

Your Name: Devon Conley

Your Website and Social Media Presence:

<https://www.devonconley.com/>

<https://www.facebook.com/devonconleymv/>

<https://www.facebook.com/devonconleymv/>

Policy Questions

Please answer the five policy questions below.

Rent Control History and Vehicle Resident History tables are available [here](#) for your reference.

1) Rent Control

Please share your public and private positions on the rent control measures proposed or adopted in Mountain View since 2015 ([see here](#)).

Are you satisfied with current Mountain View rent control policies?

The Mountain View CSFRA was approved by voters, and voters then reaffirmed Measure V in votes against Measure W and Measure D. The basics of our rent control are settled policy, and I support it.

2) Vehicle Residents

Street parking of RVs is currently permitted on some streets following settlement of a lawsuit against the City. When the Measure C settlement ends, how would you support the residents who are currently living in the three miles which the city must allow? [RV parking ordinance history here](#).

Before the settlement ends in 2026, the city should survey RV and vehicle residents, both gathering demographic data and information about the challenges, obstacles, and needs of the current residents. Each time the city does such outreach, it is a snapshot in time, but deciding how to proceed in 2026 and how to support residents living in RVs or vehicles means getting updated information. With information directly from RV and vehicle dwelling residents, the Council can then make an informed decision about policy solutions when the settlement expires.

I would also expect the city to communicate with the school districts - both districts have staff members committed to working with and supporting our unhoused students (registered under the McKinney Vento Act), some of whom are living in vehicles or RVs.

I have seen case management approaches to supporting residents in our safe parking sites help move families into non-vehicle housing, and I would advocate now for making sure our vehicle residents have access to similar resources.

I am interested in creating a one-stop resource center for supporting our unhoused neighbors. Los Angeles County has a model where there is a one stop shop site that people can visit, and

on different days different resource providers rotate through - immigration legal support, healthcare providers, dental clinics, rental assistance, etc.

3) Safe Parking

Do we need to continue to provide Safe Parking Lots for RVs?

Would you support providing electricity access to RVs at the Shoreline lot so that there would be less need for generator or natural gas use?

Yes, we need to continue Safe Parking Lots for RVs.

I have not seen much information about the costs or intricacies of running electricity in the Shoreline Lot and would like to learn more about such a plan. My experience working with PG&E on the school board is that the timeline and costs can be harrowing, at best, and make projects very challenging to finish. From the school district side of things, I hope the district can make Internet access in the safe parking lot a reality using our MVWSD Connect.

4) Displacement

What policies do you favor to help mitigate or prevent displacement?

What balance are you looking for when it comes to redevelopment and its impact on existing residents?

I have seen students from my son's school, our friends and neighbors, move away as two story, affordable apartment buildings are redeveloped. I am very concerned that even with the displacement policies we have in place, many people will not return. I am interested in looking at ways to help displaced families find local units while redevelopment is happening - perhaps through an incentive structure for developers or apartment owners? There may be legal ramifications I am unaware of, and such a policy would need to be well researched by staff, but it may help stem some of the tide.

From a school district perspective, we've seen our unhoused student numbers shoot up since the pandemic. We had 175 unhoused students before COVID, and then 333 unhoused students in the 2022-2023 school year. I don't have final numbers for last school year, but we reached that prior number sometime in January. School districts are the only government agency I know of that is responsible for unhoused residents - children can register under the McKinney Vento Act and are guaranteed the right to attend their current school, the districts must provide transportation even if a family is in a shelter elsewhere, and case management services are provided. But schools cannot solve the housing shortage alone.

I've helped form a committee on supporting unhoused students as part of the Santa Clara County School Boards Association this year, and we are actively talking with providers, like Destination Home, and other agencies, like the County Office of Supportive Housing, to try and develop not only a standard of care for unhoused families in the shelter system, but also more strategies to help get children and families back into housing as quickly as possible.

5) Affordability of new and/or existing housing.

What are your suggestions to increase the affordability of new or existing housing?

I will increase our supply of family-friendly housing by encouraging a diversity of housing types across the affordability spectrum. For example, we need more 2-3 bedroom and stacked flats options at all price points, including BMR and ELI units. Much of the policy driving this is already enshrined in Mountain View's Housing Element, but we need to update our General Plan as soon as possible to reflect the Housing Element and pay close attention to implementation. I also support the creation of Community Land Trusts in our area.

There has been a slowdown in development recently, but hopefully projects (and financial institutions) will start moving forward on building already planned or permitted housing. I think the GateKeeper process provides an opportunity to track and study possibly innovative approaches to building housing that we haven't tried, yet.

As a trustee on the Mountain View Whisman School Board, I voted to support our workforce housing development in Mountain View and our partnership with the County of Santa Clara on a workforce housing development in Palo Alto. I think these projects provide a model for creative funding and development partnerships to get more affordable housing built.

The MVWSD staff housing site in Mountain View is the result of a creative collaboration between MVWSD, the developer, and the City. Our district has a land lease for our section of the project site and used \$88M from the Measure T Bond in 2020 to fund construction of a 144 unit building. We have 123 units dedicated to staff housing, and the City has first right of refusal on 20 units. This fall the school board will finalize our lottery system and rental rates, but our goal is to break even, not to generate a profit. More information on the project can be found at: https://www.mvwsd.org/district_business/facilities/staff_housing

The district also contributed \$50,000 to the Santa Clara County led educator housing project at 231 Grant in Palo Alto. MVWSD will have 12 units in the 110 unit development. The project on County-owned land is supported by multiple school districts and significant philanthropic dollars.