

9.0 CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW

The services that are evaluated in this service review include:

- Wastewater
- Solid Waste
- Parks and Recreation
- Storm Water Drainage
- Law Enforcement
- Library

9.1 CITY LOCATION

The City of Mountain View (City) is bounded by the City of Palo Alto on the west, the City of Los Altos on the south, the City of Sunnyvale on the east, and unincorporated areas on the north and northeast. A map showing the City's boundaries is located after Section 2.0 of this Service Review.

9.2 GOVERNANCE AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The City is a charter city operating under the Council-Manager form of government. There are seven council members elected at large, serving 4-year staggered terms. Regular Council Meetings are held at 6:30 p.m. on the second and fourth Tuesday of each month. Meetings are held in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

Citizens may examine the agenda, minutes, and staff reports at the Mountain View Library, 585 Franklin Street, beginning the Thursday evening before each meeting and at the City Clerk's Office, 500 Castro Street, Third Floor, beginning Friday morning. Agenda materials may also be viewed electronically at www.mountainview.gov. Staff reports are also available at the Council Chambers during the meeting. The Council meetings are cablecast live on Channel 26 on the City Comcast cable system and are replayed the week of the Council meeting on the following days.

- Wednesday at 6:30 p.m.
- Saturday at 11:00 a.m.

The City has several boards and commissions, as listed below, which may provide recommendations on direction to the City Council regarding specific topic areas, but they do not direct the Council:

- Library Board
- Environmental Planning Commission

- Human Relations Commission
- Parks and Recreation Commission
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- Downtown Committee
- Performing Arts Advisory Committee

The City publishes a newsletter three times per year, which is mailed to City residents. The newsletter provides information on City services, programs, facilities, and other issues of concern or interest to the community. In addition, the City's web site has comprehensive information about the City and is updated regularly.

9.3 FINANCE

The City adopts an annual budget. The budget process begins in November of each year, when City departments begin the preparation of their budget proposals for the upcoming fiscal year (FY). The proposals are submitted in late December to the Assistant City Manager and the Finance and Administrative Services Director, who review the proposals and submit recommendations to the City Manager. The City Manager then reviews the recommendations and submits recommendations to the City Council in April and May. The City Council is then able to review and discuss the recommendations and consider the budget. The revised proposed budget is presented to the City Council in early June and considered at public hearings. The budget is adopted annually prior to the beginning of each fiscal year.

The City's revenue sources are largely from property taxes, service fees, sales taxes, and other local taxes. Table 9.A provides a list of the citywide sources of funds and the citywide uses of funds for FY 2005–2006.

Table 9.A: City of Mountain View Sources and Uses of City Funds, FY 2005–2006

Sources of Total Fund Revenues	
Property tax	24%
Charges for services	25%
Sales tax	9%
Other local taxes	6%
Use of money and property	9%
Permits and licenses	4%
Intergovernmental	2%
Other revenues	1%
Interfund revenues & transfers	18%
Loan repayments	2%
Total Fund Expenditures	
Operating expenditures*	72%
Fund administration charges	5%
Capital projects	11%
Debt service	4%
Loan repayments	1%
Transfers	7%

Source: City of Mountain View 2006–2007 Adopted Budget, pages 32, 36, and 37

Note: Figures have been rounded

*Operating expenditures include: City Council, City Clerk, City Attorney, City Manager, Employee Services, Finance & Admin Services, Community Development, Public Works, Community Services, Library Services, Fire, Police, and Non-Departmental operating.

As shown in Table 9.B, the City has had revenues exceeding expenditures in the last several fiscal years.

Table 9.B: City Mountain View Summary of Revenues and Expenses for Governmental and Business Type Activities

	2003–2004 Actual	2004–2005 Actual	2005–2006 Budget
Total Revenues	\$133,958,000	\$149,332,000	\$204,932,762
Total Expenses	\$133,571,000	\$137,030,000	\$192,250,333
Net Revenues (Loss)	\$387,000	\$12,302,000	\$12,250,333

Source: Comprehensive Annual Finance Report for FY 2005; City of Mountain View 2006–2007 Adopted Budget

The 2006–2007 budget states that the City has been challenged in addressing a decline in General Fund revenues since FY 2001–2002. This revenue reduction required major reduction in expenditures, including personnel and services. In FY 2003–2004 and 2004–2005, revenues began to slowly recover; however, they did not grow enough to cover even inflationary increases in costs. Therefore, further budget reductions were necessary in FY 2005–2006. These reductions included additional position eliminations. Therefore, the City has experienced four straight years of budget and

service level reductions. During this period, 66.25 full-time equivalent positions have been eliminated, representing 10.2 percent of the City's workforce. The nonpersonnel expenditure reductions included reductions to funding for the replacement or purchase of new capital equipment and a wide variety of supply and services expenditures. All City departments have been impacted with an average reduction in excess of 15 percent. While this expenditure management strategy has kept the City financially strong, there has been an unavoidable impact of service level and quality.

The City's fiscal outlook is beginning to improve. FY 2005–2006 revenues for the General Fund were 7 percent higher than the adopted budget, and the City projects that the General Fund revenue will grow another 2 percent in 2006–2007.

Reserves

The City's reserves were restructured during the 2006–2007 budget process. The current reserves are detailed below.

The General Fund Reserve is set at 25 percent of the general operating fund budget. This reserve is used for Council-approved expenditures that have not been appropriated, unanticipated revenue shortfalls, financial emergencies, and interfund loans.

The Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) Reserve has a goal of a minimum of \$5 million. This reserve is used for funding capital projects. As of June 30, 2007, this reserve balance was estimated to be \$6,553,021.

The Strategic Property Acquisition Reserve was established to set aside funds to be used for acquiring strategic properties. As of June 30, 2007, this reserve balance was estimated to be \$7 million.

The Equipment Replacement Reserve is maintained for funding the replacement of equipment. Appropriations for this fund are requested in the annual budget. As of June 30, 2007, this reserve balance was estimated to be \$8,963,013.

As of June 30, 2007, the Wastewater Reserve balance was estimated to be \$6,140,620. This reserve is set by City policy to be maintained as follows:

- Minimum 10 percent of operating budget for emergencies
- Minimum 5 percent of operating budget for contingencies
- 10 percent of operating budget for rate stabilization
- \$1 million for capital improvements

As of June 30, 2007, the Solid Waste Reserve balance was \$2,359,379. This reserve is set by City policy to be maintained as follows:

- Minimum 10 percent of operating budget for emergencies
- Minimum 5 percent of operating budget for contingencies

- 10 percent of operating budget for rate stabilization
- Requires Financial Assurance Mechanisms

The purposes of the rate stabilization reserves are to buffer any significant changes in revenues or expenses. The use of this reserve allows gradual or incremental increases in rates to lessen the impact of rate changes.

Purchasing Policies

The City procures supplies, materials, equipment, and services through a centralized purchasing system. The City has stated that this method standardizes bidding and evaluation procedures, achieves economy of scale benefits, provides consistency in dealing with vendors, and ensures an open, fair, and competitive procurement process. The City operated according to its Standards of Purchasing Practice, which delineate methods of procurements, including informal bidding, formal bidding, and requests for proposals.

Investment Policy

The City has adopted an investment policy that states that investments will be based on the criteria of safety of investment, maintenance of sufficient liquidity to meet cash flow needs, and attainment of a total rate of return. The policy states that the City's Finance and Administrative Service Director, under direction of the City Manager, has responsibility for all decisions and activities of the City's investment program. The policy also lists the types of authorized investments that the City would utilize. Monthly investment reports are submitted to the City Council and City Manager. In addition, the City's Finance and Administrative Service Director and City Manager meet quarterly with an independent external investment advisor to review the City's portfolio, and the City's Investment Review Committee reviews the portfolio annually.

City Obligations

The City's Comprehensive Annual Finance Report for end of FY 2006 states that the City had \$119.7 million of outstanding long-term obligations related to governmental activities and \$9.9 million related to business-type activities as of June 30, 2005. It should be noted that Standard & Poors gave the City an AAA credit rating in August 2003.

Rates for Service

The City's revenue policies state that fees and charges for services will be evaluated and, if necessary, adjusted annually. It also states that the City's objective in setting fees and charges for services is to achieve a reasonable level of cost recovery for services. Several of the City's rates for services, including wastewater and solid waste rates as detailed below, have been adjusted recently.

During FY 2004–2005, the City completed a wastewater rate restructuring analysis, and a 10 percent increase was adopted for FY 2005-06. In addition, rates have been restructured (phased over 3 years) to more closely reflect the cost of providing services.

A 6 percent solid waste rate increase was adopted for FY 2005–2006, and a 2 percent rate increase was adopted in 2006–2007. The solid waste fund had a \$2.4 million reserve for FY 2005–2006. The FY 2006–2007 budget states that adopted expenditures exceed adopted revenues. However, the budget states that this imbalance is acceptable due to the balance in the fund, which was \$5.9 million (not including reserves) at the end of FY 2005–2006.

9.4 LAND USE AND PROJECTED GROWTH WITHIN THE CITY

The City is almost fully built out, with little vacant land left. As of October 2006, the City had approximately 254 acres of vacant land. The City has stated that almost half of the vacant land is in the north Bayshore area and much of this is owned by the City. The City also owns vacant land in other parts of the City and other privately owned vacant parcels are small and scattered throughout the City. New construction of these parcels is likely to blend with the surrounding areas. Because of the developed nature of the City, new development and/or growth within the City has consisted of redevelopment or intensification of land uses. The following are two examples of redevelopment within the City.

- **Industrial to residential conversions.** The City has experienced a number of redevelopment projects in which industrially zoned land is converted into residential uses. For example, a 9-acre parcel located at 505 E. Evelyn Avenue was rezoned from light industrial to multifamily residential. Approximately 40,000 square feet (sf) of industrial buildings were demolished, and a developer will be constructing 151 residential units.
- **Redevelopment at higher densities.** The City has experienced a number of projects that intensified land uses. Existing sites with low-density residential or existing apartments have been either rezoned to higher densities or demolished and rebuilt at slightly higher densities. For example, a recently approved 1-acre site at 1958 Rock Street demolished 12 apartment units and will redevelop with 19 dwelling units.

The City does not have projections regarding the amount, type, and location of any other future redevelopment other than zoning. Therefore, it is difficult to detail what potential affects redevelopment/intensification could have on existing infrastructure.

Unincorporated Pockets

There are several unincorporated pockets within the City. In September 2006, the City annexed three pockets. In addition, there are two other properties that have been identified by the City as significant and expected to be annexed in the future when development plans are approved. These areas include an area referred to as the “Pumpkin Patch” and the Army’s Shenandoah Housing area on Moffett Boulevard.

9.5 WASTEWATER

The City of Mountain View is currently providing and will continue to provide wastewater services from flows that are generated within the Moffett Field area. Please refer to Section 13.0 of this Report for a description of the wastewater services provided to Moffett Field by the City.

The City's 2005 financial audit states that the City currently has 15,053 sewer connections. The City's wastewater infrastructure includes approximately 156 miles of sewer lines, which range from 8 to 42 inches in diameter. Wastewater generated within the City flows through the collection system to a sewage lift station, where wastewater is pumped to the Regional Water Quality Control Plant in Palo Alto.

The City's current average daily flow is 9.1 million gallons per day (mgd) and the peak flow is 12 mgd. The City has a contractual share of treatment capacity of 15.1 mgd. The City's existing Sanitary Sewer Master Plan determined that the total wastewater generated through 2010 would not exceed the City's flow entitlement at the treatment plant. However, the City has stated that localized design flow deficiencies in the sewers of other facilities leading to the treatment plant may exist and would be mitigated by future development. The City is currently commencing on a Sanitary Sewer Master Plan update, which will reevaluate current and future flows

The City earmarks approximately \$1 million per year for sewer infrastructure CIPs and maintenance. Infrastructure projects are generally funded through sewer fund revenues from service rates.

Wastewater Rates

The City's wastewater rates are set as monthly fees as shown in Table 9.C. Commercial and industrial rates are dependent on the amount and type of flow.

Table 9.C: Mountain View's Monthly Wastewater Rates FY 2006-07

Residential: single-family	\$19.95
Residential: multifamily	\$19.95 per unit
Commercial and industrial	Calculated depending on use

9.6 SOLID WASTE SERVICES

Solid waste service is provided by the City via contract with the Foothill Disposal Company. The solid waste that is collected within the City is processed at the SMART station in Sunnyvale. The City has stated that all of the waste processed at the SMART station is taken to the Kirby Canyon Recycling and Disposal Facility. Per the CIWMB, solid waste from the City is disposed of in the landfills listed below. Detail regarding these facilities can be found in Appendix A.

- Altamont Landfill Resource and Recovery Facility
- Arvin Sanitary Landfill

- Guadalupe Sanitary Landfill
- Kirby Canyon Recycling and Disposal Facility
- Newby Island Sanitary Landfill
- Ox Mountain Sanitary Landfill
- Redwood Sanitary Landfill
- Vasco Road Sanitary Landfill
- West Contra Costa Landfill
- Zanker Material Processing Facility
- Zanker Road Class III Landfill

According to the most recent information posted by the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), the City disposed of 53,859 tons of solid waste in 2005.¹ CIWMB shows that the solid waste disposal generation factor for the City is 1 pound per resident per day and 2.7 pounds per employee per day.

Diversion rates are defined as the percentage of total solid waste that a jurisdiction diverted from being disposed in landfills through reduction, reuse, recycling programs, and composting programs. The California Public Resources Code (PRC 41780) required all jurisdictions to achieve 50 percent solid waste diversion after 2000. Per the CIWMB, the City exceeded this goal and had a 74 percent diversion rate in 2005, which is the most recent data posted.

The City is a participant in a cooperative agreement with the Cities of Palo Alto and Sunnyvale for the operation and use of the SMART Station, which is a materials recovery and refuse transfer facility that is located in Sunnyvale. The Station processes solid waste, including recyclables and yard trimmings, prior to transfer to the landfills.

The City has varying rates for residential solid waste services, which are dependent on the size of the trash tote (e.g., 20-, 32-, 64-, or 96-gallon). Commercial rates are based on the larger refuse bin size and by number of pickups per week. The City adopted a 6 percent solid waste rate increase for FY 2005–2006 and a 2 percent rate increase for 2006–2007. Table 9.D provides a comparison of City solid waste service rates.

¹ Web site:
<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles/Juris/JurProfile2.asp?RG=C&JURID=328&JUR=Mountain+View>, accessed March 20, 2007.

Table 9.D: City of Mountain View Monthly Solid Waste Rates, FY 2006-07

Residential	32-gallon can, \$15.30
Commercial	\$15.30–\$1,664.00, depending on size of bin and number of pickups per week

Source: City of Mountain View Web site:
http://www.ci.mtnview.ca.us/city_hall/admin_services/utility_billing/trash_rates.asp, accessed 09/18/06

9.7 PARKS AND RECREATION

The City owns and maintains numerous park and recreational facilities, as listed in Table 9.E.

Table 9.E: City of Mountain View Parks and Recreational Facilities (City Owned)

Park and Location	Amenities	Acreage
Bubb Park Barbara Avenue & Montalto Drive	Basketball court, children’s playground, soccer/football field, horseshoe area, passive areas, picnic area, softball field, and outdoor volleyball court	3.45
Charleston Park Charleston Road	Passive areas and restrooms	5.00
Chetwood Park Chetwood Drive & Whisman Station Drive	Children’s playground, passive areas, and a picnic area	0.90
Community Center Rengstorff Avenue & Central Expressway	Auditorium, meeting room, and restrooms	N/A
Cooper Park Chesley Avenue & Yorkton Drive	Basketball court, children’s playground, soccer/football field, passive areas, picnic area, softball field, tennis courts, and restrooms	5.20
Creekside Park Easy Street & Gladys Avenue	Children’s playground, passive areas, and trail access	0.80
Cuesta Park 615 Cuesta Drive	BBQ facilities, bocce ball court, children’s playground, horseshoe area, passive areas, picnic areas, tennis courts, volleyball court, and rest rooms; host to Summer Sounds concert series	41.80
Dana Park Dana Street & Oak Street	Passive areas	0.25
Devonshire Park	Children’s playground, passive areas, picnic area	0.86
Dog Park Northeast corner of Shoreline Blvd. and North Road	Drinking fountains, shade structure, animal waste bags and dispensers, trash receptacles, a bulletin board, a disabled-accessible portable restroom, and benches	1.00
Eagle Park & Pool 652 Franklin Street	Children’s playground, picnic area, swimming pool, and restrooms	7.50
Fairmont Park Fairmont Avenue & Bush Street	Children’s playground, passive areas, and a picnic area	0.34
Gemello Park Marich Way & Solana Court	Children’s playground, passive areas, and a picnic area	0.50
Jackson Park Jackson Street & Stierlin Road	Children’s playground, passive areas, and a picnic area	0.84
Klein Park Ortega Avenue & California Street	Basketball court, children’s playground, passive areas, and a picnic area	1.25
Landels Park	Basketball court, children’s playground, soccer/football field, passive	3.27

Park and Location	Amenities	Acreage
Dana Street & Calderon Avenue	areas, picnic area, softball field, outdoor volleyball court, and trail access	
Magnolia Park Magnolia Lane & Whisman Station Drive	Children's playground, passive areas, and a picnic area	1.10
McKelvey Park Miramonte Avenue & Park Drive	Baseball field, softball field, and restrooms	5.01
Pioneer Park 1146 Church Street	Passive areas	3.50
Rengstorff Park & Pool 201 South Rengstorff Avenue	BBQ facilities, baseball field, basketball court, skate park, children's playground, passive areas, picnic area, softball field, swimming pool, tennis courts, outdoor volleyball court, and restrooms	27.30
San Veron Park San Veron Avenue & Middlefield Road	Basketball court, children's playground, passive areas, picnic area, and outdoor volleyball court	2.08
Senior Center Escuela Avenue & Villa Street	Auditorium, meeting room, shuffle board, and restrooms	N/A
Shoreline at Mountain View 3070 North Shoreline Boulevard	Nature preserve, environmental education, passive areas, picnic area, trail access, and restrooms	753.00
Sierra Vista Park	Children's playground, passive areas, and a picnic area. In construction to be completed 2008	0.80
Skate Park 201 South Rengstorff Avenue	Skate Park	N/A
Sports Pavilion Castro Street & Miramonte Avenue	Basketball court, gymnasium, and restrooms	1.45
Stevenson Park San Luis Avenue & San Pierre Way	Basketball court, children's playground, soccer/football field, passive areas, picnic area, softball field, tennis courts, and restrooms	1.20
Sylvan Park Sylvan Avenue & DeVoto Street	BBQ facilities, children's playground, horseshoe area, passive areas, picnic area, tennis courts, and restrooms	9.00
Thaddeus Park Middlefield Road & Independence Drive	Children's playground, passive areas, and a picnic area	0.68
Varsity Park Duke Way & Jefferson Drive	Basketball court, children's playground, passive areas, and a picnic area	0.45
Whisman Park Easy Street & Middlefield Road	BBQ facilities, basketball court, children's playground, soccer/football field, passive areas, picnic area, softball field, tennis courts, outdoor volleyball court, trail access, and restrooms	2.20
Total Acreage		880.73

Source: www.ci.mtnview.ca.us; City of Mountain View Parks and Open Space Plan, 2001; City of Mountain View Parks and Recreation

The City's Parks and Open Space Plan states that the City has adopted a standard of 3 acres of open space per 1,000 residents. Based on the State Department of Finance 2006 population estimate for the City (71,995), the City is currently providing 12.23 acres of parkland per 1,000 population, which is well above the City's standard.

The Parks and Open Space Plan notes that school sites are an important part of the City's park system. Within the City, school sites provide large areas needed for athletic activities such as baseball, softball, and soccer. The City's General Plan states that the City has 14 public school sites with approximately 150 acres of open space. The City has a long-standing policy of developing cooperative agreements with school districts to allow use of school open space as neighborhood parks (e.g. Castro school/park, Huff school/park, Monta Loma school/park). The City has also provided maintenance and helped to fund many of the school recreational amenities (e.g. Graham Sports Complex). Currently, the City co-owns the Mountain View Sports Pavilion and Whisman Sports Center with the school district and owns a portion of the land on the following school sites:

- Whisman School/Park
- Stevenson/Theuerkauf School/Park
- Landels School/Park
- Bubb School/Park
- Graham School/Park
- Cooper School/Park

It should be noted that generally the ability of the City to ensure that the open space areas owned by school districts remain available is somewhat limited, as schools have final jurisdiction over placement of portables and other needs that may encroach into open space.

New residential projects are required by the City's Park Land Dedication Ordinance to dedicate park land in the amount of 3 acres per 1,000 residents. Since it is not feasible for many smaller residential projects to dedicate land, an equivalent fee is collected instead. The land dedicated, fees collected, or combination of both, are then used for the purchase, development, rehabilitation, and/or improvement of park and recreational facilities. The City's Parks and Recreation Commission reviews the fees and annually recommends to the City Council the park and open space projects to which the fees should be applied.

The City's General Plan notes another cost-effective method utilized to acquire park land. The Education Code Section 39390, the Naylor Act, allows cities to buy a portion of the open space areas of school district property at 25 percent of the market value. The City has stated that it would utilize this tool to purchase lands if school district properties are no longer needed.

Recreation

The City offers a wide variety of recreation classes and activities for residents of all ages. The types of classes provided by the City are listed in Table 9.F.

Table 9.F: Types of Recreation Programs Offered by the City of Mountain View

Art	Dance/Cheerleading	Gymnastics
First aid	Preschool	Sports
Baby and toddler programs	Teen activities	Holiday activities
Senior programs	After school programs	Gardening/landscaping
Cooking	Aquatics	Ice skating
Cultural Arts	Environmental Education	

Source: City of Mountain View Fall 2006 Recreation Guide

9.8 STORM WATER DRAINAGE

The City’s storm drainage system consists of a combination of underground piping network, cross culverts, drywells, detention ponds, and five pump stations. In areas south of Highway 101, the underground piping systems collect storm water via inlets and discharges into Stevens Creek, Permanente Diversion Channel, Permanente Creek, Hale Creek, and Adobe Creek, which drain to the San Francisco Bay. In this area of the City, five drywells are used to receive surface runoff and let the runoff percolate underground. These drywells are located where unimproved streets, which do not meet the City’s minimum storm drainage standards, were annexed from the County. The City has stated that these drywells will eventually be eliminated and replaced with a standard storm drain system when the streets are improved by either the City (through formation of an assessment district) or by a developer as a condition of approval. In the North Bayshore Area, the piping networks carry the storm water to Charleston Storm Drainage Detention Pond and Pump Station, the Coast Casey Detention Basin and Pump Station, High Level Road Ditch and Pumps, Crittenden Pump Station, and Amphitheatre Pump Station for final discharge to Stevens Creek, Permanente Creek, and the San Francisco Bay.

The City’s 2005 Storm Drainage Master Plan states that the City has experienced localized ponding in various areas. Most of this flooding has occurred in the “Old Mountain View” area bounded by Mariposa Avenue, Calderon Avenue, El Camino Real, and Central Expressway. It has been noted by the City that this flooding is mainly the result of inadequate storm drainage cross culverts at various intersections. Additionally, there are areas that are known to flood by City maintenance experience but are not recorded, such as Gilmore and Todd, Marilyn Drive and Cuesta Drive, Marich at Karen, and Landels School. Many of these problems are the result of small mains, small grates, and nonhooded inlets. The City has stated that these are being systematically and continually being replaced and upgraded with larger sized storm drain mains and standard hooded inlets.

Even though areas of minor flooding exist, the Storm Drainage Master Plan concludes that the City’s storm drain systems are performing adequately, and that these are minor isolated deficiencies that do not require urgent improvement projects. The Master Plan includes recommended improvements that would address these deficiencies before they become major problems in addition to maintaining the system and replacing facilities that do not meet current standards. Implementing these recommendations commences after technical engineering studies determine that the improvements will be needed by a designated time and the establishment of a capital improvement budget for the project. The Master Plan also notes that the City has a history of actively addressing storm drainage problems. Over the past 10 years the City has implemented 16 major storm drain improvement

projects. Beginning in 1994 and continuing through 2004 the City has completed one to two projects almost every year.

The Master Plan concludes that under current land use conditions and with completion of capital improvements to eliminate the deficiencies found in the system, the City's storm drainage system should be able to accommodate the projected growth to build out and develop all vacant parcels. It should be noted that the City imposes storm water impact fees on new development.

9.9 LAW ENFORCEMENT

The Mountain View Police Department (department) is located at 1000 Villa Street. The facility is shared between the City's police and fire departments. The facility was developed in 1980 and consists of approximately 44,000 sf.

The City's department consists of four divisions, which are detailed below.

- The Administration Division is responsible for providing support activities necessary for the efficient and effective operation of the department, including professional standards, citizens police academy, crime prevention, personnel and training, crime analysis unit, and the volunteer program.
- The Field Operations Division is responsible for providing all uniform police services to the community. Its primary function includes responding to criminal activity and calls for service in an effective and timely manner and providing crime suppression and prevention activities. Within this division reside Patrol, Traffic Safety, Special Operations, and School Resource Officers.
- The Investigation Unit is responsible for conducting follow-up investigations, tracking criminal trends and events, ensuring criminal prosecution, and prevention of future crimes. This unit includes the general crimes unit, high technology unit, and domestic violence victim advocacy program.
- The Support Services Division is comprised of (1) Emergency Communications, which answers all 911 and nonemergency calls for public safety; (2) Public Safety Systems, which manages the City's radio systems, public safety computer systems, and fleet maintenance; (3) Records, which is responsible for record-keeping activities; (4) Property and evidence; and (5) Management and fiscal services, which coordinates the department facility, grants, financial issues, as well as many other management tasks.

As mentioned, the City operates an emergency communications center, which provides 24-hour answering of all emergency and nonemergency police, fire, and medical aid calls. The emergency communications center is also under contract to provide dispatch services for the Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space District. The center has a direct link with a State-funded 911 program that provides emergency translation in more than 140 languages and dialects. The center utilizes radio communication, mobile computers, Computer-Aided Dispatch, and a records management system to provide fast and effective emergency communication services. The department has a performance target to answer 95 percent of incoming 911 calls within 9 seconds of receipt. The department reported a 97.5 percent actual rate and is exceeding that goal.

The department is a participant in several regional task forces with other law enforcement agencies. These include:

- A Critical Incident Operations Group, which consists of the SWAT team, Crisis Negotiations Team, and patrol of first responders. This Group has a partnership with the Palo Alto Police Department
- The Santa Clara County Special Enforcement Team, which is a narcotics enforcement task force with six participating cities and two participating State agencies
- A high technology crime and identity theft task force
- A regional auto theft task force

The department currently employs 97 sworn officers and 53 staff members. There are also three canine teams. The City has no adopted standard related to the ratio of officers to population; however, to provide an indication of service level, based on the State Department of Finance 2006 population estimate (71,995), the City is currently providing 1.35 officers per 1,000 population. This ratio is slightly above the common standard of 1 officer per 1,000 population.

The 2005 department Annual Report states that in 2005 there were 76,803 calls for service. The City’s General Plan states that the City should maintain a police force sufficiently staffed and deployed to sustain a 4-minute maximum emergency response time 70 percent of the time. In the 2006–2007 performance measures, the department reported responding in 4 minutes or less on all emergency calls for service 51.83 percent of the time. Therefore, for FY 2006–2007, the department is falling below the General Plan policy goal. However, Table 9.G indicates that the City had exceeded this goal in the third quarter of 2006.

Table 9.G: City of Mountain View Law Enforcement Service Calls and Response Times for the Third Quarter of 2006

Priority	Number of Calls	Average Response Time (Minutes)
Emergency	44	3:55
1	776	4:37
2	2,735	9:43
3	1,189	21:19

Source: City of Mountain View, October 2006

The existing police/fire facility has deficiencies, as detailed in the 2006–2007 CIP. Due to growth of the departments, the existing building is not large enough to accommodate the police and fire staff needed to serve the City. In 2002 the City prepared a space needs study for the facility, which determined that an additional 10,000 sf were needed immediately and projected a space shortage of 16,000 sf by 2020. In addition, the building needs refurbishment due to age and needs upgrades to meet current ADA requirements. The City’s 2006–2007 CIP includes three projects that would resolve some of the more significant deterioration issues and funds studies to confirm the structural integrity of the building and analyze potential space solutions. The City’s strategy is to resolve the

issues cost-effectively, while avoiding making significant improvements that would be changed when a larger project is undertaken to resolve the long-term space need.

Law enforcement programs are continually being reviewed, and resources are placed where needed. Work studies and audits are conducted routinely and as deemed necessary by the Police Chief. There are no current plans for additional programs. It should be noted that in 2005 volunteers donated 5,244 hours. This allows some additional services to be provided in a cost-effective manner. The department's 2005 Annual Report estimates this time to be worth \$121,009.

9.10 LIBRARY

The City provides library services within the community. The City's library is located at 585 Franklin Street and is 60,000 sf in size. As of June 30, 2006, the library had 300,624 items in its collection and circulated 1.45 million items in FY 2005–2006. Within this circulation, 550,508 children's items were borrowed and 8,980 items were borrowed from other libraries through a cooperative agreement.

The library does not have any adopted service standards but states that it does regularly compare its services with other California libraries of similar size. To provide an indication of service level, based on the State Department of Finance 2006 population estimate (71,995), the City is currently providing 4.18 volumes and 0.83 sf per resident.

The library recently completed a space study of the existing facility. The study evaluated operating and capacity challenges and recommended improvements to maximize efficiency in the existing space. The space reallocation is included in the 2006–2007 CIP and would alleviate congestion in high demand areas, provide additional seating, and introduce a new group study room. In addition, the City has identified future improvements, which are larger in scale and would be evaluated further.

The City funds capital projects for the library out of the City's CIP funds. The City has stated that there are revenue constraints that affect the level of service of the library. These include a variety of unmet needs due to reduced funding (children's programs, service to schools, literacy) and limited outreach (mobile library) services.

The library has arrangements with other organizations for sharing resources. For example, the Library belongs to the Silicon Valley Library System and participates in reciprocal borrowing and resource sharing with other libraries locally and throughout the state, and the library receives better pricing on goods and services by participating in cooperative purchase agreements.

The library has a Board of Trustees, which is a five-member volunteer board that advises the City Council and staff on Library matters. The Board is selected by the City Council from the general citizenry. Members are appointed for a maximum of two 4-year terms. The Library Board meets on the third Monday of each month at 7:30 p.m. in the Library Community Room. The agenda for each meeting is posted on the Friday before each meeting at the library and at the City Clerk's Office on Monday morning.

9.11 SERVICE REVIEW DETERMINATIONS FOR THE CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW

The service review guidelines prepared by the State Office of Planning and Research recommend that issues relevant to the jurisdiction be addressed through written determinations called for in the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 1985 (CKH Act). Based on the above information, following are the written determinations for the City.

Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies

1. The City has stated that localized sewer system capacity deficiencies may exist. The City is commencing on a Sanitary Sewer Master Plan that will evaluate capacity and make infrastructure recommendations.
2. The City's 2005 Storm Drainage Master Plan states that the City has experienced localized ponding in various areas, which is the result of inadequate capacity of the existing infrastructure. The Storm Drainage Master Plan concludes that these are minor isolated deficiencies that do not require urgent improvement projects.
3. The Storm Drainage Master Plan states that with completion of capital improvements to eliminate the capacity deficiencies found in the system, the City's storm drainage system should be able to accommodate the City's projected growth.
4. The existing police/fire facility is not large enough to accommodate the staff needed to serve the City. In addition, the building needs refurbishment due to age and needs upgrades to meet current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. The City's CIP includes projects that would resolve some of the more significant deterioration issues and funds studies regarding future upgrades.
5. The library has operating and capacity challenges. A space reallocation plan is included in the City's CIP to address some space needs and to improve operating efficiencies. Additional space needs, most notably in the Children's Area, will be addressed at a later time.

Growth and Population

1. The City is almost fully built out, with little vacant land left. Because of the developed nature of the City, new development and/or growth within the City has been and will continue to consist of redevelopment or intensification of land uses.

Financing Constraints and Opportunities

1. The 2006–2007 budget states that the City has been challenged by a decline in revenues since FY 2001–2002. This revenue reduction required major reductions in expenditures, including personnel and services. While this strategy has kept the City financially strong, there has been an unavoidable impact of service level and quality.
2. The City's fiscal outlook is beginning to improve. FY 2005–2006 revenues for the General Fund were 7 percent higher than the adopted budget, and the City projects that the General Fund revenue will grow another 2 percent in 2006–2007.

3. Land dedicated and fees collected through the City's Park Land Dedication Ordinance are used to purchase, develop, rehabilitate, and/or improve park and recreational facilities.
4. The City has stated that there are revenue constraints that affect the level of service of the library.

Cost-Avoidance Opportunities

1. The City has adopted purchasing policies and procedures in an effort to control costs and provide for efficiency and accountability.
2. The City has several cooperative arrangements with other agencies that provide services at a reduced cost.
3. The City has stated that it would utilize the Naylor Act, which allows cities to buy open space areas of school district property at 25 percent of the market value to provide additional parkland at a reduced cost.
4. In 2005, volunteers donated 5,244 hours to the police department. The department 2005 Annual Report estimates this time to be worth \$121,009. This allows some additional law enforcement services to be provided in a cost effective manner.

Opportunities for Rate Restructuring

1. The City has established rate stabilization reserves in order to allow gradual or incremental increases in rates to lessen the impact of rate changes.
2. The City's revenue policies state that fees and charges for services will be evaluated and, if necessary, adjusted annually. It also states that the City's objective in setting fees and charges for services is to achieve a reasonable level of cost recovery for services.

Opportunities for Shared Facilities

1. The City has several cooperative agreements with other agencies that provide for service provision in a cost-effective manner. This includes the wastewater treatment plant, SMART Station, library services, park and recreational facilities, and law enforcement regional task forces.
2. The police department shares a facility with the City's Fire Department.

Government Structure Options

1. LAFCO has identified several unincorporated areas within the City's USA. In September 2006, the City annexed three unincorporated pockets. In addition, there are two other properties that have been identified by the City as significant and expected to be annexed in the future when development plans are approved. In order to implement more efficient planning boundaries and take advantage of the current streamlined annexation opportunity, the City should commence annexing the remaining unincorporated pocket areas.

Evaluation of Management Efficiencies

1. The City's cooperative projects with other agencies provide management efficiencies in the provision of services.

Local Accountability and Governance

1. The City ensures that local accountability and governance standards are met by holding City meetings pursuant to the Brown Act and having them available for download on the City's Web site.

9.12 SOI RECOMMENDATION FOR THE CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW

Current SOI Boundary

The City's existing SOI boundary, which was adopted in September 1984, is coterminous with the City limits to the east, south, and west. The northern portion of the City's SOI boundary includes unincorporated areas and extends 2 miles into the San Francisco Bay and also includes approximately half of Moffett Field. The City of Mountain View is substantially bounded by the City of Sunnyvale to the east; by the City of Los Altos to the south; and by the City of Palo Alto to the west. Since 1984, Mountain View's SOI boundary has remained significantly unchanged.

SOI Boundary Recommendation

As the existing Mountain View SOI is substantially coterminous with the City limits and almost fully bounded by other cities, very little outward expansion is possible. Therefore, it is recommended that LAFCO reaffirm the existing SOI for the City of Mountain View.

9.13 SOI DETERMINATIONS FOR THE CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW

As detailed in Section 1.1, Government Code Section 56425 requires written determinations with respect to the following four factors to update an agency's SOI. Based on the information above, the following determinations are provided to update the City's existing SOI.

1. The Present and Planned Land Uses in the Area, including Agricultural and Open-Space Lands

The Mountain View SOI is substantially coterminous with the boundaries of the City; therefore most of the land within the SOI is within the City. The City is almost fully built out, with only 254 acres of vacant land left. The City indicated that almost half of the vacant land is in the north Bayshore area, and that the City owns much of this land. Other vacant parcels are small and scattered throughout the City. The City includes a mix of land uses. Planned land uses in the City are not expected to change.

Finding: The Mountain View SOI is substantially coterminous with the boundaries of the City. Planned land uses in the City are consistent with existing land uses.

2. Present and Probable Need for Public Facilities and Services in the Area

The City is expected to experience modest growth mostly through in-fill development and redevelopment of underdeveloped parcels. The need for a full range of public facilities and services is expected to grow modestly in the future.

Finding: The type of public services and public facilities required in the proposed Mountain View SOI boundary will not change, although the level of demand will increase modestly.

3. Present Capacity of Public Facilities and Adequacy of Public Services that the Agency Provides or is Authorized to Provide

The properties within the City receive a full range of public services from the City. For the most part, the present capacity of public facilities appears to be adequate in general. However, some specific inadequacies were identified including: (1) sewer system capacity improvements may be needed in some areas of the City pending completion of a master planning process; (2) storm water drainage infrastructure upgrades and capacity improvements are needed in localized areas; and (3) the City Police Department facility is overcrowded and inadequate. The City is currently working to resolve these issues through studies and engineering projects.

Finding: The present capacity of public facilities and public services is generally adequate. However, some areas of the City may need sewer infrastructure improvements, the City's storm water drainage facilities are deficient in localized areas, and improvements to City police facilities are needed. The City is currently working to resolve these issues.

4. Existence of Any Social or Economic Communities of Interest in the Area if the Commission Determines that they are Relevant to the Agency

The City's SOI is substantially coterminous with the City limits and USA boundary, which is almost fully bounded by other cities, with the exception of the northern portion of the City's SOI boundary which includes unincorporated areas open space lands, extends 2 miles into the San Francisco Bay, and also includes approximately half of Moffett Field.

The City's USA boundary also contains some unincorporated pocket areas that are developed or slated to be developed with urban land uses. The Joint Urban Development Policies of the cities, the County, and LAFCO call for islands or pockets of unincorporated land to be annexed to the applicable city. The City has indicated that some of these areas are expected to be annexed in the future when development plans are approved.

Finding: There exist social and economic conditions that cause interaction and interdependence between the City of Mountain View and the areas within the City's SOI boundary.