

# City Council Questions

## June 18, 2019 Council Meeting

### ITEM 6.1 BELOW-MARKET-RATE HOUSING PROGRAM PHASE 2 MODIFICATIONS

1. Would a developer be likely to do more than 15% BMR units for rowhouses/townhouses, even if the purchase price could go up to 120% or 150% of AMI? What would be the incentive to do this?

Based on additional testing of the option for a higher requirement for this product type per Council input, the 15% BMR requirement at a weighted average of 100% AMI (with a range of 80%-120% AMI) pencils slightly better than the option of a 20% BMR requirement at a weighted average of 120% AMI (with a range of 80%-150% AMI). As a result, a developer might not select the 20% option even if the purchase price could go up to 150% AMI. However, the economics could change over time.

2. Which two EPC Commissioners were absent from this meeting?

Chair Baird and Commissioner Hehmeyer were absent.

3. What happens to the BMR requirements if there is a mix of unit types in a for sale development and one or both types has a unit count of less than seven? For example, what if there are four rowhouses, and 20 stacked flats? Or what if there are 10 townhouses and five single family homes? Or what if there are three townhouses and three single family homes?

The BMR on-site requirement would apply to the project as a whole if the total unit count (inclusive of all product types) is seven or more. Staff would review the application with the developer and incorporate BMR on-site units that meet the requirements of the program, including proportionality of BMR units relative to the market rate units. If a for-sale project has two product types, such as four rowhouses and 20 stacked flats, staff would work with the applicant to meet the intent of the BMR program and what the four BMR on-site units (15% requirement x 24 units = 3.6 units, rounded up to 4) should be. This process of working with the applicant would apply to any other combination of product types with a total unit count of seven or more. A project with a total unit count of less than seven has the option of paying in-lieu fees for the fractional unit.

4. Can you show a summary of the product types and recommended BMR elements?

See attached chart.

### ITEM 6.2 ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 2019-20 BUDGETS, APPROPRIATIONS LIMIT, FEE MODIFICATIONS, AND FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019-20 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS, AND PROJECTS 20-59 AND 24-40

1. I'm not certain I understand staff's recommendation for the Community Outreach Coordinator. Is the new recommendation the original 0.5 FTE (ongoing) plus 0.5 FTE (limited-period), for a total of 1.0 FTE?

**Yes, staff's recommendation is for a total 0.50 FTE limited-period Community Outreach Coordinator (adding 0.25 FTE to the original recommendation of 0.25 FTE limited-period) to supplement the existing 0.50 FTE ongoing Community Outreach Coordinator in the base budget.**

#### **ITEM 7.1 TIMING OF FUTURE GATEKEEPER APPLICATION HEARING**

1. What does staff think about developers paying for additional staff time to work on Gatekeepers to get them done earlier?

**It is not as simple as just providing for additional staff time. Even if additional staff could be secured, that would not happen immediately and new staff would need to get up to speed, and management, as well as possibly other departments, would need to be involved in a complex Gatekeeper.**

2. Is there any way or any good reason to let Gatekeepers forward earlier if developers pay additional fees to get them done?

**Similar to one above, additional fees does not really address capacity issues.**

3. Specifically, what does staff think about Mr. Zappettini paying for additional staff time to work on his Gatekeeper project in the Terra Bella area?

**See one and two above. While master planning the area makes sense, the issue is capacity throughout the organization and paying for additional planning staff does not fully resolve it, unless Council altered other priorities.**

4. If a Master Plan conforms to a Precise Plan, does it need a gatekeeper application?

**No it would not.**

#### **ITEM 7.2 EL CAMINO REAL STREETScape PLAN, PROJECT 16-67**

1. The staff report says that the "Streetscape Plan will include implementation strategies for the three pedestrian crossings, bikeway implementation, and **other streetscape improvements.**" What are details on the other streetscape improvements? Typical streetscape improvements include trees, landscaping, wayfinding signage, human-scaled lighting improvements, public art, differentiated paving and street furniture. Is there a plan for more tree planting, differentiated paving or any other streetscape improvements?

**Other proposed streetscape improvements include street trees, accent trees at intersections, shrubs in planting strips, street lights, pedestrian-scale lights, benches, bike racks on blocks over 1000 feet or near intersections at public/private plazas, and trash receptacles near benches. Council will see more of these design concepts and details when the Draft Streetscape Plan is brought to City Council in fall 2019.**

2. Can we have consistent wayfinding signage for the new parking arrangements?

**Vehicles currently parking on the street would be expected to use the parking lots and parking structures on-site for the businesses they are visiting, consistent with the zoning code to accommodate parking needs on-site. These parking lots or their driveways are generally visible from the street. Wayfinding signage can be considered if there is a location where the parking structure/lot is only accessible from a side street.**

3. According to the staff report the El Monte/El Camino Real intersection has the most substantial proposed intersection changes including a new plaza and a “placemaking pedestrian or bike facility” on that new plaza. Can you describe the “placemaking pedestrian or bike facility” in more detail? What will the new plaza consist of? Although plazas are defined as public squares, in Figure 6 it looks mostly like a lot of concrete with three trees. Can it have more landscaping, bioswales, more trees, differentiated paving, etc.?

**The Streetscape Plan is identifying the land area that could be converted into a plaza with the intersection reconfiguration. The Plan’s scope of work does not include developing the design details for the plaza. The Plan will, however, note that some of the design goals for the plaza will be to ensure it has placemaking features, including green infrastructure elements (such as permeable paving, rain gardens) and public art, and a bicycle and pedestrian connection between El Camino Real and the El Monte/Ednamary Way intersection. This new public plaza would be designed as part of a future Capital Improvement Project (CIP) for reconfiguring the El Camino Real/El Monte intersection, using a collaborative process that incorporates public input.**

4. What are the two dashed black lines running through the “plaza?”

**The dash lines represent the concept of a multiuse bike/pedestrian pathway as part of the new plaza. The actual alignment and design of this pathway would be determined as part of a future CIP plaza design process.**

5. The staff report says that some streetscape improvements, including landscape improvements, “are expected to be implemented at the parcel level in conjunction with development.” Can these be coordinated and consistent with an eye toward improving the pedestrian and biking experience and thus encouraging increased walking and biking?

**The Streetscape Plan will provide design standards for a coherent and consistent landscape that supports the pedestrian and biking experience along El Camino Real. Private developers will be required to design their frontages along El Camino Real consistent with the Streetscape Plan. In addition, any projects for El Camino Real designed and implemented by the City will follow the Streetscape Plan.**

6. According to Wikipedia, "Some motorist confusion has been reported at newly installed HAWK beacons. When first introduced to an area, enforcement and public education are needed until users understand how the beacon works." Does Public Works plan any public education or do you know if Caltrans plans any public education? Is any initial enforcement planned?

**Public Works will coordinate with Caltrans and the Police Department on public noticing, education, and enforcement efforts for the new HAWK beacon being installed on El Camino Real.**

7. The staff report says the City will widen existing 8' sidewalks to 12', if 4' easements are granted by adjacent property owners on El Camino. Has there been any problem having easements granted?

**A 4-foot easement from properties receiving new development approvals is required under the El Camino Real Precise Plan. The City has allowed some remodel projects to proceed without the easement.**

8. What is the El Monte Avenue intersection slip ramp?

**A slip ramp occurs when the right turn lane is separated from the through lanes at an intersection by a curbed "pork chop" or land area. This allows vehicles to turn right at the intersection without being controlled or slowed down at the intersection, which can create conflicts for bicyclists and pedestrians crossing the slip ramp. The slip ramp from eastbound El Camino Real at El Monte is particularly long with a large land area dividing the right turning vehicles from the signalized intersection on El Camino Real.**

9. Is Caltrans repaving ECR between Highway 237/Grant Road and Sylvan?

**Caltrans repaved El Camino Real between Highway 237/Grant Road and Sylvan Avenue between 2012 and 2014. They will not be repaving this segment as part of the upcoming project.**

10. What is the timing of "later" when it comes to when various segments would be done?

**The timing of bikeway improvements for the segments west of Rengstorff Avenue and east of Sylvan Avenue will depend on when the cities of Los Altos, Palo Alto, and/or Sunnyvale are ready to implement bikeway projects for their portions of El Camino Real. Sunnyvale and Palo Alto have some planning efforts underway in support of adding bikeway facilities to El Camino Real but Los Altos is not currently pursuing any such planning efforts. At this time, staff cannot estimate the likely timing for these segments.**

**As noted in the Council report, the segments between Rengstorff Avenue and Castro Street have six businesses that experience some overflow parking onto the street at certain times of the day or week. The timing of bikeway implementation will be depend on either redevelopment of these properties or a Council policy decision to move forward with removing the on-street parking and implementing the bikeways. Another timing factor for this segment will be funding and staffing capacity. Should the Council support staff's recommendation to proceed with Castro Street to Sylvan Avenue in the near term, the Rengstorff to Castro segment will have to wait until Fiscal Year 2024-25 or later as part of the next 5-year CIP.**

11. In the fiscal impact section, the timing of the projects is different than earlier in the staff report. It seems like the third bullet point projects should be in 2021-22 and the second bullet point projects should be in 2022-23. Can staff put together a simple table of the segments in terms of the years they might be done and the associated cost to the City?

The El Camino Real bikeway projects included in the City’s Proposed 5-Year CIP for Fiscal Year 2019-20 through Fiscal Year 2023-24 are placeholders. Below is a table indicating how these placeholder CIPs may be revised once an agreement is reached with Caltrans on what they will include in their paving project:

<i>CIP FY</i>	<i>Funding (millions)</i>	<i>Placeholder Project Description</i>	<i>Potential Revised Project Description</i>
2019-20	\$1.3	Design of El Camino Real Bike Improvements	Design of Bike Improvements on El Camino Real between Castro and Sylvan
2021-22	\$3.3	Construction of bike improvements from Rengstorff to Shoreline/Miramonte	<p><u>FY 2021-22 and 2022-23 CIPs combined into:</u>            Construction of bike improvements from Castro to Sylvan/Americana and pedestrian improvements (compatible with Caltrans’ paving project) for all of El Camino Real within City jurisdiction.</p> <p>Construction would begin in Summer 2022 making it possible to use both FY 2021-22 and 2022-23 funding for a cooperative agreement with Caltrans.</p> <p>If Caltrans will not include installing bike improvements from Highway 237/Grant Road to Sylvan Avenue as part of their repaving project, a portion of this funding would be allocated to a City project to install the bike lanes for this segment in the same year.</p>
2022-23	\$3.1	Construction of bike improvements from Calderon/Phyllis to Sylvan/Americana	

12. Does Caltrans have to approve everything we want to do, such as bike lanes and removal of parking?

Yes, Caltrans must approve all improvements on El Camino Real. Their engineers will need to either design or approve the design of the bike lanes. Although Caltrans needs to approve removing parking, Caltrans staff has informed us that they consider on-street parking to be a local issue. They need the City Council to adopt a resolution to designate No Parking on El Camino Real and they will approve it.

13. Can intersection improvements include “leading pedestrian” signals (so it turns to walk for pedestrians before it turns green for cars)?

Caltrans also owns and operates the traffic signals. The City can request “leading pedestrian” signal timing plans as part of intersection improvements but it will be up to their traffic signal operations staff of whether to implement in terms of overall impact on operations.

<b>Product Type</b>	<b>BMR % Requirement</b>	<b>Weighted Average Income Target</b>	<b>AMI Range</b>	<b>Income Range (1-person HH)</b>	<b>Rent Range (1-person HH)</b>	<b>Income Range (4-person HH)</b>	<b>Rent Range (4-person HH)</b>
<b>Rentals (All)</b>	15% on-site	65% AMI	50% AMI - 120% AMI	\$51,250 - \$110,400	\$1,280/mo - \$2,760/mo	\$73,150 - \$157,700	\$1,830/mo - \$3,940/mo

<b>Product Type</b>	<b>BMR % Requirement</b>	<b>Weighted Average Income</b>	<b>AMI Range</b>	<b>Income Range (1-person HH)</b>	<b>Purchase Range (1-person HH)</b>	<b>Income Range (4-person HH)</b>	<b>Purchase Range (4-person HH)</b>
<b>Ownership (excluding Rowhouse/Townhouse)</b>	15% on-site	100% AMI	80% AMI - 120% AMI	\$72,250 - \$110,400	\$208,000 - \$350,000	\$103,900 - \$157,700	\$326,000 - \$530,000
<b>Ownership - Only Rowhouse/Townhouse (Option A)</b>	15% on-site	100% AMI	80% AMI - 120% AMI	\$72,250 - \$110,400	\$208,000 - \$350,000	\$103,900 - \$157,700	\$326,000 - \$530,000
<b>Ownership - Only Rowhouse/Townhouse (Option B)</b>	20% on-site	120% AMI	80% AMI - 150% AMI	\$72,250 - \$138,000	\$208,000 - \$450,000	\$103,900 - \$197,125	\$326,000 - \$660,000