ATTACHMENT 14

1 of 3

UNITE HERE! LOCAL 19 Enrique L. Fernaíndez Business Manager

> Debra Rockwood Financial Secretary - Treasurer

Art Fernandes President

Sandra R. Alvarez Vice President

2302 Zanker Rd., 2nd Floor San Jose, CA 95131 Tel. (408) 321-9019 Fax (408) 321-9029

Sarah Julian Recording Secretary

Trustees: Elizabeth Guzman, Chair Isidro Cisneros Dolores Dominguez

Al Chachra Inspector

Omar Alvarado Sergeant-at-Arms

Executive Board: Rose Rodriguez Barbara Garcia Scott Loberg Mark Deger Majid Barghi Consepcion Garcia Alma Navarro Jose Barba

November 14, 2016

Mr. George Schroeder Community Development Department, Planning Division City of Sunnyvale 456 West Olive Avenue Sunnyvale, CA 94068

Re: 1250 Lakeside Drive Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report

Dear Mr. Schroeder,

I am writing on behalf of UNITE HERE Local 19 to present our organization's comments on the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("FSEIR") for the 1250 Lakeside Drive Project (the "Project.") UNITE HERE Local 19 represents hotel, food, and beverage workers in the South Bay, many of whom live and work in Sunnyvale. Our members in these industries stand to be impacted as employees, as commuters, and as residents of the Project's surrounding area. Furthermore, given that Local 19 members were employed at the Four Points Sheraton¹ Hotel previously located at this site, UNITE HERE Local 19 has a longstanding interest in the site's successful and equitable development.

On September 12, 2016, we submitted a comment letter for the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report. We thank staff for responding to those comments, however we still believe the Project would be improved by further examination of the issues our letter addressed.

Comment to Response D.1

Our first concern dealt with the Project's transportation impacts. As the union that represents the type of hotel and hospitality workers potentially employed by and therefore commuting to this Project, we have a strong interest in ensuring that all options that might reduce the Project's traffic impacts are considered. While the Draft SEIR identified multiple significant traffic impacts, we believe that some possible mitigation strategies remain unexplored that could reduce traffic impacts to less than significant levels. Both the City of Sunnyvale and the Project's EIR highlight shuttle buses as just one of many such strategies, which is why we asked the City to further explore the possibility of a shuttle program the might reduce the transportation impact to a less than significant level.

¹ Kezra, Victoria. "Sunnyvale: Commission reviews hotel, housing project at Lakeside Drive." *The Mercury News*. Retrieved from <u>www.mercurynews.com</u> on September 9, 2016.

Although the City stated in its response that the Project's shuttle bus program was not intended to mitigate the Project's traffic impacts to a less than significant level, our view remains that exploring the feasibility of this program might provide significant benefits to the Project. We ask that the Final SEIR further explore the feasibility of a shuttle bus program that, along with other strategies, cumulatively reduces traffic to a less than significant level.

Comment to Response D.2

Workers potentially employed by the future hotel are also likely to use public transportation to get to work. We asked that the Final SEIR examine the impact of transit trips in excess of available capacity in order to confirm the DSEIR's conclusion that the Project would have no substantial impacts on Sunnyvale's transportation infrastructure. If current transportation infrastructure will inadequately accommodate the additional riders created by the Project, then that is an impact that the Final SEIR must examine. While this analysis may or may not be required by CEQA, it is certainly not prohibited. If the City examines this issue, it might discover an important impact that could disproportionally affect hotel workers.

Additionally, the City's response included a reference to aspects of the shuttle program memorialized in the recommended conditions of approval. Of concern to us is the possible exclusion of workers from the shuttle program. We ask that the recommended conditions of approval be modified to include employees in the shuttle program's intended ridership.

Comment to Response D.4

In terms of the jobs/housing balance, the DSEIR stated that the Project's creation of housing units could off-set the increase in jobs resulting from the Project, and "therefore it would not likely foster or stimulate the construction of additional housing elsewhere in the City." We challenged this conclusion because of the discrepancy between the low wage jobs and market rate housing the Project will create. In its response, the City stated that additional text was added to the FEIR to clarify that the Project would not "substantially" affect the number of jobs and housing units "citywide." However, it is unclear to us why the Final SEIR can evaluate the Project's "citywide" housing impact without its individual impact. In our view, the affordable housing need created by 238 low-wage jobs needs to be properly evaluated and addressed in the Final SEIR. It is concerning that, despite the added text, the Final SEIR still implies that that this Project's combined creation of jobs and housing itself off-sets the Project's housing impacts.

Comment to Response D.5

Overall, we believe that the affordability of the housing units is of an environmental concern if the Project as a whole is not in line with the jobs/housing balance and the goals of Sunnyvale's Housing Element.² Although the latter identified Sunnyvale's housing/jobs ratio as 1:1, it also stated that most Sunnyvale residents commute out and

² Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Sunnyvale, 2014:

http://sunnyvale.ca.gov/Portals/0/Sunnyvale/CDD/Housing/HousingElement/Draft-2015-2023-Housing-Element.pdf most Sunnyvale workers commute in. While the Housing Element proposed strategies for addressing this problem – including requiring mitigation from large developers – this Project includes none of those proposed strategies.

Finally, while the proposed Project was deemed complete prior to the effective date of the housing impact fee ordinance, in some cases developers have agreed to pay fees that are passed after they have submitted their application but before their Projects have been granted final approvals. Given the fact that this Project will be creating low wage jobs, the developer should pay a housing impact fee to avoid creating further strain on the affordable housing market.

We ask the City to evaluate these issues before moving forward.

Sincerely,

Stephano Medina Researcher UNITE HERE Local 19