

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION QUESTIONS
September 9, 2020 MEETING

Item 5.2 – Heritage Tree Appeal – Glenborough Drive and Hedgerow Court Walkway

1. Did the applicant submit this application in his role as City of Mountain View Forestry Coordinator? Is this standard procedure for a (non-dead) City Heritage Tree?

When a tree is on City Property generally one of the Arborists on staff will submit an application. It is standard practice for two of the following three staff to evaluate trees together, in order to provide a second opinion on any given tree. Jakob Trconic, Peter Raasch, or Matt Feisthamel are Arborists on staff. . For this particular tree, staff responded several times over the years based on concerns communicated by a resident in the area. After reviews by multiple City arborists, the consensus was that it warrants consideration for removal. An application was filed by Matt Feisthamel and the tree was posted.

2. To clarify does the subject tree (#13022) show physical evidence of canker and/or bark beetle?

Yes, the tree has a patch of canker at the base of the tree that can be seen in this circled area. This tree did not have signs of beetles.



3. In looking at the proposed heritage tree removal, I saw two additional trees very close to it that seem in bad shape. I assume one is the one that has died. But right next to the appealed tree is another in bad shape. I'd like to have staff describe their plans for reforesting the entire walkway.

Two of the trees are dead in the photos. One was part of the original posting/application but due to its moving from severe decline to dead, it can be removed without a permit and therefore was reposted as such. The other tree near this location is also now dead. It will be posted with a dead tree posting and removed with the other dead tree at some point after the hearing.

Staff have briefly discussed the replanting of the area in that we absolutely want replacement trees. Staff likes the Canary Island Pines since they fit the neighborhood.

However, we are not sure if new trees would be subject to canker or other issues. Therefore, staff is currently determining the best replacement trees for this area, but have not come to a final determination.

4. What is the "forestry coordinator" position?

This position reports to the Forestry and Roadway Manager. The Forestry Coordinator administers and implements the City's forestry and community tree programs and ensures compliance with ordinances; acts as one of the City's liaisons between contractors and the public; and performs other specialized arboriculture functions as assigned. In addition, this position is responsible for implementing initiatives and goals set forth in the Community Tree Master Plan that fall outside the realm of the City's "Tree Crew." This includes working with property owners to plant street trees, scheduling plantings with our contractor, tracking replant requirements for approved heritage tree application, managing volunteer tree plantings; performing outreach, and education for Heritage Trees; performing analysis and tracking of the City's tree inventory; and providing functional and technical direction to developers, permit applicants, and contractors related to tree maintenance, tree protection, and general arboricultural practices. Since Matt Feisthamel filled this position two years ago, the Forestry Coordinator has become a vital part of the Forestry Team and supporting the goals of the Community Tree Master Plan.

5. Can information about heritage replacement strategies and requirements be added to the publicly posted notices?

The postings are meant to convey information about the application and process for removal. Staff does not recommend adding this information to the posting as the practice has been to work with property owners to identify species and locations for replanting. This process is not always completed prior to the Heritage Tree posting.

Item 5.3 – Rengstorff Park Aquatics Center Replacement, Design, Project 18-38 Schematic Design

1. Who are the members of the Development Review Committee (DRC)?

The DRC is comprised of three members: two private architects and a representative from the City's Planning Division of CDD. The members are Linda Poncini (LP), Daniel Glaessl (DG), and Rebecca Shapiro (RS) who is the City of Mountain View Deputy Zoning Administrator.

2. How do the Target Budget of \$16.4M (page 4) and the current cost estimate of \$17.7M (estimate exceeds budget by \$1.3M) relate to the Schematic Design Construction Budget of \$21.9M (page 9)? (Are there incremental items included in the \$21.9M?)

The "Target Budget" and "current cost estimate" represent the estimated construction contract or "bids" for the proposed project from contractors. The "Schematic Design Construction Budget" includes all costs and budgeted contingencies for the project. That number includes all cost elements that the City will need to budget to complete the construction phase of the project, including but not limited to:

- *Construction Contract (or Contractor Costs)*

- *Construction Contingency (10% of item 1 for unforeseen changes)*
- *Construction Management (staff and consultant)*
- *Inspections and testing*
- *Permits*
- *Utility connection fees*
- *Fixtures, furnishings and equipment (i.e. tables, desks, chairs, computers, audio/visual equipment, etc)*
- *Moving Costs (in and out of the existing facility & temp storage costs)*
- *Public Art @ 1% of Construction Contract*
- *City Administration overhead @ 6.5% of all costs*

3. Does “Perimeter and site fencing should be visually open” imply see-through fencing with no wind screens?

The DRC guidance and staff recommendation was to provide as visually open a perimeter fencing solution as feasible to avoid the appearance of exclusivity while also allowing the facilities users to enjoy the beautiful park setting. Staff can explore if the facility would benefit from portions of the perimeter having a tighter wind-screen mesh material, however completely surrounding the perimeter in more opaque materials will have an adverse aesthetic impact and visually separate the pools from the rest of the park. The site design does already benefit from wind protection on the westerly side from the building as well as dense mature trees at multiple points along the perimeter.

4. The water slide appears to be different in the schematic design. Did this change?

The slide shown in the Schematic Design Package represents the re-use of the existing slide - which is the baseline scope of the project. The Conceptual Design diagrams showed the potential new add-alternate slide. A new slide with a different configuration will be included as an "add-alternate" in the final design package used for bidding out to contractors.

5. How was the reduction in site acreage from 2.4 acres to 2.2 acres accomplished? Would it be possible to show an “overlay” graphic that outlines the difference in perimeters/boundaries of the prior and current plans?

The reduction was achieved primarily by adjusting the position of the perimeter fence inward and closer to the pools. The requested graphic will be included in the presentation at the meeting.

6. By formula (using the 14” diameter), trees #1 and #3 would seem to fall below the 48” Heritage tree mark. Did a true and accurate measure of the circumference put them above the threshold?

Your observation is correct. The diameter dimensions shown on Table 2.0 were taken in error from the Civil site survey. The more relevant and accurate source should have been the arborist report which identified the same trees with more accurate diameter

measurements at 54" above natural grade. The determination of Heritage Tree status on this site was dictated solely by the Arborist Report - not the Civil Survey.

Table 2.0: Heritage Tree Impacts (corrected)

#	Tree Tag No.	Tree Diameter @ 54" Above Grade	Type
1	23684	14" 16.2"	Chinese Tallow
2	23698	18" 19.0"	Callery Pear
3	23717	14" 17.0"	Queen Palm
4	23728	24" 27.4"	London Plane

7. Can you clarify the situation with the trees saved in the Crisanto parking lot? Will the lot not be graded? How will this affect the trees?

The majority of the existing median island will be retained as will the trees in the middle of the existing parking lot. The current design does not call for regrading of this area - only cosmetic repairs and modifications needed for proper drainage.

8. The planting environment for the Crisanto parking lot trees is very bad. Can it be improved?

Staff will review the existing conditions and incorporate City arborist recommended enhancements as feasible.

9. Are extra parking spaces being added to the parking lot (over and above what had been planned)? Can the "found" extra space be dedicated to green space/extra trees?

No the current design has a slightly lower parking count than initially targeted. The existing parking count is 48 spaces (including two accessible spaces). The conceptual design sought to add between 8 to 10 spaces. The proposed schematic design allows for up to 54 spaces (or +6).

While, the 4 spaces in the "found" space are noted as overflow in the schematic design, they are not in an area conducive to added "green" space. This exiting ramp is at the nexus of multiple paths coming from the park as well as the Family BBQ area. As noted in the memo, this is also a large maintenance vehicle access point. While seldom used, it is desirable to retain this feature in the event larger maintenance vehicles require access to the park.

10. Are there negative environmental consequences to losing the bioswales?

No. The proposed design will still use bio-retention basins as required to meet the storm water treatment measures for the project - just in different locations and sizes. As noted

in the memo, the larger retention basins in the initial schematic design scheme were dictated by the sunken pools and revised grading of the site.

11. Is the San Antonio area bearing the entire cost brunt of the project (which is a city-wide project)? What is its park/inhabitants ratio?

Staff is planning to cover the entire cost of the project from the San Antonio Planning Area. While this project is considered a City-wide project, most of the available in-lieu fees are in the San Antonio Parks and Open Space Area. The only other areas with a significant amount of fees available are also below the 3 acres per 1,000 residents goal. Attached to the PRC questions is a table of the current available fees by parks and open space area as well as each area's current parks ratio.

The San Antonio Planning Area currently has 1.34 acres per 1,000 residents and as you can see, the ration will be improved with new parks scheduled in the near future.

August Monthly Report

1. How quickly do lap swim appointment slots fill up?

Lap swim appointments are available for sign up two weeks ahead on the hour for that hour (i.e. if a resident looks for appointments at 10am, the 10am time slot for appointments for two weeks out would be available). Within about 15 minutes, the 11 appointment spots available for each hour become reserved. Appointments do become available for various days/times if someone with an appointment cancels or reschedules.

2. What is "wetting agent"?

Soils tend to become hydrophobic and not allow water to penetrate. Wetting agents help increase the spreading and penetrating properties of a liquid by lowering its surface tension. Staff typically use a combination of aerification and wetting agent applications as a water conservation tool for problematic soils.

PARK LAND DEDICATION FEES

PROJECTS	UNRESTRICTED	CENTRAL	GRANT	MIRAMONTE	RENGSTORFF	SAN ANTONIO	STIERLIN	SYLVAN-DALE	THOMPSON	WHISMAN	N BAYSHORE	TOTAL
2016-17	\$0.00	\$74,510.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,225,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,299,510.00
2017-18	\$0.00	\$9,600.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$8,022,000.00	\$4,800.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$8,036,400.00
2018-19	\$569,511.83	\$211,200.00	\$42,000.00	\$0.00	\$72,450.00	\$5,553,000.00	\$9,600.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$219,300.00	\$0.00	\$6,677,061.83
2019-20	\$1,414,250.92	\$161,400.00	\$226,500.00	\$0.00	\$433,500.00	\$16,062,400.00	\$9,600.00	\$0.00	\$4,800.00	\$3,900,000.00	\$0.00	\$18,247,650.92
2020-21	\$197,208.33	\$5,712,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,800.00	\$0.00	\$4,800.00	\$17,184,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$23,093,208.33
TOTAL UNCOMMITTED:	\$2,180,971.08	\$6,168,710.00	\$268,500.00	\$0.00	\$510,750.00	\$30,862,400.00	\$28,800.00	\$17,184,000.00	\$4,800.00	\$4,119,300.00	\$0.00	\$57,353,831.08
TOTAL COMMITTED:	\$227,310.00	\$0.00	\$237.50	\$201,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$429,047.50
OPEN SPACE ACQUISITION:	\$478,080.11	\$2,139,720.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,863,105.09	\$4,390,757.00	\$2,718,000.00	\$761,414.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$13,351,076.20
TOTAL IN FUND:	\$2,886,361.19	\$8,308,430.00	\$268,737.50	\$201,500.00	\$510,750.00	\$33,725,505.09	\$4,419,557.00	\$19,902,000.00	\$766,214.00	\$4,119,300.00	\$0.00	\$71,133,954.78

APPENDIX 1

PARK/SCHOOL OPEN SPACE LOCATION, ACREAGE AND ACRES PER PERSON

Planning Area	2010 Pop Estimate	Existing Parks/ School Sites	Type of Park	Total Open Space Acres	Open Space Acres Owned by City	Open Space Acres owned by School District	Acres per 1,000 persons
		Future Parks/ School Sites					
Central	11,318	Castro	School/Park	4.18	0.00	4.18	2.06 (2.03)
		Dana	Mini	0.42	0.42	0.00	
		Eagle	Neighborhood	5.17	5.17	0.00	
		Fairmont	Mini	0.34	0.34	0.00	
		Landels	School/Park	8.49	3.27	5.22	
		Mariposa	Mini	0.61	0.61	0.00	
		Mercy/Bush	Mini	0.65	0.65	0.00	
		Pioneer	Neighborhood	3.15	3.15	0.00	
		Villa Street	Mini	0.40	0.40	0.00	
				23.41	14.01	9.40	
Grant	5,424	Cooper	School/Park	11.01	5.19	5.82	6.34
		Huff	School/Park	6.50	0.00	6.50	
		Mountain View High	School	16.86	0.00	16.86	
				34.37	5.19	29.18	
Miramonte	9,657	Gemello	Mini	0.48	0.48	0.00	6.42
		Bubb	School/Park	9.18	3.45	5.73	
		Cuesta	Community	32.56	32.56	0.00	
		Graham	School/Park	9.54	2.89	6.65	
		McKelvey	Neighborhood	4.27	4.27	0.00	
		Springer	School/Park	5.50	0.00	5.50	
		Varsity	Mini	0.48	0.48	0.00	
				62.01	44.13	17.88	
North Bayshore (Regional)	817	Dog Park	Dog Park	0.59	0.59	0.00	983.1
		Charleston	Neighborhood	6.48	6.48	0.00	
		Shoreline	Regional	753.00	753.00	0.00	
		Stevens Creek Trail	Regional	43.13	43.13	0.00	
				803.20	803.20	0.00	
Rengstorff	6,577	Sierra Vista	Mini	0.80	0.80	0.00	0.44 (0.31)
		Heritage	Mini	1.22	1.22	0.00	
		Wyandotte	Mini	0.88	0.88	0.00	
				2.90	2.02	0.00	
San Antonio	13,951	Del Medio	Mini	0.38	0.38	0.00	1.95 (1.34)
		Klein	Mini	1.36	1.36	0.00	
		Rengstorff	Community	16.92	16.92	0.00	
		Fayette	Mini	1.30	0.00	0.00	
		Mora-Ortega	Mini	0.80	0.80	0.00	
		400 San Antonio	Mini	0.40	0.40	0.00	
		LASD Fields	School/Park	4.00	0.00	4.00	
		CA/Showers	Mini	2.00	2.00	0.00	
				27.16	21.86	4.00	
Stierlin	9,083	Crittenden	School/Gym	7.72	00.0	7.72	2.31 (2.15)
		Jackson	Mini	0.77	0.77	0.00	
		Rex Manor	Mini	0.41	0.41	0.00	
		San Veron	Mini	2.08	2.08	0.00	
		Stevenson/	School/Park				
		Theuerkauf		8.54	1.20	7.34	
		555 Middlefield	Mini	1.48	1.48	0.00	
				21.00	5.94	15.06	
Sylvan/Dale	6,396	Sylvan	Neighborhood	8.37	8.37	0.00	1.41 (1.31)
		355 Evelyn	Mini	0.68	0.68	0.00	
				9.05	9.05	0.00	
Thompson	2,541	Monta Loma	School/Park	5.67	0.00	5.67	2.56
		Thaddeus	Mini	0.83	0.83	0.00	
				6.50	0.83	5.67	

**Park/School Open Space
Location, Acreage and Acres Per Person**

Whisman	8,627	Whisman	School/Park	8.60	4.35	4.25	2.18
		Slater	School/Park	3.39	0.00	3.39	(1.79)
		Magnolia	Mini	0.92	0.92	0.00	
		Chetwood	Mini	0.86	0.86	0.00	
		Creekside	Mini	0.78	0.78	0.00	
		Devonshire	Mini	0.86	0.86	0.00	
		Evandale	Mini	0.27	0.27	0.00	
		S Whisman	Mini	2.76	2.76	0.00	
		355 Middlefield	Mini	0.40	0.40	0.00	
				18.84	11.33	7.51	
TOTAL w/ North Bayshore	74,391			1,008.44 (993.07)	917.43 (908.24)	88.83 (84.83)	13.55 (13.35)
TOTAL w/o North Bayshore	73,574			205.24 (189.87)	114.23 (105.04)	88.83 (84.83)	2.79 (2.58)