<u>Public Comments - July 10, 2025</u>

Aarthi Rajiv via mvwsd.org

Jul 9, 2025, 4:07 PM

Hello Trustees, Supt. Baier,

Please return this school district to the business of education and not real estate. Noble-though its origins were, the opposition to this is mounting so please atleast pause and reconsider.

Thank you.

Aarthi Rajiv (parent to 5th and 8th graders)

Vish Shastry via mvwsd.org

Jul 9, 2025, 4:07 PM

Hello -

I'm a parent to a rising 5th grader at Imai. My wife and I are active at the school; she's a past president of the Imai PTA and we regularly volunteer / donate to both the Imai & Graham PTAs (we had two children at Graham previously who are now at MVHS) and MVEF.

With regards to the resolution in the subject line, I would like district staff and the Trustees to provide more detail on the following before approving the purchase of real estate:

- What are the specifics behind the $29m that will be funded from Facilities & Capital Outlay funds - were they already earmarked for this parcel / low cost housing subsidies, and if not then what were they previously allocated towards? For Measure T projects that will be paused - which projects specifically will be paused, and when will they be resumed?

- Given that staff recommends taking on an instrument similar to a loan - shouldn't the Trustees and the public have much more information on these instruments? Who is financing the COPs? What's the term length on the COPs? What interest rate will be paid, and given the term what's the total interest and total principal? How does this compare to the purported $380m in costs referenced in the "Challenges" slide? What is the detail behind the $380m number, and how does this compare to the costs involved with paying the COPs as well as delayed investments from both the Facilities & Capital Outlay funds as well as delayed Measure T projects?

- Why is a new non-profit entity being established to oversee the residences? Wouldn't this decrease public & Trustee visibility and accountability for the project? The project already seems to be mismanaged given the lack of occupancy and the poorly negotiated $1.9m annual cost increases.

- Given only 51 of 144 units are occupied - what will keep this project from continuing to be a monetary investment that takes money away from teacher salaries and school / student investment? Will increasing the BMR threshold actually increase occupancy (Staff only stated it would increase the eligibility)

- Has any survey data or other research shown that district teachers / staff value subsidized housing more than taking the money for the project and moving it towards increased teacher salaries instead?

Without these questions being publicly addressed and discussed by the Trustees, I would like to note my objection to the Resolution. Thank you for your time and consideration of the questions above.

Best regards,
Vish Shastry

Lily Hendra via mvwsd.org
Jul 10, 2025, 7:08 AM

Dear Supt. Baier, MVWSD board members:

I would like to share my **grave concerns** regarding the plan to purchase land for the staff housing in the amount of $53M.

I am going to lay my case here in the hopes that you would understand how this entire project that was touted as "private-public partnership between Miramar Capital (a.k.a Mountain View Owner) and MVWSD" has really been a propaganda at best.

Back in the beginning of 2025, I submitted a CPRA request for all communications between Ayinde Rudolph and Miramar Capital / MVO from 2018. I received the result at the end of March, and the result, especially communications from the early years of the project (2018 and 2019) was quite revealing.

I trust that you all have access to the full result so I will not bother to share those thousands of pages with you, but there are 2 particular emails from Perry Hariri, the managing partner of Miramar Capital in the bay area that I would like to point out and am sharing here:

- Perry Hariri's email from 9/1/2018: "*Also illustrates how much we are actually subsidizing the District housing units.... we paid $14.5M/ac for the land 3 years ago for 777 and recent land transactions in Mt. View by others and ourselves have ranged bw $13M-S17M per acre*".

  Just FYI, a quick internet search right now shows two properties of just over 1.4 acres in Mountain View on the market for 12.9M and 20M, respectively, which is not more than $14M/acre in today's money. What this is saying is that **even with inflation**, land price in Mountain View has NOT really gone up all that much since Miramar purchased that section of the land back in 2015. If at all, Miramar Capital made a bad purchase back in 2015 and overpaid for the land. Plain and simple.

- Perry Hariri's email from 9/17/2018: "*The ground lease is essentially a mechanism for Miramar to try to recoup, over a long period of time, some of the $30MM+ in development costs we are absorbing in the market rate costs for the affordable development, in addition to the $30MM land contribution we are making.*"

In addition to Hariri going on record about the original land purchase price and his whole intention for the land lease (i.e. passing down the cost to MVWSD), I would like to remind you all that, thanks to the MVWSD staff housing that is perpetually designated for affordable housing, Miramar/MVO will completely owns ONLY the market rental portion of the complex, should the district move with the decision to purchase the land.

In other words, **there is no subsidy for the district's staff housing by Miramar / MVO**. They instead have found a loophole in the city's affordable housing ordinance. This is corruption, plain and simple - They skirted the law, and are getting away with it!

This is not something that taxpayers were promised. The staff housing project was initially budgeted to NOT EXCEED $56M, which turned into $89M, which now is turning into >$140M. On top of that, you will also be cancelling other Measure T projects, which some are sorely sorely needed by our schools. **This is such a tragedy!** And our children are paying the price!

@Board members: all of you when sworn in, pledged to uphold the U.S. and California Constitutions, to faithfully discharge your duties and respect taxpayer interests. You also were supposed to represent all stakeholders and avoid personal advantage.

I am urging you all to **cancel this decision** and do not let the developer get away with this scheme. Make them put money where their mouth is!

Thank you,
/Lily Hendra
Taxpayer, voter, MVWSD parent

Christopher Chiang via mvwsd.org
Jul 10, 2025, 11:59 AM

Dear Honorable Board of Trustees and the MVWSD Community,

Please do not tonight repeat the three critical mistakes made when the teacher/staff housing project was originally approved and expanded:

1) Relying solely on staff recommendations without community or independent analysis.
As a former trustee, I shared your trust in staff assurances that this project would not affect student finances. That proved false. General fund revenue has gone to cover startup costs, and student-facing bond projects have been canceled to fund this housing.

2) Failing to estimate and publicly vet projected rents.
For years, the public assumed the housing would be affordable. Yet projected rents exceed what many teachers currently pay on the open market—even though this could have been calculated from the start (lease+operating costs ÷ units = rent). Had our board seen these numbers, we would have raised the alarm.

Now you're being asked to approve another $53 million based on staff's claim that future rent will cover the COP loan. Before voting, demand a clear, public estimate of future rent per unit (COP+operating costs ÷ units = rent).

And do not overlook that this includes using Measure T funds as a "down payment." Staff analyses likely only show COP break-even—ignoring the upfront bond dollars that could have gone directly to students. This is like a car dealer advertising a low monthly payment after requiring a large, hidden down payment.

3) Rushing the vote.
Even if you support the plan, please delay the vote. Discuss it tonight, take a straw poll, and schedule action for the next meeting. This is a special meeting announced only 24 hours ago, with public comment now limited to in-person participation. There is no justifiable reason for denying Zoom comments or fast-tracking a $53 million vote without full community input.

I say this as someone who strongly supports using school land for break-even workforce housing. But this project is now too expensive for the very teachers it was meant to serve. I urge you to stop further district investment, transfer the project to a qualified affordable housing provider, and treat Measure T's past housing costs as sunk costs, and as a community housing initiative—not an education one.

Let an affordable housing agency take it forward and let them pursue a COP/loan. This way, we preserve the 80% AMI units for staff and shift our focus back to students—who still have no new science labs, art/makerspaces, middle school teaching kitchens, or upgraded theater AV systems, more classrooms, despite the Measure T bond promising just that. The Measure T Ballot never even mentions teacher/staff housing. It's only in the fine print and campaign materials.

It's not equitable or justifiable to continue subsidizing housing for a small number of staff when those same funds could benefit all students or all MVWSD employees.

Sincerely,
Chris Chiang
Former MVWSD School Board Member

Measure T Ballot Language:
https://ballotpedia.org/Mountain_View_Whisman_School_District,_California,_Measure_T,_Bond_Issue_(March_2020)

Measure T Ballot: "To provide safe/modern classrooms, arts/science labs at neighborhood schools for quality education; relieve student overcrowding; replace aging roofs, inefficient heating/ventilation systems; upgrade, acquire, construct classrooms, facilities, sites/equipment; shall Mountain View Whisman School District's measure authorizing $259,000,000 in bond."

Today's Agenda:
https://mvwsd.novusagenda.com/AgendaPublic/MeetingView.aspx?MeetingID=294&MinutesMeetingID=-1&doctype=Agenda

Tonight's Resolution: "Board of Trustees Resolution No. 02-071025 allowing the Superintendent or designee to exercise the Option to Purchase Real Property, enter into the Purchase and Sale Agreement for Real Property with Joint Escrow Instructions with a purchase price of Fifty-Three Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($53,500,000), execute the certificate of acceptance, and to take all such future actions and execute additional documents, as necessary, to complete the acquisition of Lot B."

Jenny Schroder via mvwsd.org
Jul 10, 2025 12:29 PM

How much money from the Measure T funds would be put on hold? Or would it be used for this proposed purchase instead of for the projects listed in the Measure T language?

Mohan Gurunathan
Jul 10, 2025 1:03 PM

Dear Supt. Baier and MVWSD Trustees,

Please include this comment in the public record for today's Board meeting. (I will read a similar statement at the meeting in person.)

Six years ago, former Supt. Rudolph and the Board of Trustees came to us with a proposal to spend $56 Million of taxpayer money to build a new teacher housing facility. The community was assured that it would be "cost-neutral," that teachers would be able to afford the rents, and that a majority of teachers would be eligible to live there. In other words, we were assured that the District staff and the Trustees had **done their homework.** Trustee Conley and others proceeded to hype up the project through press releases, photo ops, and newspaper op-eds, all the while completely failing to provide any meaningful fiscal oversight to the pending financial disaster.

What we got instead is a **$90 Million dollar money pit** where most teachers either can't afford to rent, aren't eligible to rent, or don't want to live. We can't even properly manage the laundry, mail, or trash in the facility. And we have a completely unsustainable 55-year ground lease which was somehow missed -- a staggering oversight of everyone involved.

Now, you come to the public with **24 hours public notice**, during summer break, announcing that you intend to spend another **$53.5 MILLION DOLLARS** without giving the community ***any*** idea about your long-term plan to get us out of this mess. Adding insult to injury, you are planning to make this monumental decision in a single meeting, with no opportunity for the community to fully understand, discuss, or weigh in on the long-term financial ramifications.

To use the old adage: Fool us once, shame on you. Fool us twice, shame on us.

Simply put: WE HAVE NO TRUST LEFT that Staff or the Board will make sound financial decisions on our behalf.   The events of the past year have made it clear that our **community must act as a watchdog** over your financial decisions.   The fact that your negotiations are being led by Rebecca Westover and Phil Henderson - two of the people who led us into this mess in the first place - makes the plan that much more dubious. If there is some larger plan or vision around this purchase, **you owe it to the community to provide more details**. **You also owe it to explain all the options that you have considered to exit from this ill-fated project.** Without that, it is completely reckless and inappropriate for you to go forward with this purchase.

Let me remind you: **You are not spending your own money.** You are spending the community's hard-earned dollars—money that belongs to our children, our families, and our neighbors. To ask us to approve another massive expenditure without providing a clear, long-term plan is, frankly, offensive.

Slow down. Stop rushing into these massive financial decisions. **Stop keeping the community in the dark** about your plans. And please remember: the community will hold you accountable for the choices you make.

Sincerely,

Mohan Gurunathan