

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION QUESTIONS
April 28, 2021 MEETING

Item 5.1 – Shoreline Play Structure Replacement Project Update, Project 20-55

1. Of the \$840K cost estimate, how much is for Part 1 (procuring replacement parts) and how much is for Part 2 (removal/installation)?

The total project budget, including construction costs and soft costs is \$840,000. Included in the project budget is \$160,000 for procurement of the play structure equipment and \$330,000 for the removal of the damaged equipment and installation of the new equipment.

Item 5.2 – Fiscal Year 2021-22 Park Land Dedication Fund Recommendation

1. Page 6 of the report mentions “at least two parks that staff is tracking which are associated with a residential development.” Are you able to provide more detail on which residential developments and/or the potential park locations?

The developments are located at 555 W Middlefield Rd (Stierlin Area, currently under review) and 355 E. Middlefield Rd (Whisman Area, approved by Council 5/2020 but has not submitted building permits). The effects of COVID-19 on the progression of these developments are unknown, which may affect the development timelines. Therefore, staff would caution there is a possibility these developments and their associated parks may not occur in the five year CIP schedule being proposed.

2. Are the El Camino Real Median Renovation related to landscaping? Are these in conjunction with other possible State-funded renovations/changes along that stretch of El Camino Real?

The El Camino Real Median Landscaping project in the Five-Year CIP is related to landscaping improvements, including new soil, irrigation and vegetation for the medians. The other renovation project that is being conducted first is roadway pavement improvements by Caltrans which incorporates City proposed bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Staff does not anticipate significant median improvements as part of their roadway improvements work. However, City will coordinate with Caltrans to avoid design conflict or any duplication of landscape and irrigation work on El Camino Real.

3. Are the “Alternatives” listed on page 8 of the report separate from Recommendation items 1 and 2 listed on page of the report? Or are the “Alternatives” related (or a subset) to Recommendation Item #2 (“Provide a recommendation to the City Council to schedule...”)

The “Alternatives” are examples of other actions that the PRC can recommend rather than the “Recommendations” on page 1. Alternatives 1 through 3 apply to the first recommendation regarding commitment of Park Land Dedication Funds.

4. I'm having trouble following the discussion about Evelyn and Villa mini parks, and the PLD funds from the 1720 Villa project. Could you please review the memo and clarify the following?

It appears the final version of the memo with final edits was not the version that was incorporated into the Agenda. This was an oversight by the Senior Management Analyst.

- a. The name of the planning area for these two parks. My understanding is that Villa is in the Central Area and Evelyn is in the Sylvan/Dale Area, but the memo and attachments have conflicting information.

You are correct the planning areas in the table are switched for these two parks. The 525 Evelyn Avenue park is located in Sylvan-Dale POSP planning area and the 1720 Villa Street park is located in the Central POSP planning area.

- b. The commitment of PLD funds from the 1720 Villa development, particularly the rationale for using some of these funds for the Sylvan Park trellis.

The 1720 Villa Street development will not be funding Sylvan-Dale projects. The Villa Street and Evelyn Ave projects were mixed-up again in Attachment 1. The Sylvan Park Trellis and Stevens Creek Trail Bridge are recommended to be funded by in-lieu fees from the 525 Evelyn Ave development in the Sylvan-Dale POSP planning area. An updated Attachment 1 is attached to these questions and will be updated in the presentation.

- c. When Evelyn and Villa mini parks came to the PRC for review. The report says February, but that was the Fayette (San Antonio) mini park.

At the February 24 special PRC meeting, the PRC reviewed two items: San Antonio Mini-Park (400 San Antonio) and the Community Services Department Proposed Budget Requests for Fiscal Year 2021-22. As part of the CSD Proposed Budget Request item, PRC committed Park Land Dedication funds to the design phase of both the Evelyn and Villa mini-parks and recommended that City Council appropriate the funding to CIPs. Because the CSD Budget Request item was addressing budget requests and future commitment of funds, staff brought the Park Land Fund commitments as part of this item as well. The funding for design was approved as a Consent Item at the April 13, 2021 City Council meeting and the CIPs have been created.

5. I'm also having trouble following the discussion about the proposed parks-related five-year CIP. The memo references a list in Attachment 2, but I do not see a list there that matches Tables 3 and 4. Could you please clarify?

The reference to Attachment 2 on page 2 for projects funded by other sources than Park Land Dedication Fund is a typo. It should state, "Table 4 provides a schedule of the projects being proposed that fall under the purview of the Community Services Department but are not to be funded by the PLD Fund."

Tables 1 & 2 represent parks-related projects that are recommended for funding in FY21-22 (Year 1) from the Park Land Dedication Fund. These are projects that PRC is being asked to make a recommendation for funding.

Table 3 represents future parks-related projects that are expected to be funded from the Park Land Dedication from FY22-23 through FY25-26 (Year 2 through 5). These projects are not recommended for commitment of funds at this time. However, PRC has an opportunity to provide input on the schedule of these projects, Staff have provided a recommended schedule based on necessity, funding, workload and other factors such as completion of residential developments or phased approaches. However, PRC has the opportunity to move project around if certain projects are considered of a higher priority and need to be in earlier years of the Five-Year CIP plan.

Table 4 represents projects that are not to be funded by the Park Land Dedication Fund. Table 4 contains projects from FY21-22 through FY25-26 (Year 1 through Year 5). PRC does not have authority over the funding sources of these projects – unlike projects funded by the Park Land Dedication Fund. Therefore, PRC has the opportunity to provide input on the schedule of these projects but is not making a budgetary action.

Essentially, PRC is being asked to commit funds and schedule the projects in Tables 1 and 2. PRC is being asked for input on the schedule of the projects listed in Tables 3 and 4.

6. **The proposed 5-year CIP does not mention any projects located within the Rengstorff planning area, which is extremely park-deficient according to Attachment 3. What is being done by the City to increase parks in this area?**

Because Mountain View is built out and residential parcels are not very large with the cost of land being high, the City typically acquires open space through unique land acquisition opportunities or by gaining open space associated with residential development. At this time, there are not any residential developments proposed in the Rengstorff Planning Area that are large enough to incorporate open space.

However, two of the last three parks that have been completed are in the Rengstorff Planning Area: Wyandotte Park and Heritage Park. The space for Heritage Park was acquired through a uniquely large residential plot where the homeowner reached out to the City for first opportunity to purchase the land specifically for a park. Wyandotte Park was a unique opportunity where the City acquired the space from where a dog kennel used to be located and converted industrial space to open space. The City, and specifically the Real Property Program Administrator (RPPA), continue to seek out unique opportunities for acquiring land for open space. The RPPA provides an annual update to the PRC on land acquisition efforts with last one being brought to PRC in November 2020.

Lastly, it is anticipated the future open space acquisition opportunities will be explored through the creation of the Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan, since it serves as an update to the current Parks and Open Space Plan. It is anticipated that the Strategic Plan will identify planning areas in need of more park space and could include some recommended steps to increase park space similar to the previous version.

7. Where do projects such as the Tree Master Plan or the Wildlife Management Plan or other relevant projects coming through the Council's Strategic Plan (for example, definition of biodiversity goals) fit into the current funding request?

The update to the Community Tree Master Plan and the Wildlife Management Plan are both listed as items on the current Council Goals Work Plan and we anticipate them to be rolled over into the City Council Strategic Plan. Both of these projects are already funded. The funding is located in the CSD's operations accounts (not a CIP) as one-time funding from the Tree Mitigation Fund and Shoreline Fund. The Capital Improvement Plan and the Council Goals are executed separately and only coordinated in terms of funding and timing when necessary.

8. I am unclear when funds can be "earmarked" ("Staff is scheduling all larger maintenance projects, such as turf field replacements, so that funds are earmarked for those projects and not utilized elsewhere.") versus for example the Villa park scenario where funds cannot be set aside. Are these "earmarked" funds already sitting in a City account?

Staff uses the term "earmarked" as common terminology to refer to identified future projects and their estimated costs for staff to track. This allows staff to estimate future balances, especially when new projects are proposed. However, money cannot be officially earmarked, set aside, or committed to a project without action by the PRC or City Council. When funding is committed through either body taking action, then it is officially earmarked in the fund and can only be put towards another project if the PRC or City Council takes another action to change the commitment.

In the context of the report, staff meant that when future in-lieu fees are being forecasted, staff are comparing that forecast with the cost of future projects. The funding is not being officially earmarked. This enables staff to address whether commitment of fees will or could impact future projects when PRC and City Council are making a decision on use of PLD funds. Attachment 2 to the report highlights this approach by providing the cost of anticipated future projects along with uncommitted fees by POSP planning area. Staff have been advised to not share forecasted Park Land Dedication In-lieu fees because it may influence decisions regarding current gatekeepers or other residential projects.

Park Land Dedication Fund Commitment

Amended Projects

Project(s)	Planning Area	Uncommitted Fees in Area	Schedule Year	Current Funding	Requested Funding	Project Total	PLD Priority	Funding Source	PLD Fee
Rengstorff Park - Maint/Tenn Bldg Construction	San Antonio	\$33,898,920	FY20-21	\$600,000	\$2,840,000	\$3,440,000	2	400 San Antonio	\$287,120.00
								2268 El Camino Real	\$2,552,880.00
								Total	\$2,840,000.00
Sylvan Park Trellis	Sylvan-Dale	\$16,729,000	FY20-21	\$600,000	\$250,000	\$850,000	3	525 E Evelyn Ave	\$250,000.00
								Total	\$250,000.00

Total Commitment for Amended Projects: \$3,090,000

New Projects

Project(s)	Planning Area	Uncommitted Fees in Area	Schedule Year	Current Funding	Requested Funding	Project Total	PLD Priority	Funding Source	PLD Fee
Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan	Citywide	\$3,480,786	FY21-22	\$0	\$600,000	\$600,000	2	FY18-19 Refund	\$3,000.00
								FY18-19 Investment Earnings	\$569,511.83
								FY19-20 Investment Earnings	\$27,488.17
								Total	\$600,000.00
Stevens Creek Trail Bridge Rehab over Central Expressway	Citywide	\$3,480,786	FY21-22	\$0	\$3,638,000	\$3,638,000	3	525 E Evelyn Ave	\$3,638,000.00
								Total	\$3,638,000.00
Trash Enclosure Improvements at Cuesta and Sylvan	Miramonte and Sylvan-Dale	\$16,729,000	FY21-22	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	3	FY19-20 Refund	\$100,000.00
								Total	\$100,000.00

Total Commitment for New Projects: \$4,338,000

TOTAL PLD COMMITMENT: \$7,428,000