

Council Questions

June 25, 2024 - City Council Meeting

ITEM 4.3 Recommended Fiscal Year 2024-25 Capital Improvement Program

1. What is the status of the Hope Street Lots 4 and 8 developments?

The developer (Robert Green) completed the building permit plans but did not pull the building permits prior to the expiration of the entitlements in November 2023. The developer continues to invoke and qualify for the Financing Extension clause of the Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) due to high interest rates in securing their construction loans. They have until June 2025 to begin construction or the DDA expires.

2. Why is staff proposing to leave in place the planned Fiscal Year 2027-28 Fire Station No. 3, Construction (Placeholder), from the previous Five-Year CIP when the council directed staff to change the name of Project 24-31 to include construction? Why would there be two CIPs that include construction?

The recommended amendment to add “Construction” to the project title and scope is to convey intent to construct the project. The amendment does not include appropriating funds to construct the project because a funding source for the \$30+ million needed is not available. Staff recommends the planned Fiscal Year 2027-28 Fire Station No. 3, Construction (Placeholder) remain as a future CIP to allow staff to track and program the funding needed as part of the next Five-Year CIP. When the design phase is nearing completion, and an accurate cost estimate and funding source(s) are identified, staff will recommend amending Project 24-31 to increase project funding for construction and delete the Placeholder project, resulting in one CIP for the study, design and construction phases of Fire Station No. 3.

ITEM 4.14 Villa-Chiquita Park, Project 21-61-Various Actions

1. Will the turf be natural grass or artificial turf?

Natural Grass

ITEM 4.15 SB-1 Streets Project (Moffett Boulevard Complete Streets), Project 24-03-Professional Services Agreement

1. Members of the community have recommended that we address additional sidewalk gaps that are not currently contemplated as part of this project. Can staff provide recommendations regarding 1) the Ameswell side of the overpass, and 2) Stevens Creek Trail entrance on the Ameswell side to Shenandoah Square? Can these sidewalk gaps be addressed as part of this project?

The scope does not include closing the two sidewalk gaps mentioned. Closing these sidewalk gaps will be extremely complex and require significantly more funding and time than can be accommodated in this grant-funded project.

Elements that would need to be considered to add sidewalks for the area north of Ameswell include insufficient available width of the Moffett Boulevard overpass at U.S. 101 and availability of right-of-way between the Moffett Boulevard overpass and RT Jones Road (approximately 1,000 feet in length). For the area south of Stevens Creek Trail entrance, challenges include the potential need to excavate or reconfigure the Moffett Boulevard SR 85 underpass structure and geometry of the southbound SR 85 on-ramps. Both locations will affect California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) facility operations and structures, requiring extensive coordination, analysis, and permitting needs with Caltrans.

This project is seen as a first step in improving this corridor. The One Bay Area Grant Cycle 3 (OBAG3) program was very competitive, and staff determined that a \$3M – \$4M grant request was the optimum range for the City to be successful for the grant. The City was awarded a \$3.5M grant with the conditions that the project scope be consistent with the application, and the project be implemented by 2026. Including these sidewalk gaps into the scope would impact the project, both with increased costs and a longer schedule, placing the City's \$3.5M grant funding at risk. Due to these impacts, staff does not recommend addressing these sidewalk gaps as part of this project. Staff will evaluate the remaining sidewalk gaps as part of the active transportation priorities and other needs for inclusion in the next Five-Year Capital Improvement Program.

ITEM 4.16 Agreement with Cascadia Consulting Group to Develop 2035 Climate Strategy

With the focus on Reach Codes at the April and May Council Sustainability Committee meetings, staff gave only verbal updates in 2024 regarding the development of a Climate Strategy but did not bring the scope of work to the CSC for review. To allow for this, staff is pulling the Climate Strategy item from the June 25 Council agenda. Staff anticipates scheduling the scope of work for review at a CSC meeting in the early fall, followed by a return to Council for authorization to execute the contract.

1. On page 11 of the scope of work, under the heading Prioritize Measures and Actions, why is effectiveness not one of the criteria for prioritization, for example effectiveness regarding carbon emissions reduction? Should that not be a major criterion?

Potential carbon emissions reductions are addressed under the example criterion "Level of Impact", which would evaluate the emissions reduction potential or adaptation potential of an action. At this point, the criteria are examples put forward by the consultant. Final criteria will be discussed and decided by the City. Staff will engage the Council Sustainability Committee at multiple points through the project to gain feedback, including on the evaluation criteria.

2. Cascadia Consulting Group states that they have supported other cities, counties, and non-governmental entities in estimating consumption-based emissions and developing strategies to address those emissions. Can you name several types of consumption-based emissions that they have addressed? Would they include food, air travel, fast fashion, or plastics consumption, for example?

Cascadia has experience developing strategies to address consumption-based emissions such as those related to transportation, housing, food, goods, and services. These strategies sometimes overlap with more common actions in Climate Action Plans, like encouraging driving less, but they can also include things like encouraging alternatives to air travel, promoting more plant-based foods (and reducing meat and dairy consumption), and supporting reuse, repair, and secondhand purchasing (limiting fast fashion).

3. On page 15 of the scope of work, I see Tasks and Deliverables that include meetings and strategy reports, but not typical strategy actions. What have typical strategy actions been for other cities Cascadia has worked with?

For other cities Cascadia has worked with, typical actions have focused on reducing driving, advancing transportation, and building electrification, and building resilience. Some example actions Cascadia has proposed for recent Climate Action Plans include, but are not limited to:

Sustainable transportation: expand multimodal transportation networks, increase, or improve public transit services, create an electric vehicle infrastructure plan.

- Electrification and energy efficiency: support grid electrification and resilience, support local renewable energy, incentivize electrification retrofits, incentivize new construction to be all-electric, educate about energy efficient home appliances.
- Waste reduction: set up or increase food donation projects to reduce food waste, increase access to local compost and recycling, launch waste diversion education campaigns, limit single-use plastics.
- Community resilience: launch community resilience hubs, create an emergency preparedness plan, launch an air purifier program for low-income residents, educate and incentivize adaptation upgrades to homes and buildings (i.e., green roofs, permeable pavement, rain collection, etc.), promote community gardens.
- Natural environment: increase urban green space, protect biodiversity, increase forest resilience to wildfires, plant pollinator gardens, incentivize native plant landscaping, and improve water conservation.

Staff notes that some of these strategies have been at least initiated in Mountain View and the actual recommendations that will ultimately be proposed for Mountain View's Climate Strategy may include different actions since each city is at a different stage in their journey to mitigate and adapt to climate change.

ITEM 4.21 Building Reach Code Updates

1. Is it possible to use Planning-side incentives to encourage electrification? For example, expedited or ministerial approvals, Bonus FAR, relaxed development standards, etc.?

The Council Sustainability Committee's (CSC) current recommendation to the City Council does not include an evaluation of zoning incentives as part of the Building Reach Code Updates. If the majority of Council would like City staff to evaluate potential zoning incentives, then that direction can be provided at the Council meeting. If that direction is provided, additional public hearings/study sessions may be required with the Environmental Planning Commission, CSC, and Council to identify a preferred zoning incentive(s).

ITEM 6.2 Public Hearing on the Recommended Water, Wastewater, and Trash/Recycling/Organics Rate Increases

1. Why were rate increase notices limited to CSFRA occupants, and not sent to all renters?

The City would have liked to send postcards to all renters in Mountain View informing them of the upcoming utility rate increases. Unfortunately, the only database available to the City is the CSFRA Database, containing contact information of tenants covering most tenants of multi-family apartments with an initial date of occupancy of 2016 and older. Between the 16,800 notices sent out to the utility account owners and the 13,600 postcards to the CSFRA tenants, staff believes the outreach was maximized, given the current resources/information available.

ITEM 7.1 Call a Municipal Election for November 5, 2024, and Place a Ballot Measure Amending Real Property Conveyance Tax

1. What is the revenue implication, not the property value implication, of raising the threshold to \$6 million from \$5 million? (Page 8)

The potential impact of the \$6 million threshold versus the \$5 million threshold is approximately \$346,707 in annual revenue.

| Over Prior 5 Years | \$5 million & above | \$6 million & above |
|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Total Sales Value | \$3,344,331,544 | \$3,228,762,772 |
| x .015 | | |
| Potential Revenue/Year | \$10,032,995 | \$9,686,288 |

2. Do we have any data that shows that increasing the amount of affordable housing in the city reduces homelessness?

The lack of affordable housing is a key contributor to homelessness. However, homelessness is caused by many different factors. Therefore, reducing homelessness also requires efforts in other areas (ex. mental health, criminal justice, case management, job training, foster care, etc.). While increasing affordable housing alone may or may not reduce homelessness due to the other factors involved, an insufficient supply of affordable housing exacerbates the challenge, especially in high-cost areas like Mountain View and Silicon Valley.

3. Given the polling/community outreach, would it make sense to change “affordable housing support” in the Ballot Question to “addressing homelessness?”

The City’s polling firm (EMC) and strategy firm (Lew Edwards Group) have advised against altering the ballot question that was used for survey purposes. That said these areas of interest can be communicated in other forums.

4. Should we consider including “transportation safety” in the Ballot Question? For example, “pothole repair and transportation safety” instead of “Street, sidewalk and pothole repairs.”

The City’s polling firm (EMC) and strategy firm (Lew Edwards Group) have advised against altering the ballot question that was used for survey purposes. That said these areas of interest can be communicated in other forums.