where does the assumed 4-month delay in development review come from?

The constraints analysis used a 4-month delay as a reasonable metric to connect longer review timelines to monetary costs. 4 months was determined to be meaningfully large and not trivially small, while also representing a reasonable unit of analysis. It is roughly the maximum time between two submittals in an application (1 month of review plus 3 months of revisions).

10. Given the letter from CSA, can we remove the CSA building from the site inventory?

Yes, the CSA site will be removed from the Site Inventory. The Sites Inventory is continually monitored and will reflect updates based on additional information received. For example, the site in South Whisman (along the VTA Light Rail tracks) will also be removed due to lack of street frontage, and a small parcel along Pamela Drive (behind Grant Park Plaza) will also be removed because it is an undevelopable driveway. In addition, staff will add new Pipeline projects as they are submitted.

11. Can staff share the analysis/evidence that the property on El Camino Real and Phyllis Ave will likely develop as housing within the next 8 years?

The sites inventory is not a prediction, and we have no control over property owners' decisions. It is a list of sites where residential development is generally feasible, considering all constraints (including zoning and existing uses). Vacant sites, such as the one on Phyllis and El Camino Real, are generally presumed to not have such constraints, especially if nearby sites have replaced existing uses with residential development under current Zoning. In other words, there is nothing keeping residential development from happening on that site, besides property owner's decision. Therefore, it is appropriate to include in the inventory.

12. On page 201 of the draft, staff indicates that "because a large share of residential development in Mountain View is infill development that involves demolition and replacement, building footprints are often already in place and tree preservation issues do not arise as a major concern to developers." Given significant concerns about tree removals in several recent projects, how did staff come to this conclusion?

Based on feedback from local developers, the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance did not come up as a primary constraint to residential development. Depending on the site, there may be projects that experience more challenges with this issue, while other developments have fewer challenges. In general, most zoning districts require some amount of open area, and site planning can help support configuring that open area to include existing Heritage trees. Additionally, state laws are making it increasingly difficult for cities to deny housing projects that are consistent with regulations – in the case of Mountain View, if they meet the criteria for tree removal and provide tree replacements.

13. On page 195 of the draft, staff indicate that "The City of Mountain View identified several possible zones to permit emergency shelters by-right based on their compatibility, access to transit and services, and suitability to accommodate permanent shelters for the homeless, and determined that City's General Industrial (MM) district could support emergency shelters." What transit and services are staff referring to? And how are residential shelters compatible with industrial uses?

The transit and services mentioned are referring to those near downtown (eg, the Pioneer Way area), as well as transit near Middlefield Road and Shoreline Boulevard (eg, the Terra Bella area). Industrial uses in Mountain View do not have hazards that would endanger shelter occupants and would have less residential populations that might object to shelters, although it is possible businesses could object.

14. On page 192 of the draft, staff indicate that “the time required for development approval is not generally a constraint or substantial cost to housing developers.” How does staff come to this conclusion? How does staff reconcile this with the analysis in the Chamber letter?

This conclusion was reached based on the economic analysis that the City conducted as part of this Housing Element Update and found that while extended development schedules due to delays in City approvals can have a moderate impact on residential development costs, the time required for development approval in Mountain View is not generally a constraint or substantial cost to housing developers with consideration for the State-required timelines for the approval of development permits.

15. On page 183 of the draft, most of the “precedent projects” listed were approved prior to the “Palmer fix” that legalized inclusionary zoning. Those that are not are either 100% affordable (950 W El Camino Real) or not built (400 Logue). As the draft recognizes, inclusionary zoning has a major impact on development feasibility. How can these projects truly serve as “precedent” given the significantly different market dynamic?

Provision of affordable units is a constraint on market-rate development, though it is necessary in that the ordinance contributes to fair housing and equity and achieves more affordable units.

The precedent projects are still appropriate in most cases, given changes to BMR requirements on rental units:

- Several of the market rate projects in the list (including 2700 West El Camino Real and 400 San Antonio Road) utilized State Density Bonus to provide nearly the number of affordable units that would be required under the City’s current BMR requirements, at a deeper affordability level. Many new development applications are also utilizing the State Density Bonus to be allowed additional density and waivers/concessions while complying with the City’s BMR requirements. Recently enacted state laws allow an increase of up to 50% over base density for projects that provide inclusionary units, which increases feasibility.
- Under review projects are progressing with full knowledge of their requirements. The applications identified are a significant way through the approval process, with experienced developers who know the requirements and economic conditions. In contrast, projects that have not progressed (such as the SummerHill project at 355 East Middlefield Road) did not know all the requirements when they initially applied.
- 100% affordable developments are appropriate precedents, since the site inventory is in part an exercise to show the feasibility of such projects. While these projects are dependent on outside funding, the Housing Element also includes programs to continue and augment that funding.

16. Can we use the Housing Element EIR to complete our requirement to align the City’s zoning with the General Plan per SB 1333?

The General Plan Village Centers and El Camino Real Village Centers are two of the major remaining inconsistencies and, if directed by Council, will be addressed with this EIR. Other remaining inconsistencies are either non-developable sites (townhome complexes, parks, water district property, PG&E substation, etc) or require additional analysis that will be presented to Council in the near future.

17. Please explain the calculation of Low- and Moderate-Income Units. The staff report says: — Sites only supporting fewer than 50 units are 100% moderate-income; — Sites supporting 50 to 150 units are 100% low-income — Sites supporting 150 units to 300 units are 150 low-income units and the remainder moderate-income; and — Sites supporting more than 300 units are 150 low-income, 150 moderate-income, and the remainder above-moderate-income. I understand that this is a way of estimating outcomes but the assumptions just don't sound like what we've been getting. Are these the outcomes we've been getting? For example have sites supporting 50 to 150 units produced 100% low-income housing? Have sites supporting 150 units to 300 units produced 150 low-income units and the remainder moderate-income, etc.?

The sites inventory is not a prediction of what will be built. It is analysis of sites that can accommodate projects at a range of incomes. HCD instructs jurisdictions to accommodate their lower income units on sites that allow more than 30 dwelling units per acre, even if most projects that have been built are not lower income.

The methodology is based on HCD guidance that few lower income projects tend to be developed with fewer than 50 units or more than 150 units. The following is an excerpt of HCD guidance from their Site Inventory Handbook.

“To achieve financial feasibility, many assisted housing developments using state or federal resources are between 50 to 150 units. Parcels that are too small may not support the number of units necessary to be competitive and to access scarce funding resources. Parcels that are large may require very large projects, which may lead to an over concentration of affordable housing in one location or may add cost to a project by requiring a developer to purchase more land than is needed, or render a project ineligible for funding.” (HCD Site Inventory Guidebook, Page 16, May 2020)

Based on this, the City has taken the following approach:

- Not to assume low-income units for sites that produce less than 50 units.
- To limit a single site's lower income allocation to a range between 50 and 150 units for sites that produce greater than 150 units.
- Only assuming that moderate income units will be built if sites produce more than 150 units (for the portion exceeding 150 units).

This approach also limits the risk that a single project will require a significant number of additional sites to be identified in the Sites Inventory under “No Net Loss” if it is developed with mostly market rate units or other uses.

18. How can we make sure that when shopping centers are redeveloped they include the urban amenities and form that make cities livable such as human-scaled walkable blocks, neighborhood-serving retail, public space, trees, etc.?

The proposed Village Center rezonings would include development standards that maintain neighborhood-serving retail, public open space, and pedestrian-friendly frontages. The standards would also require minimum landscaping areas, and the zoning ordinance already includes several tree-related standards (e.g., Heritage replacement and trees in parking lots). Language regarding new connections to surrounding neighborhoods can be added, but, in general, these centers are only a small part of the existing block pattern and there is limited opportunity to add new streets.

19. How can we make sure that when shopping centers are redeveloped they do not include more office than they currently have?

The amendments will limit commercial uses to those allowed in the CN zone or existing Grant-Phyllis Precise Plan language. These areas require “neighborhood-serving” uses (or in the case of Grant-Phyllis, “community- or local-serving” uses). They prohibit offices that do not fit those descriptions.

20. What are the implications of removing the Village Center Overlay requirement from the El Camino Real Precise Plan? If there are few implications, why was it put in place to begin with?

The El Camino Real Precise Plan was originally organized to allow for a range of heights and intensities where anything above the Base tier (i.e., Tier 1 and Tier 2) would require public benefits. Specifically, the Tier 2 Process (only allowed for Village Centers and requiring legislative action/overlay rezoning to obtain the highest FAR of 2.3) was intended to control applications based on the gatekeeper process and allow the City greater discretion to control building form and provide for additional public benefits through the overlay zoning process.

Due to recently enacted State laws, General Plan densities prevail over densities allowed in the zoning. Currently, the General Plan land use allows higher densities for Village Centers in the El Camino Real Precise Plan. Removing the requirement for legislative action/rezoning, would bring the Precise Plan into conformance with the General Plan. Removing the legislative overlay zone requirement would likely somewhat reduce the amount of public benefits received (though some public benefits would still be required – to increase over the Base).

21. The staff report says that the majority of EPC had concerns about business displacement in Village Center redevelopment projects and wanted Council to consider future action in evaluating antidisplacement programs for commercial tenants to preserve key small businesses. What are some examples of such programs?

Traditionally, commercial leases (office more than retail) have relocation provision clauses. Should there be interest in considering an anti-displacement policy to cover other commercial types, further analysis could be conducted through the work of the Economic Vitality Strategy. Mountain View could model an ordinance similar to Redevelopment Agency relocation assistance programs and the State of California University of California Regents relocation program that include a range of provisions for when relocation assistance can be provided based upon length of tenancy, size of business, type of business and income and sales.

22. Why aren't we getting efficiency units at the minimum size we allow, 150 sqft?

There are two main reasons:

1. Tax credit requirements- TCAC establishes the minimum unit size thresholds and 450 sq ft is the minimum for one-bedroom units. Developers usually build units ~100-150 sq ft bigger than this. While there is no threshold stated for studios, developers have not opted to go below this amount.
2. There is no market demand for such small units, so market-rate developers aren't building them. As a result, they are not provide through the inclusionary BMR program.

23. Could HCD count permanent safe parking/urban camping as affordable units produced? Could we add that under Provisions for a Variety of Housing Types?

Cities may report on related housing programs and services in their annual progress report as part of policy progress and program implementation, but those types of housing do not meet the definition of a housing unit and HCD would not count them as affordable units produced.

24. Which churches in the city are deemed to be historic?

The buildings below have been identified in previous historic surveys. The City is in the early stages of a comprehensive historic resource study, which may modify this list and will provide additional documentation about the resources identified.

The following churches have been identified as historic:

- 582 Hope Street (St Joseph Catholic Church)
- 596 Mercy Street (Peninsula Church in Christ)

In addition to churches, the program looks at community assembly sites generally (this is a better land use definition, since churches can be operated out of peoples' homes). The following community assembly sites have also been identified as historic:

- 200 Castro Street (Odd Fellows)
- 890 Church Street (Masonic)
- 361 Villa Street (Portuguese Hall)
- 157 Moffett Boulevard (Adobe Building)

None of the sites above are in R1.

25. In the next RHNA cycle, do sites from this cycle's inventory become sites become "by right" sites?

Housing laws continue to evolve and it is not clear what requirements the future 7th Housing Element cycle will entail. For this 6th cycle, a nonvacant site that was included in a prior planning period's housing element (e.g., 6th cycle housing element in this example question) would be required to: 1) indicate in the housing element site inventory that this parcel was used in a prior housing element planning period, and 2) include a program in the housing element requiring rezoning within three years of the beginning of the planning period to allow residential use by right at specified densities for housing developments in which at least 20 percent of the units are affordable to lower income households.

The Site Inventory in the proposed Housing Element does not include any such sites. The only sites that are recommended from the previous Housing Element are in the El Camino Real Precise Plan and were rezoned to add more density between the last Housing Element and this cycle. Therefore, the sites do not have the requirements noted above.

26. When do Google sites in the NBS for Affordable Housing become available for development?

Google North Bayshore is a multi-year development plan and will provide a combination of affordable and market-rate housing. Within the 2023-2031 planning period, the Master Plan is assumed to provide 50% of land dedications for affordable units based on the phasing plan provided by Google and LendLease, their residential partner. The initial affordable housing dedication sites are estimated to be available by November 2025.

27. With respect to understanding the demographics of the City, do we have a map of the percent of English-language learners at each elementary school?

We did not compile data for this specifically and will ask the school district for information.

28. How can we make mapping for condos standard practice for construction of new multi-family housing? What are the obstacles?

The City's BMR standards and guidelines allow for condominium conversion and rental of mapped units, which was a major constraint before 2019. While there continue to be some additional costs (eg, a higher BMR in-lieu fee for fractional units, map-preparation and filing costs, new undergrounding requirements), these are generally small. City staff continues to inform developers about this fact, and several have opted to map their projects, even though they intend to initially rent.

It should be noted that rental projects built with a condo map would result in significant displacement of existing tenants if those units are sold off. The City's TRAO includes assistance, but would not fully address the displacement.

29. What is the current rate of ADU development?

The City Council approved updated ADU regulations in 2020 therefore it is likely that the rate may rise as the trends show. The number of ADUs constructed in the last four years are as follows:

- 2018 – 5 units
- 2019 – 5 units
- 2020 – 12 units
- 2021 – 15 units

#### **ITEM 4.4 AB 361 Resolution to Continue Remote Public Meetings During State of Emergency**

1. When we go back to meeting in person with hybrid meetings, will it be possible for our Advisory Boards to meet virtually if they would like to?

Yes. Currently, California Government Code section 54953 authorizes the “legislative body” of a local agency to make findings and declarations necessary to hold virtual meetings during a declared state of emergency. “Legislative body” for purposes of section 54953 includes “a commission, committee, board, or other body of a local agency, whether permanent or temporary, decision-making or advisory, created by charter, ordinance, resolution, or formal action of a legislative body.” All of Mountain View’s advisory boards qualify as a “legislative body” and therefore each board can make its own findings and pass its own AB361 resolution to continue meeting virtually *while the declared state of emergency remains in effect*, even if city council begins to hold hybrid in person meetings. Staff liaisons to the City’s advisory bodies will be coordinating on making these findings for their respective bodies for meetings which occur over the summer.

#### **ITEM 4.5 Renewal of Downtown Parking Maintenance and Operation Assessment District for Fiscal Year 2022-23**

1. How is it that the Downtown Parking District gets property tax as revenue?

The Parking District historically receives property tax as revenue. The County recognizes the Parking District as a recipient.

**ITEM 4.8 Continuation of 24/7 Safe Parking Program Operation for City-Secured Sites and Authorization of Associated Agreements, and Adoption of Resolution Extending the Declaration of a Shelter Crisis**

1. Is Lord’s Grace fully utilized per the chart on page 8 of the staff report?

The lot is still utilized for up to 4 passenger vehicles.

2. It looks like seniors is defined as people 55 years of age or older. Is that the city’s standard definition of a senior? How many people are 65 years of age or older in the safe parking lots?

The County and City use age 55 as the baseline for older adults/seniors. The age of 55+ is the starting range for many organizations senior programs and services, a snapshot of some examples are here: <https://www.mountainview.gov/depts/cs/rec/senior/age.asp>. We do not have data for over age 65.

3. Page 7 of the staff report says the majority of people living in OV’s in the safe lots are families. But, in attachment 3 it says 56% of the people living in OV’s are single adults. Can you please reconcile this seemingly conflicting information?

Staff regrets the inadvertent error. The trends are moving to a majority of senior singles and families as the next largest demographic.

4. Page 12 of the staff report says “Staff recommends that Council extend the shelter crisis declaration until June 30, 2024. This provides additional time to make progress in addressing this regional challenge and for the next County PIT homelessness count to be completed, thus providing the City with additional information regarding the level of homelessness in Mountain View and the progress of its programs and partnerships with the County and community-based organizations.” How is the declaration of a shelter crisis tied to any of the activities listed in the second sentence? Aren’t they completely separate?

The main benefit of the shelter crisis ordinance is allowing for the streamlined safe parking permit should private lot owners wish to apply, which one of the key programs/partnerships serving the homeless.

**ITEM 4.10 2020-21 Concrete Sidewalk and Curb Repairs, Project 21-06-Various Actions**

1. There are a number of locations along California Street with damaged sidewalks, particularly between Showers and Rengstorff. Are there any repairs scheduled?

Streets staff have completed a number of sidewalk repairs on both sides of California Street from Rengstorff Avenue to Pachetti Way this year. Additional repairs will be made as they are brought to staff’s attention.

**ITEM 7.1 Public Hearing for the Fiscal Year 2022-23 Recommended Budget**

1. Can the terminology be changed on page 4 of the pdf from Mountain View Citizens to Mountain View Residents?

As a point of clarification, the question is referring to page iii of the Recommended Budget, City Government Organization chart. Staff will make this update in the published Adopted Budget.

2. Is it possible to repeat row headers when a table spans multiple pages? Examples are on pdf pages 155-156, 370-371, 402-403, and more.

The headers/titles are designed for hard copy printing. Those pages are facing each other when they are printed, so the headers are shown on one side only. Staff will research the feasibility of modifying the affected pages to display the headers/titles in the PDF version of the budget document.

3. On page 1-2 it says the GBI program was over \$1.3 million. I am under the impression that it is \$1.5 million net of the recent \$100k grant. What is the cost to the city of this program?

The \$1.3 million mentioned on page 1-2 is the direct cost related to this program for year 1, which included \$1.0 million from ARPA's 1st tranche to provide \$500 in monthly income to low-income residents and \$358K to administrate the program. There is an additional \$212K for the project research partner to evaluate this pilot program, which is not included in the \$1.3 million. The total cost for Year one, net of the recent \$100K grant was \$1,480,510. For Year two, staff is recommending \$1.3 million from ARPA funding, which includes \$1.0 million for the cash payments; approximately \$160,000 for the CSA program staff; \$113,000 for a second year of research and evaluation; and \$13,165 for the fiscal payment processor, and a contingency amount of \$13,835 to address any unknown implementation needs for the pilot program.

4. What library fines still exist, as if I recall correctly, late fees no longer exist?

There is one fee left. The Lost or Damaged Materials fee is based on replacement cost.

5. How much of the ARPA funds have been spent on infrastructure, or proposed to be spent on infrastructure?

City has made no ARPA funding commitments for Citywide infrastructure in the first tranche of funding. While some funds have been allocated for City information technology equipment and cyber protection, most of the ARPA funding is focused on helping the residents and small business owners that have been negatively impacted by the pandemic. In the second tranche of funding recommended, a portion (about a quarter) of the \$1.5 million would be going towards the sewer rehabilitation and upsizing along Castro Street.

6. Why are we not using some of the ARPA funds for waste water projects rather than potentially issue debt for waste water projects?

While ARPA funds are eligible for wastewater projects, the City Council has prioritized these funds toward providing needed resources for those in the community adversely impacted by the pandemic and in need of immediate relief. The City has an aging waste water system, and the list of infrastructure needing repair or replacement continues to grow and could require a significant amount of funding that would take away from funding many of these critically needed forms of financial assistance by our residents and small businesses. The City is able to issue long-term debt for waste water projects as the need arises. As an example, in 2018 the City entered into a direct financing agreement with a private bank to raise \$10.1 million in proceeds for various wastewater infrastructure projects.

7. How much of the funds available to be spent on affordable housing (e.g., CDBG, HOME, etc.) that are not APRA funds have instead been spent on COVID relief?

The City has allocated \$3.8 million to the COVID-19 Rent Relief Program (C-19 RRP). Of that amount, \$1.5 million came from BMR funds and \$786,000 in regular CDBG funds, for a total of \$2.286 million. Other funding for the C-19 RRP include CDBG-CV1 and CV3 funds that were part of the federal CARES Act passed in May 2020 to respond to the pandemic. Note the City has provided general unrestricted funding to CSA through ARPA (which was passed by the federal government in March 2021), but that funding was not specifically directed towards the rent relief program.”

8. If projects to address sea level rise are at least \$122 million, what is the thinking behind allocating just \$3 million per year for 10 years when so much more funding is needed?

The \$3.0 million set aside per year was what Council approved to set aside from the SRPC funding balance back in 2018. Staff is working on a new 20-year Shoreline forecast and strategy for funding the revised \$122 million sea level rise liability that will be included in this forecast when it is ready for Council to review. A revised funding recommendation will be made at that time.

9. In the 5-year forecast, why does debt service increase in 2023-24?

It is assumed \$40.0 million of debt will be issued for the Public Safety Building project and annual service payments will be approximately \$3.3 million beginning FY 2023-24.

10. What is Grapevine Development proposing to do on Lot C?

Grapevine Economic Development Fund, a 501 (c)(3) nonprofit organization, was the only respondent to the City’s Notice of Availability for Lot C. In a letter of intent, Grapevine proposes to:

- Build an 8-level multifamily structure with 320 100% affordable housing units.
- Build 5,290 parking spots to replace Shoreline Amphitheater parking, support the parking spots for Google’s development and provide parking for the multifamily residential development.
- Build a vertiport on the top level of the proposed parking structure. More information about vertiports can be found here <https://archer.com/news/what-is-a-vertiport>

The City entered into a good-faith negotiation period, as prescribed by the Surplus Land Act, which ends on July 18, 2022. During the good-faith negotiation period Grapevine will need to provide information for the City to assess the financial, technical, and regulatory feasibility of their proposal.

11. It looks like Planning is discontinuing their sole existing performance/workload measure as shown on page 243 of the pdf. What is the plan for new performance measurements?

Staff is proposing a new performance measure to track the division’s workload by reporting on the number of Planning and Building Permit submittals reviewed. This new measure will be included in the next budget cycle. The recommended new Assistant CDD Director position will be overseeing the development review process and will be working on new related performance measures.

12. Adding fees to address costs associated with affordable housing loans seems like it is adding a cost to the city since the city funds a portion of affordable housing. Is this really a fee that would at least partially be paid for by the city? Wouldn't this fee also increase the cost of affordable housing?

Over the past year, staff have been developing underwriting guidelines to facilitate the administration of the City's NOFA program. The intent of these guidelines is to help streamline the NOFA submittal, application, and negotiation process by standardizing the terms for affordable housing projects that seek City funding.

In developing the guidelines, staff and the City's affordable housing consultants reviewed guidelines from other cities and public agencies that provide funding such as the County, State HCD, and the Tax Credit Allocation Committee. This review showed that public agency funders with established programs and NOFA processes typically include a suite of fees to support the administration of their programs. Finally, staff held a stakeholder process this fiscal year with non-profit developers who have done projects in the City or would like to. The process included review of the draft guidelines and potential fees. The developer input showed that they were familiar with the fees in other jurisdictions, have incorporated them in other projects, and provided comments on which fees to consider prioritizing and the fee levels without impacting development feasibility.

Based on this review, stakeholder input, the City's extensive affordable housing pipeline, and the increased need to support the asset management of current and future projects to ensure compliance and the repayment of the City's loans, nominal fees are recommended. The recommended fees comprise a very minimal percentage of a project's total cost and would partially offset the cost of providing the necessary services; the City will continue to pay for the vast majority of the costs through staff salaries and City consultants (which are primarily funded by BMR fees). Additionally, incorporating these fees into a project will more accurately reflect a project's actual cost, which would be included in tax credit and other applications to leverage more external funding.

13. How does getting fiber throughout the city work? Does the city lay the fiber? Do internet providers lay the fiber? Is there fiber in any part of the city? If so, what areas?

The city does not own or manage any fiber of its own. Residential and businesses get their fiber from Internet Service Providers (ISPs) such as Comcast and AT&T. Providers apply for an excavation permit from the city and are responsible for installing and maintaining the network. In some cases, providers may utilize "last mile" fiber providers like AT&T to reach some locations.

The fiber connecting city facilities and schools is provided by Comcast, known as "Institutional Network" (iNet), and is part of their franchise agreement with the city. They are responsible for maintaining the fiber, and the City's and School's IT Departments manage the network services that run on it.

14. What is the role and benefit of a management fellow? Why is this not a traditional employee or limited period position?

The Management Fellow position is a two-year entry level analyst position that the City fills as part of a regional Next Generation program to attract recent graduates into local government public service. During the pandemic, the City decided to extend the incumbent Fellow for a second 2-year term. As part of the program, Fellows participate in training and networking opportunities with Fellows in other agencies.

The Management Fellow is a limited period position that the City has funded since 2016. The Fellow works on a range of assignments designed to provide needed capacity for critical City programs and projects and to provide exposure to the opportunities in local government. Assignments in the past have

included developing City employee commuter benefits to encourage a reduction in single occupant vehicles and install bike fixit stations at key locations in the city; coordinating across departments to track progress on Council work plan projects; managing safe parking contracts; administering the short-term rental program; research in support of development of the Guaranteed Basic Income pilot; and supporting meetings with school district staff regarding negotiation of the Education Enhancement Reserve Joint Powers Agreement.

Although the City relies on this position to handle ongoing workload, and has funded the position for multiple years, it is used as a rotating position in order to expose more people and expand the pipeline of being recruited into City jobs. When possible, the City has been able to place outgoing Fellows into other regular City positions.

15. The Council has received correspondence from Foothill College and Mountain View Los Altos High School District about potential opportunities to partner on workforce development programs. Can staff evaluate these proposals and provide recommendations or feedback to the Council on Tuesday?

Staff has identified workforce development as an important community need that has been exacerbated by the pandemic. Accordingly, staff recommends that as part of the budget process Council allocate \$250,000 in ARPA funds to support workforce development. Staff's initial thinking is to build on existing partnerships and resources with the Library to provide support for online degrees and job training, tutoring and exam preparation. Additional ideas about new workforce development initiatives were presented by the Foothill College and Mountain View Los Altos High School Districts the day before the Council meeting, and it is not possible for staff to evaluate these ideas and provide a recommendation by this evening. If Council wishes, it can direct staff to explore these ideas and return with a recommendation at a future meeting. It is likely that any significant new initiative would need to be considered as part of the Council's biannual process, which will commence in February 2023, to develop the FY 2023-25 Council Work Plan.

16. How much would amenities like bus shelters (seating, shading, etc) cost to provide at all community shuttle stops?

There are currently 54 Community Shuttle stops. Bus shelters with benches are provided at 8 stops and another 19 stops have benches, nearly all of which are also VTA bus stops with VTA providing the amenities. VTA bases shelter and other stop amenity investments on stop utilization.

The cost of bus shelters largely depends on design, size and place. Based on information from a report recently prepared by VTA, a 13' ad shelter could cost \$20,000-30,000 and smaller shelters would cost less. This cost does not include fees for installation or any ADA remediation work that may be needed to bring the site into ADA compliance. If the site needs significant ADA work, grading for the concrete pad, etc., the total can approach \$100,000 or more. This cost estimate also assumes there is right-of-way available for the shelter, preferably behind the sidewalk so sidewalk width can be maintained. Annual maintenance costs per shelter is around \$1,000. Smaller bus stop upgrades such as benches cost less but may still require a concrete pad and right-of-way behind the sidewalk if the sidewalk is narrow.

17. Particularly given the impact of inflation, some neighborhood groups have requested additional funding for the CNC Neighborhood Grant Program. Can staff recommend a reasonable ongoing increase to accommodate the need?

Historically, many groups have not entirely expended their grants. If Council wishes to address inflation this year, staff could make a one-time 10% increase in funds available to the program, so that groups, upon spending most of their initial grant, could request an additional 10% in funds to account for inflation, upon which staff would amend the applicable grant agreement. This would amount to a maximum of \$3000 additional funding for the program, or approximately \$100-\$250 per group. Staff recommend considering the ongoing increase with the Neighborhoods committee this winter.

18. Is the permitting & land management software system recommended in the Matrix Development Review Process Assessment (recommendation #17) already funded? If not, why isn't it in this budget proposal?

Per the recommendations in the Development Review Assessment by the Matrix Consulting Group in 2021, the City will implement a Land Management system for a more efficient and cost-effective system to help the city manage and keep track of permits, leases, properties, and inspections.

The City will implement the recommendations from the assessment plan in two phases:

1. Phase 1 (in progress) – Implement a digital application review system.
  - a. This system provides an online portal for users to submit permit applications and materials, pay for permits, and monitor the status of their applications.
  - b. The application is currently being configured to support our Building Division's permits and workflows.
  - c. The Building Division is scheduled to go live with this system in October of 2022.
  - d. Following Building, the applications and workflow processes for the Planning and Land Development Divisions will be configured in the system. The live date for these Divisions is expected to be June 2023.
2. Phase 2 (Proposed) - The FY 2022-23 Recommended Budget includes a newly created position of IT Senior Analyst for Land Management Systems. This position will be responsible for collecting the requirements for the land management system, managing the RFP process, and implementing the system:
  - a. Requirements collection for the application will begin as soon as the position has been filled and is expected to be completed by the end of 2023.
  - b. The RFP evaluation and procurement process will take approximately six months, it is expected to be completed in mid-2024.
  - c. Implementation of the Land Management system will be done in phases and will take approximately two years to complete, so it is expected to be completed in mid-2026.

19. Can staff provide a list of all positions currently vacant and, if possible, when the position became vacant?

Human Resources (HR) works with departments to prioritize the recruitment workload in a way that best serves each department. The HR Department has 39 recruitments active to fill 53 current and upcoming vacancies. Most recruitments are internal and will increase much needed staff resources, however the City remains committed to growth and development. As such, 9 of the 39 recruitment processes are internal only and therefore are anticipated to result in new vacancies due to promotion. For this fiscal year we continue to exceed our performance measure of 30% of appointments filled internally and are anticipated to close the fiscal year at approximately 40%. Reviewing 2022 as a calendar year, promotions already make up over 50% of appointments.

Attached is a detailed list of current vacancies.

20. What is the status of the shopping cart abatement program? Has the City seen a material reduction in abandoned shopping carts following engagement with the business community?

Public Services and Economic Development staff began discussing coordination on outreach about the shopping cart abatement program in January and has engaged the City Attorney's office in review of the businesses' obligations under City Code. Due to current workload, staff has not yet been able to meet with businesses but plans to do so this summer.

21. When are we getting the new land management software purchased, installed and implemented?

See the answer above (#18)

22. What's happening with the permit navigator position?

One of the key recommendations of the Development Review Assessment by the Matrix Consulting Group in 2021 was the creation of a Permit Navigator to oversee the development review permit process. The City implemented a two-phased approach:

Phase 1 (completed) - Permit Navigators in each of the Planning, Building, and Public Works were appointed to act as primary liaisons for the department/divisions to:

- Resolve issues or customer complaints and promptly elevate them, if necessary to upper management (Innovation Team).
- Be the primary coordinator with the Information Technology (IT) Department to employ technological solutions as they relate to the development review process, including the land management and online permitting systems (Permit Team);
- Be the primary coordinator for development review website improvements and updates to improve the customer experience.

Phase 2 (Proposed) - The FY 2022-23 Proposed Budget includes a newly created position of Assistant Community Development Director – Permit Navigation and Special Projects. In the capacity of Lead Permit Navigator, this position will oversee the permitting process and Permit Navigation Team. The position will work collaboratively with the Permit Navigators, Permit Team, and the Innovation Team:

- Streamline the development review process to ensure a high level of customer satisfaction and meet demanding local, state and federal deadlines.
- Ensure that projects are reviewed in a consistent, timely and accurate manner.
- Ensure that customer service complaints and issues are dealt with in a timely manner.
- Coordinate with Information Technology and the Permit Team to implement technological solutions to the permitting process.

23. The Figure 2 graph depicts the results of the MissionSquare Survey. Were any Mountain View employees included in the survey? We are assuming that these reasons probably apply to MV as well. How do we know that? Are there any factors that are particularly important or some that don't apply here? For instance, we have a good benefits package, but the cost of living is very high.

Human Resources receives feedback from employees through a variety of sources including, exit interviews, conversations between employees and their managers, conversations with candidates, etc. The general themes we are hearing from employees about the reasons why they are leaving the City include: promotional opportunity or career growth, relocation, workload, lifestyle changes and/or personal reasons, higher compensation, job satisfaction, commute, etc. In addition, the recent retirement rate of City employees has signified that many workers are ready to leave the workforce, as outlined in the MissionSquare Survey.

While we don't have sufficient quantitative data to assert whether the impacts outlined in the Mission Square article are occurring in MV at the same rates, the trends outlined are present in Mountain View. We are working to mitigate these trends with increased staff to address workload, competitive compensation packages to meet employees' financial needs, commitment to COVID19 safety in the workplace to reduce worry regarding returning to work onsite, employee appreciation events to recognize employee contributions, and flexible schedules and work arrangements to provide options to employees as they balance personal and professional commitments.

Over the last couple years, the City has experienced challenges with filling some vacancies due to the low number of qualified applicants. At times recruitments have required several rounds of outreach and interviews before successfully filling the position. We continue to prioritize the City's presence on social media and have been working with professional recruiting firms to fill the more specialized positions. Based on feedback from recruiting firms, the recruitment challenges Mountain View has experienced are common at this time. One of the ways in which staff has prioritized recruitment and retention has been the compensation surveys for benchmark positions which will result in management staff's recommendation for Council consideration on June 28, 2022 of equity adjustments for positions that fell below the market average as well as a list of positions that are internally tied or aligned with those positions. The HR team has filled approximately 75 positions so far this calendar year, including promotions and remains committed meeting staffing needs.

24. How are the staff vacancies distributed throughout the departments?

DEPARTMENT	NUMBER OF VACANT POSITIONS	BUDGETED FTE	PERCENTAGE OF CITYWIDE VACANT POSITIONS	VACANT POSITIONS AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL POSITIONS IN DEPT.
City Clerk's Office	0	5	0%	0.00%
City Attorney's Office	1	9	1.19%	11.11%
City Manager's Office	3	15.25	3.57%	19.67%
Information Technology	4	22	4.76%	18.18%
Finance and Administrative Services	9	36.5	10.71%	24.66%
Human Resources	0	8.25		0.00%
Community Development	17	55	20.24%	30.91%
Public Works	16	133.5	19.05%	11.99%
Community Services	13	90.5	15.48%	14.36%
LIBRARY	4	30.75	4.76%	13.01%
FIRE	7	86.5	8.33%	8.09%
POLICE	10	144	11.90%	6.94%
<b>Total</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>636.25</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>13.20%</b>

25. What does "Self-insurance/Transfers" cover?

Self-insurance represents the General Operating Fund's (GOF) share of insurance costs such as General Liability, property and earthquake coverage that is accounted for in other City funds (known as Internal Service Funds). Transfers include movement of cash resources between the GOF and other City funds based on approved budgets. Transfers include such things as transferring 90% of the increased business license tax revenue from Measure P to the transportation and housing reserves, transferring the revenue generated from the Ameswell project to the Budget Contingency Reserve and transferring at-risk lease revenues to the Capital Improvement Reserve. Transfers also include funding resources for the annual costs of equipment replacement.

26. Is Mountain View's contribution to building the Salt Removal Facility included in the wastewater fund?

No, the Salt Removal Facility project is not funded from the wastewater fund. Recycled water costs are paid out of the water fund. When Mountain View needs to pay into the project costs, staff will propose the costs in the budget process.

VACANCY LIST AS OF 6/5/22

DEPT	JOB CODE	POSITION #	POSITION	Date Vacant	Recruitment Status
CAO	457	1	EXECUTIVE ASST. TO THE CA	4/2/2022	Recruitment in Progress
CAO	379	2	ANALYST II	2/11/2022	Recruitment in Progress
CAO	379	LP1	ANALYST II	2/11/2020	Recruitment in Progress
CAO	700	1	OFFICE ASSISTANT III	2/7/2022	Eligibility List Established
ITD	73	1	ASSISTANT IT DIRECTOR	12/23/2021	Recruitment in Progress
ITD	177	1	IT APPLICATIONS MANAGER	7/1/2021	Appointment made; Start date in July 2022
ITD	615	1	IT DESKTOP TECHNICIAN II	5/25/2022	Recruitment in Progress
ITD	615	3	IT DESKTOP TECHNICIAN II	7/1/2021	Recruitment in Progress
FASD	154	1	RISK MANAGER	12/31/2021	Recruitment in Progress
FASD	247	1	PRINCIPAL FINANCIAL ANALYST	3/11/2021	
FASD	306	2	SENIOR MANAGEMENT ANALYST	3/6/2020	Recruitment in Progress
FASD	410	2	PAYROLL ACCOUNTANT II	3/6/2022	Recruitment in Progress
FASD	590	1	DOCUMENT PROC. TECHNICIAN III	8/7/2020	
FASD	630	3	ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN	5/16/2022	
FASD	650	1	SECRETARY	1/10/2022	Recruitment in Progress
FASD	675	501	DOCUMENT PROC. TECHNICIAN II	7/29/2019	
FASD	740	1	COPY CENTER TECHNICIAN	12/31/2021	
CDD	147	1	PRINCIPAL PLANNER	12/12/2021	Eligibility List Established
CDD	196	1	DEPUTY BUILDING OFFICIAL	2/11/2020	Recruitment in Progress
CDD	256	LP1	SENIOR PLANNER	3/26/2017	Eligibility List Established
CDD	289	1	HOUSING OFFICER	4/17/2021	Appointment made; Start date in July 2022
CDD	342	5	ASSOCIATE PLANNER	1/8/2022	Eligibility List Established
CDD	342	LP1	ASSOCIATE PLANNER	3/26/2017	Eligibility List Established
CDD	357	1	BUILDING INSPECTOR II	9/5/2021	
CDD	357	3	BUILDING INSPECTOR II	4/5/2020	
CDD	379	1	ANALYST II	5/12/2022	
CDD	379	6	ANALYST II	3/6/2022	Appointment made; Start date in June 2022
CDD	467	2	ASSISTANT BUILDING INSPECTOR	11/29/2020	
CDD	580	2	PERMIT TECHNICIAN	10/17/2021	
CDD	650	1	SECRETARY	5/1/2021	Appointment made; Start date TBD
CDD	650	LP1	SECRETARY	4/30/2021	Not recommended to continue in FY23
CDD	745	1	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	12/31/2021	Eligibility List Established
CDD	745	2	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	9/5/2021	Eligibility List Established
PWD	139	1	FLEET AND FACILITIES MANAGER	7/12/2021	Recruitment in Progress
PWD	157	3	TRANSPORTATION PLANNER	12/3/2021	Recruitment in Progress
PWD	187	6	SENIOR CIVIL ENGINEER	1/15/2022	Recruitment in Progress
PWD	187	LP3	SENIOR CIVIL ENGINEER	10/17/2021	
PWD	250	18	ASSOCIATE ENGINEER (CIVIL)	3/6/2022	
PWD	306	2	SENIOR MANAGEMENT ANALYST	6/27/2021	Recruitment in Progress
PWD	359	LP1	PUBLIC WORKS INSPECTOR II	6/13/2021	
PWD	446	1	SENIOR WATER SYSTEM OPERATOR	5/1/2022	Recruitment in Progress
PWD	451	2	SR POSTCLOSURE ENV SYS TECH	3/20/2022	Recruitment in Progress
PWD	505	1	HEAVY EQUIPMENT SPECIALIST	2/5/2022	
PWD	533	1	EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT	3/6/2022	Recruitment in Progress
PWD	563	2	WASTEWATER UTILITY WKR III	3/20/2022	
PWD	585	2	HEAVY EQUIPMENT OPERATOR	6/28/2020	
PWD	657	1	STREET MAINT. WORKER II	5/1/2022	
PWD	710	1	EQUIPMENT SERVICE WORKER	8/8/2021	Recruitment in Progress
CSD	152	1	PERFORMING ARTS MANAGER	12/29/2021	Eligibility List Established
CSD	156	1	FORESTRY & ROADWAY MANAGER	11/13/2021	Recruitment in Progress

VACANCY LIST AS OF 6/5/22

CSD	474	701	VOLUNTEER COORDINATOR	7/16/2021	Reclassification Proposed in FY23
CSD	497	1	TREE TRIMMER III	3/25/2022	Recruitment in Progress
CSD	557	12	PARKS MAINT. WORKER III	12/30/2021	
CSD	613	1	TREE TRIMMER II	11/3/2021	
CSD	613	2	TREE TRIMMER II	12/23/2020	
CSD	655	2	PARKS MAINT. WORKER II	12/22/2021	Eligibility List Established; Conditional Offer Made
CSD	655	11	PARKS MAINT. WORKER II	12/31/2022	Eligibility List Established; Conditional Offer Made
CSD	655	12	PARKS MAINT. WORKER II	2/7/2022	Eligibility List Established; Conditional Offer Made
CSD	655	24	PARKS MAINTENANCE WORKER II	2/7/2022	Eligibility List Established; Conditional Offer Made
CSD	745	1	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	3/21/2020	Eligibility List Established; Conditional Offer Made
CSD	745	501	OFFICE ASSISTANT II	5/25/2022	Eligibility List Established
CSD	795	701	RECREATION LEADER II	7/31/2020	
LSD	469	2	SENIOR LIBRARIAN	3/8/2020	
LSD	507	7	LIBRARIAN II	10/3/2021	Appointment made; Start date in July 2022
LSD	507	701	LIBRARIAN II	11/25/2021	
LSD	653	2	LIBRARY ASSISTANT III	6/1/2021	Recruitment in Progress
FIRE	202	3	HAZARDOUS MAT SPEC NON SAFETY	7/1/2019	Reclassification Proposed in FY23
FIRE	353	6	FIREFIGHTER/PARAMEDIC	5/15/2022	Eligibility List Established; Conditional Offer Made
FIRE	353	10	FIREFIGHTER/PARAMEDIC	5/1/2022	Eligibility List Established; Conditional Offer Made
FIRE	353	13	FIREFIGHTER/PARAMEDIC	5/1/2022	Eligibility List Established; Conditional Offer Made
FIRE	353	16	FIREFIGHTER/PARAMEDIC	5/1/2022	Eligibility List Established; Conditional Offer Made
FIRE	353	20	FIREFIGHTER/PARAMEDIC	5/15/2022	Eligibility List Established; Conditional Offer Made
FIRE	428	2	PUBLIC EDUC/FIRE SAFETY SPEC	7/1/2019	
POLICE	64	1	DEPUTY POLICE CHIEF	12/28/2021	Reclassification Proposed in FY23
POLICE	220	15	POLICE SERGEANT	5/13/2022	Eligibility List Established
POLICE	365	5	POLICE OFFICER	2/17/2022	Recruitment in Progress
POLICE	365	40	POLICE OFFICER	4/3/2022	Recruitment in Progress
POLICE	365	44	POLICE OFFICER	3/20/2022	Recruitment in Progress
POLICE	437	7	PUBLIC SAFETY DISPATCHER II	12/26/2021	Eligibility List Established; Conditional Offer Made
POLICE	673	3	POLICE RECORDS SPECIALIST	3/5/2021	Eligibility List Established; Conditional Offer Made
POLICE	673	8	POLICE RECORDS SPECIALIST	12/19/2021	Eligibility List Established

Total Vacancy Count	81
Current Vacancies in Recruitment/Filled	53