

City Council Questions
November 18, 2019 Council Meeting

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTION:

1. How much current housing development do we have in the current pipeline? That would include the new project next to Lorenzo's on El Camino, the three Prometheus projects, the Graystar project, the project on Middlefield and others. How many new housing units are those? On the housing question include Sobrato's project, summer Hills on Middlefield and I'm sure there's some others out there.

	<i>Net New Units</i>
Under Construction	1929
Approved	2854
Under Review	1855
Total	6638

ITEM 4.1 2020 COUNCIL MEETING SCHEDULE

Please review the 2020 Council Meeting Schedule carefully and bring your calendar with you in case any adjustments are necessary.

1. Would it be possible not to have five meetings in June?

When taking into consideration conferences, events, and observed holidays in 2020, staff felt that five meetings in June would be necessary in order to bring all planned items, including items related to the adoption of labor agreements, to Council prior to the summer recess. If Council prefers to remove a June meeting, June 2 or June 16 are recommended.

2. Would it be possible not to have a meeting on/after a three day weekend (September 8)?

Traditionally, Council has returned from summer recess on the Tuesday following the Labor Day holiday. If Council prefers no meeting after the Labor Day holiday, a meeting could be scheduled on Tuesday, September 1, and no meeting on Tuesday, September 8.

3. Would it be possible not to have a meeting during Thanksgiving week (November 24)?

With the election November 3 and the NLC Conference in Tampa November 18-21, November 10 and 24 are the only options for Tuesday meetings in November 2020. If Council prefers no meeting on Thanksgiving week, a special meeting could be scheduled on another date in November; however, the Wednesday, November 11 Veteran's Day holiday would need to be taken into consideration for agenda preparation.

ITEM 4.4 AUTHORIZE AN AGREEMENT FOR SAFE PARKING OPERATIONS AND REPROGRAM FUNDS FOR CASE MANAGEMENT

1. Why hasn't the full balance been spent?

The full balance has not been spent because fewer resources were needed for administrative help.

2. Will Council get regular updates on how the money is being spent and that the goals are being achieved?

The Council receives annual updates on all homeless initiatives.

ITEM 4.6 ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING COMMISSION RECRUITMENT UPDATE AND AUTHORIZATION OF CURRENT COMMISSIONER'S LEAVE OF ABSENCE

1. When will the recruitment begin and end? Has the City taken special efforts in previous recruitments that have been around the holidays?

The City Clerk's Office plans to begin Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) recruitment this week with an ad in the Mountain View Voice, an online ad on the Mountain View Voice website, posting to the City website, posting on social media, etc. The application deadline will be 5 p.m. on Thursday, December 19. Notification will be included in the ad that interviews will be scheduled in early January.

A second EPC recruitment was conducted at this time last year, with a similar deadline. Those interviews were conducted at a special meeting on January 3, 2019; staff will work with the Mayor and Vice Mayor to schedule an interview date in early January 2020 for the current recruitment.

ITEM 6.1 TERRA BELLA VISION PLAN ADOPTION

1. Why would developers/landowners have to have signed agreements with every other land owner in their area? This seems prohibitively difficult. Isn't there a simpler way of proceeding with a Master Plan?
2. Why would we make a residential permit parking a community benefit? If there is an impact, shouldn't the development pay?
3. If parkland of 16 acres is required, why are we only showing parks for eight acres?
4. Page 7 of staff report - #5 the word should is used to "create as much affordable unit." Can we change that word to "shall"?
5. If we have concerns about "spillover parking into existing neighborhoods," wouldn't having aggressive parking reduction targets make the matter worse?
6. Page 11- it is mentioned doing a master plan without doing a complete precise plan. Could we do parts of a precise plan study like the impacts of traffic?
7. Could a master plan, one that is a world class example of innovation, well beyond anything we have now, move forward with council permission?
8. Terra Bella vision plan - Is this a draft version?
9. Page 8, #7 - It is stated that redevelopment could affect rents, isn't the word will more realistic?
10. Will there be an infrastructure built for av's and contacted vehicles, part of the vision plan?
11. What is the internalization rate for tb given its location next to a major highway?
12. Page 14, # 10 - concern when you mention "a number of small business," would preserve space for a "diverse number of small business" not be so limiting?
13. Page 14, #11 - could we emphasize public art more?
14. Page 25 - how wide is a side walk that is being referred to on Item #1 building setbacks?
15. Page 29, #1 - how would we know if a 40 or, a 35 ,or a 30 degree daylight plane be better?
16. Page 29, #4 - could we require trees be six feet in height?
17. Page 32, Parks - can we require minimum park dedication be four acres and not should?
18. Page 37, #1 - what if schools and developer do not agree on a school strategy, does the project end?

19. Page 38, Table 4-1 under district transportation improvements – could shuttles, agt, and state of the art signals be included?
20. Are water smart meters required?
21. With having unbundled parking, wouldn't it make it easier to park on the street?
22. Page 44, #1b - shouldn't there an additional bullet point, taking about saving light industrial?
23. When agt comes in, would it replace the reversible bus lane?
24. With the City only having three main roads that run north/south (Shoreline, Rengstorff, and San Antonio), do we want to continue to optimize them for moving vehicle traffic through town?
25. Do we have an idea what the best ratio of light industrial is for the City?
26. Could you comment on the attached suggestions for setbacks by the Terra Bella neighbors? In particular, could you compare it to the Prometheus Madera project on Villa Street in downtown? What are the setbacks to Madera from the other side of Villa Street - for the two story side, and the four story side facing Evelyn?
27. Is there possibility for the school strategy to include more than the 1.2 acres of land currently identified in the vision plan?

ITEM 6.2 701 TO 747 WEST EVELYN AVENUE

1. How was the 13' wide sidewalk measurement chosen? Is this adequate near a transit center or might we be setting an inadequate precedent for the area?

The thirteen foot wide measurement was chosen based on the midpoint of the existing sidewalk dimensions. It also creates a functional garage for Marwood and is larger than other sidewalks in the area, including Castro Street (12'), and Hope Street in front of the hotel (12').

2. Are there stacker stalls in the Robert Green development garage as well? Are the stackers proposed by Marwood stackers or puzzle lifts?

No, there aren't any stackers in the Robert Green garage. The stackers proposed by Marwood are puzzle lifts.

3. Does the technology currently exist to provide real-time transit information (as noted on page 13 of the staff report)?

Yes, this information is available from internet-based sources.

4. Is it possible to not lease Lot 6 to Marwood and just have Marwood construct the parking structure that the City would own (and Marwood would have access to 81 of the stalls)? Do they need to lease Lot 6 from the City in order to build the parking structure?

Presumably Marwood would have to obtain a construction loan from a private funding source to construct the parking structure. Any lender will require some form of collateral to secure the loan. That collateral would be either the lease (if revenue was being produced), or the parking structure itself (which the City would presumably not allow). Staff would recommend Marwood place the construction costs for 81 stalls, plus additional consideration in the amount of a pro rata share of the land rental value, into an irrevocable escrow to be used by the City in constructing a parking structure on Lot 6. If Council is interested in this option, there are many details that would need to be worked out.

5. What is the estimated total cost of building a parking structure on Lot 6 with 270 or 360 stalls?

Staff conducted an analysis of the cost to construct the California/Bryant parking structure (containing CVS) in 2015, deducting the cost of the retail space and the solar panels. It came out to about \$48,000 per space in 2015 dollars, which is about \$52,000 today. This equals \$14 million to \$19 million to construct a 270-stall to 360-stall garage. There may be additional costs, including building it in a way it could be repurposed in the future. Note the following:

- It is unclear how many parking stalls can actually be constructed, given site constraints and other policy goals (such as ground floor commercial)**
- Since the garage would be replacing 98 existing stalls, the actual cost to increase parking capacity would be approximately \$70,000 to \$80,000 per net new stall. A 270-stall or 360-stall garage with 81 stalls owned by Marwood would result in net new 24/7 public parking of 91 or 181 stalls.**

Staff has initiated various tasks related to Downtown parking, including cost estimate/options for a Lot 6 structure. The work is being scoped, with a target of Lot 6 cost estimates in Q1 2020. This information may change the cost assumptions above.

6. Is TRGC prohibited from creating a separate contract with Marwood for an additional payment for ramp access?

No. A separate agreement between TRGC and Marwood to provide for an additional payment(s) for recurring operations and maintenance of the ramp access and parking management would be reasonable and anticipated.

7. What is meant that Marwood would rent Lot 6? How long and how much would they charge for parking?

Marwood's alternative proposals in Attachment 6 are conceptual. Details would need to be worked out through staff review, Council input and negotiation.

8. Would they pay for a new parking garage? That could cost more than \$ 17 million (270 stalls times \$65000).

Marwood's proposals would limit their obligation and risk to \$8 million. If they construct a parking garage for us (as described in Option 2 in their letter), they would expect City reimbursement of anything above that amount. However, these options are conceptual. Details would need to be worked out through staff review, Council input and negotiation.

ITEM 7.1 RECYCLED WATER ADVANCED TREATMENT AND WASTEWATER PURIFICATION AGREEMENT

1. Can you give me the City's total revenues less expenses for 2020-2050? It looks to be well over \$7 million. Why would we be paying this if we don't need the water?

The total expenses for 2020-2050 are estimated to be \$22.3M if the advanced treatment plant runs at full capacity. The expenses will be offset by an estimated \$14.4M of revenue from Valley Water. We anticipate it will take time to reach full production so expenses are likely to be lower, particularly in the first few years. These costs will be offset in the long-term as recycled water production increases and will be recovered through recycled water rates.

Currently, the City does not pay the RWQCP for recycled water, although we estimate the production cost would be \$900 - \$1,000 per acre foot when the advanced treatment plant is fully operational. As the City's recycled water consumption increases, the City's purchases of SFPUC water will decrease, offsetting recycled water production costs. The current cost of SFPUC water is \$1,786 per acre foot.

- It sounds like one of the big reasons we would be doing this is to reduce our use of SFPUC water so that that water can be used by other SFPUC customers with increasing needs. Those customers are cities in Alameda, San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. If that's the main reason to do this, why should Mountain View pay so much? Why would other SFPUC customers not pay more?

The primary reason for constructing a recycled water advanced treatment facility is to improve the quality of the recycled water and eliminate impacts from the high salinity. Additionally, higher quality recycled water increases the potential applications, improving the reliability of the City's overall water portfolio while also providing environmental benefits.

The City's guaranteed supply of SFPUC water (12.46 million gallons per day) will not be impacted by this agreement. The City will still have access to this supply and it is not being transferred to other purchasers of SFPUC water. Agencies that need more water than their SFPUC contractual supply will need to fund the cost of developing new water supplies. As the City's use of recycled water increases and our use of SFPUC declines, we preserve our SFPUC supply for potable needs and are less likely to need to invest in the cost of developing new and costly water supplies.

- When you say, "The City has an adequate supply of potable water for long-term anticipated consumption," what do you mean by long-term? What timeframe are you talking about? Is this out to 2050?

The City's water demand projections extend to 2045.

- "The agreement includes an option for the City to secure a new source of water (up to 1.3 MGD) if needed." When is it foreseen that we might need more water? How would we secure it in the event that we would need it?

Based on our long-term projections, we do not anticipate needing additional supplies, but the option for new water was included to provide an additional measure of safety for unanticipated changes. The agreement requires Valley Water to develop a supply if formally requested by the City, although the process to develop a new supply would take up to 16 years.

- "The City's projected total water consumption (including recycled water) in 2045 ranges from 12.25 to 13.60 MGD." What is this based on? Is it based on a certain daytime or nighttime population or a certain number of households? If so, what are those figures?

The lower water use estimate is based on build-out of land-use policies adopted by January 2019 (e.g., General Plan amendments, North Bayshore Precise Plan, etc.). The higher estimate also includes projects and policies adopted since January or currently under study (e.g., East Whisman Precise Plan). The table below lists population and jobs estimates for both scenarios:

<i>Projected 2045 Water Use</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Jobs</i>
12.25 mgd	104,400	119,400
13.60 mgd	119,300	128,400

6. On page 2 of the staff report, is it 38% of the City's total wastewater flow or 38% of the RWQCP total wastewater flow?

The City's wastewater flow to the RWQCP is 7.3 MGD, approximately 38% of all RWQCP partner's total flow to the plant.

7. What is the benefit of having the opportunity to request up to 1.3 MGD of potable water from Valley Water if the City has to pay for the cost of the water supply development?

Based on our long-term projections, we do not anticipate needing additional supplies, but as listed earlier, the option for new water was included to provide an additional measure of safety for unanticipated changes. If the City needs flows other than those contractually guaranteed by our suppliers (SFPUC and Valley Water) it is likely we would always be required to fund the cost of developing the new water supply if our suppliers met their obligations and did not have additional supplies available. Valley Water's agreement to develop a supply individually for Mountain View and Palo Alto is unique to this contract as supplies are typically developed for their entire customer base.

8. Why is this agreement so complex? Can it be simplified?

Staff acknowledges the agreement is complex, but includes the details necessary to reflect the long-term, the challenges of substantial financial arrangements, and the varying needs and goals of multiple government agencies.