



**E OF WOMEN VOTERS**  
**the Los Altos-Mountain View Area**

June 25, 2017

Mayor Ken Rosenberg and Members of the City Council  
City of Mountain View  
500 Castro Street  
Mountain View 94041

Re: Council Meeting - June 27th, Agenda Item 8.1 - North Bayshore Precise Plan land use and transportation topics

Dear Mayor Rosenberg and Members of the City Council:

The LWV supports actions that cope with the jobs/housing imbalance, as well as actions that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The LWV also supports affordable housing for all Californians. We believe that the North Bayshore Precise Plan (NBSPP) policies are designed to promote both of these goals.

We have long supported policies to maximize the number of housing units built in NBS, with the ultimate goal of 9,850 new housing units, in sustainable strong neighborhoods. We favor incentives to build new housing, as we expect the office square footage to continue to grow, exacerbating the existing jobs/housing imbalance.

We support high density/high FAR and also the Tier I and Tier II guidelines, with the goal of 20% affordable housing. As we have stated earlier, we urge that employees in NBS be given preference for the affordable units and recommend that units remain affordable in perpetuity, assuming such preferences are legally permissible.

We are pleased to see that the Affordable Housing Administrative Guidelines attempt to incent development of affordable housing for a range of incomes. We have consistently supported below-market rate units (BMRs) that are dispersed within residential developments as an important way to integrate affordable housing into the greater community.

However, we are concerned that only 5% of the rental units are designated for those at very-low income (VLI) levels, typically the households least served by the market. The Silicon Valley Rising comments suggest there should be further study of the demographics of the service workers in NBS, especially relating to income levels and family size. Such information would ensure that the income levels and unit sizes are appropriate for the affordable housing mix.

We also have concerns regarding the income "cushion" when tenants first qualify for affordable units. As this can inadvertently blend income ranges across levels. We think the HUD guidelines should be followed: i.e. under 50% area median income (AMI) for VLI units and 50-80% AMI for low-income (LI) units. Otherwise, VLI units may be rented to households earning between 50 and 60% AMI, households which are not VLI. We DO support a cushion after initial occupancy so that tenants are not required to leave at their annual recertification if they are slightly over-income.

Another concern is potential for imbalance of phased housing without office development triggers. Moving these developments in tandem (or going with higher caps) can achieve more balanced development & traffic flow in NBS.

Finally, we would not include the above-moderate income level, but put more emphasis on those with lower incomes. In this over-heated rental market, there appears to be a need for affordable units above 120% AMI, but in historical times, moderate-income levels (80-120% AMI) were considered equivalent to market-rate units. The NBSPP is a long-term plan; therefore we recommend at least some flexibility in terms of phasing out these above-moderate levels as part of the affordability mix.

Donna Yobs  
Co-Chair, Housing Committee  
LWV of the Los Altos/Mountain View Area

cc: Wayne Chen Martin Alkire Dan Rich Randy Tsuda