Commenting as a resident of Mountain View, I would like to offer a couple of comments on the Blueprint Strategies:

- I support the strategy under Economy that calls for the protection of industrial lands. It’s critical to maintain a competitive economy. I believe this can be achieved through targeted economic incentives and land use policies that support manufacturing and high-tech industries.
- I support the Transportation Impact Fees on new office developments at the city or county level, but I do not support the imposition of a regional jobs/housing linkage fee. I don’t believe that development-related revenues generated in one county should be used potentially in three counties (50 to 75 miles away). Additionally, I believe that the use of VMT for analysis of transportation impacts in CEQA (per SB 73) is a viable metric for all locations in the same county. However, the imposition of a regional fee could lead to unintended consequences.

For the Strategy on transforming malls and office parks:
- I support this concept in principle but believe the strategy description should acknowledge that cities may want/need to preserve existing capacity in these areas. The new uses can be added to existing buildings, which may be more cost-effective in the long run.

For the transportation strategy on safety and VMT Zero:
- I fully support the reduction of vehicle speeds in areas where pedestrians and cyclists are present. However, I question the value of pursuing lower speeds on freeways, especially with the introduction of more autonomous vehicle technology. I suspect that this approach will increase safety for everyone at the cost of increased travel time and operational efficiency. It’s also important to consider the impact on regional traffic patterns. I look forward to seeing the final plan for the Blueprint Strategies.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments!

Rob Swerk