

City Council Questions

December 7, 2021 Special City Council Meeting

ITEM 4.9 California Street (West) Complete Street Improvements, Pilot, Project 21-40? Authorize Professional Services Agreement

1. Is there anything the Council can do to speed up implementation of each phase, including expanding the scope of the project to include additional segments of California St?

This pilot phase is an opportunity for staff to implement temporary improvements, learn how these measures perform along the focused segment and receive feedback from pedestrians, cyclists, drivers, residents and business owners. Staff will be working with the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee to evaluate the effectiveness and success of the pilot phase, including identifying modifications, as needed. A 12-month duration for this pilot will allow time for staff to gather data and receive input before implementing measures to additional portions of California Street. This pilot phase will set the groundwork to be able to implement additional pilot and/or permanent measures and expand the scope along the corridor more quickly.

ITEM 4.11 Shuttered Venue Operators Grant Award

1. Are any other venues, non-profits, or other eligible parties in Mountain View benefiting from this relief program? Did the City help promote it to eligible agencies and organizations?

Staff was aware that a number of organizations were applying for this grant opportunity. In fact, some of those organizations reached out to CPA staff for information related to their own application process. According to the US Small Business Association's website nine (9) grants were awarded in Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Palo Alto, and Los Altos. MVCPA Client organizations receiving grants include TheatreWorks Silicon Valley, Chamber Music San Francisco, Lamplighters Music Theatre, Pocket Opera, and Smuin Ballet.

Staff did not actively promote the opportunity with other agencies or organizations due to heavy coverage in the trade/industry media at the time as well as hearing from others that were already applying.

ITEM 6.1 Gateway Master Plan, General Plan Amendment for 1555 Plymouth Street, and North Bayshore Precise Plan Amendments

1. Are projects consistent with the Gateway Master Plan subject to the SB330 limitations on the number of public hearings?

Yes

2. On page 16 of the staff report, please confirm that the 200,000 sf of retail included other uses such as entertainment. How much has retail really been reduced if done on an apples-to-apples comparison?

The 200,000 s.f. reduced retail alternative included other uses such as entertainment. The feasibility analysis evaluated 100,000 square feet of theater/entertainment and 100,000 square feet of retail/active/small business space. The 100,000 square feet of retail/active/small business space could include fitness uses, although at a smaller scale than what was originally proposed by SyWest.

The minimum amount of ‘traditional’ retail was recommended to be reduced from 100,000 square feet to 50,000 square feet based on comments at the Council study session in 2019 regarding mandating a minimum, and to provide more land use flexibility and viability. The plan thus requires a minimum amount of ground floor retail (50,000 square feet) while allowing a flexible amount of retail/entertainment uses of up to 300,000 square feet to provide maximum property owner flexibility. Since the square footage amounts have been reviewed for viability and flexibility, staff does not recommend adding other uses such as live/work, and other uses.

The Plan’s minimum requirement of 50,000 square feet of ground floor retail will help activate building frontages and the streetscape. To make streets more vibrant, the Plan uses several strategies, including new smaller blocks; new pedestrian and bike infrastructure adjacent to buildings; ‘key’ corners where special architectural building treatments are required; requiring retail frontage along a minimum of 70% of building frontages in key identified areas; allowing active land uses on ground floors; and requiring active spaces on ground floor office and residential buildings to include uses such as public plazas, pedestrian entries connecting to open spaces, entry lobbies, common rec rooms, gyms, and cafes.

3. In Attachment 3, page 20, (page 46 of the NBPP) does the open space have to match a specific parcel size?

Yes, GMP.6 sets minimum requirements for each type of open space required.

GMP.6 Publicly Accessible Open Spaces

- (a) A **Central Open Space**, as identified in the Precise Plan, shall be located in the general area shown in Figure 3.4, and shall meet the following requirements:
 - a. Be contained within Blocks 3 and 6.
 - b. Include a minimum area of 30,000 square feet.
 - c. Include a minimum of 16,000 contiguous square feet located on Block 3 with a minimum dimension of 60 feet.
- (b) A **Linear Open Space**, as identified in the Precise Plan, shall be located in the general area shown in Figure 3.4, and shall meet the following requirements:
 - a. Be located along the west side of Blocks 3, 6, and 9.
 - b. Include a combined minimum area of 15,000 square feet.
 - c. Include an average width greater than 30 feet, and a minimum width of 10 feet.
- (c) A **Neighborhood Park** shall be located in the general area shown in Figure 3.4, and shall meet the following requirements:
 - a. Be contained within Blocks 7 and 10, and located at the intersection of Pear Avenue and Joaquin Road.
 - b. Include a minimum area of 20,000 square feet.
 - c. Include a minimum dimension of 100 feet.

4. How much tax revenue will be produced by the build out of the Gateway plan and how much of that will go to the schools?

The staff report notes the Gateway Master Plan will result in a net change of between approximately \$19 - \$23 million in annual property taxes.

Based on the existing EERJPA agreement (that currently expires in 2023) with the City and school districts, the schools would receive two payments. The first one would be based on the prior year property tax payment allocation that has been in place since 2013, which is increased by the annual percentage change in property tax revenues in the Shoreline Community compared to the preceding fiscal year.

In addition to this payment, a second payment would be based on new residential development assessed value growth. Using an estimated amount of growth of \$17 million from new residential development, approximately \$6.6 million would go to the school districts based on the current allocation factors.

In accordance with the terms of the agreement, the City is in discussions with the school districts regarding the possibility of a continued or new agreement.

5. How does Table 3.13-1 "Estimated Student Generation" compare with MVWSD figures?

For our analysis we used student generation rates of 0.171, 0.867, and 0.016 students per multi-family unit (market rate//affordable//micro units respectively). This represents the latest student generation rates we received from the school district.

6. Table 3B what is the circulation factor?

The circulation factor is the amount of available parking spaces in a parking garage, including the number of cars entering/exiting parking spaces and the garage.

7. What is the status of the Recycled Water CIPs mention in Scharf & Wheeler report? ES-2

The Recycled Water capital improvement projects in the Scharf & Wheeler report are not currently in the City's 5-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP). They are being evaluated as part of the Recycled Water Feasibility Study Update along with other potential CIP projects and alternative to consider in the expansion of the recycled water distribution system. A Council Study Session is planned for Q1 2022 for staff to seek Council input on the alternatives and prioritizing projects.

8. Interested in promoting use of recycled water with dual plumbing in residential units. Where would that fit?

Google's Charleston East project was subject to the recycled water requirement due to its size. This requirement is for any new non-residential building over 25,000 square feet.

The code resides in the CPC code with the Building Division, but is jointly enforced with Public Services.

9. The staff reports says the “Complete Neighborhood Area Requirement... requires Bonus FAR applicants to include new residential uses as part of their proposals since residential uses are a key qualifying criterion in the Bonus FAR Guidelines and are only allowed within complete neighborhoods. This approach provides a “carrot” in the form of valuable office FAR that can be used to help offset the cost of proposed residential development.” But with remote work and the expected densification of office use do we need to recalculate the amount of housing needed per square foot of office?

The NBSPP, unlike the East Whisman Precise Plan, did not establish a minimum required ratio of number of housing units per square foot of office. The strategy in North Bayshore (amended Precise Plan) was to use the Bonus FAR program to help incentivize new residential unit construction, with the goal of building a net new 3.6 million square feet of office and 9,850 units at build-out of the Precise Plan. The City has only roughly 250,000 s.f. of remaining Bonus FAR. Council has the flexibility during the Bonus FAR process to approve Bonus FAR applications with a range of potential new residential units.

It is unclear to what extent telecommuting will affect the need for housing since companies have the flexibility to change policies based on their needs. The goal of the Bonus FAR allocation is to achieve the vision in the North Bayshore Precise Plan.

10. Do I understand correctly that retail has been reduced for feasibility reasons? How does this effect retail viability? In other words, how will it affect the streetscape? Will retail strips be short and spotty and thus surrounded by pedestrian dead zones? Can we change that using live/work, narrow retail, apartment gyms open to public membership and other solutions to make streets more vibrant?

See response to Question 2

ITEM 7.1 North Bayshore Circulation Study

1. What actual (not modeled) travel pattern data do we have to support the recommendation that Shoreline Boulevard and Rengstorff Ave gateway measurements should be combined in order to more closely reflect actual travel patterns?

We do not have specific data in part because of the pandemic traffic conditions. Traffic modeling has indicated that many North Bayshore trips could utilize either gateway to reach many office destinations and the District Parking as currently planned.

2. Looking at page 10 of Attachment 1, it does not look like vehicles use Rengstorff when Shoreline has a long queue of vehicles. So what would this change?

The figure on page 10 is based on gateway monitoring data. It shows that traffic backups occur on both Rengstorff and Shoreline in both the AM and PM peak periods. As traffic demand grows, some drivers may decide or may be directed by navigation systems or other apps to use an alternate gateway to reduce travel time. The monitoring is a one-week snapshot of counts that may be subject to an unexpected surge or reduction at one gateway and may not capture the lag time in drivers choosing to change their travel route or time of day to pass through the gateway. Combining these two alternative gateways will provide a clearer picture of the level of capacity remaining available.

3. Which office buildings are expected to remain and not be torn down and rebuilt into either residential buildings or new office buildings? How many sf do these buildings that are expected to remain contain? What percent of the total sf of office buildings in the NBPP area do they represent?

Staff does not have this type of information available because we do not know what various property owners and developers in the NBPP area will propose. For the Google Master Plan area, Google proposes to demolish all the existing buildings within the Master Plan area except an existing approximately 84,960 square foot office building at 1201 Charleston Road, which is proposed to be used as a community space or house proposed district utility systems in the future. For the remainder of the NBPP area, with all the Bonus FAR allocated, the only remaining development opportunities for existing properties would be to develop to the allowed base FAR of 0.45, or request a Gatekeeper authorization for additional office FAR. Any development proposing an addition over 1,000 square feet, including within the base 0.45 FAR, will be required to submit a TDM plan to achieve at least the 45% SOV rate in compliance with the NBPP and potentially a lower rate should Council approved the Circulation Study recommendation for a 35% to 40% SOV rate for new commercial development.

4. What are the current financial penalties for not meeting SOV goals? What level is staff thinking would be more appropriate?

For approved projects such as Microsoft and Charleston East, the penalties were \$100,000 of the first 1% above their project's trip cap (which is based on their SOV target) and \$50,000 for each additional percentage point. A potential alternative approach is included in Attachment 4 TDM Peer Review that includes a tier of penalties based on total number of employees, with the penalties higher for the larger employers. The proposed rates for the largest employers would be at least 50% higher than the current rates.

5. On page 9 of the staff report, is the peak period a floating peak period, or a fixed period?

The peak period is a three-hour period with the heaviest usage. Currently, that is 8-11 in the AM and 4-7 in the PM. If traffic patterns change, the peak period could be adjusted. It was previously shifted from 7-10 in the AM to 8-11.

6. What is the rationale for making the peak period trip cap, three times the peak hour?

Gateway capacity is function of the physical configuration of the transportation infrastructure, which would be unchanged during the peak period – all three hours have the same capacity per hour. As a result, the traffic consultant recommended that the three-hour peak period capacity be three times the peak hour capacity.

7. Why are the CRAG changes only impacting the pm gateway capacity?

The traffic consultant analysis concluded that in the AM, without the Rengstorff ramp realignment, traffic would be constrained in reaching the CRAG intersection by current merging conflicts. The CRAG changes in the morning would only provide benefits in conjunction with the ramp realignment.

8. If operational details and specifics are removed from the NBPP, would changes to operational details and specifics come to council for changes? What specific operational details and specifics would be removed?

Operation requirements could be included in separate transportation administrative guidelines, similar to the current North Bayshore residential and non-residential TDM guidelines and Affordable Housing guidelines. Additionally, conditions of approval specific to each approved development application would have specific trip thresholds based on the requirements and monitoring requirements.

9. There are several recommendations to decide on something at a future point in time. For example, on page 22 of the staff report, bullet point 3, it says a lower SOV rate in the range of 35% to 40% should be established. How will this be established? Who will establish this?

A specific rate would be established for individual projects as a condition of approval on a case-by-case basis.

10. Have any companies paid fines for not reaching their SOV targets? If so, which companies and how much were the fines?

No projects that have been constructed and started reporting have exceeded their site trip thresholds, therefore no fines have been collected.

11. Interested in use of payment for parking as way to control traffic. How can this be incorporated in TMA/is it already incorporated?

Paid parking is listed as one possible tool in the TDM toolkit for employers to achieve their SOV rate requirements. It, along with the converse program called Parking Cash Out, are specifically called out as impactful strategies in Attachment 4 TDM Peer Review. As part of development approvals, the employers/developers are conditioned to achieve the SOV rates using any and all tools necessary to achieve compliance or face financial penalties.

12. It appears staff is recommending congestion pricing over paid parking even though they may have similar outcomes. Why is this? Could we do paid parking instead of congestion pricing?

Staff is not recommending congestion pricing at this time and paid parking, and its converse called Parking Cash Out, are key tools in the TDM toolkit for employers to achieve their SOV rate requirements. As part of development approvals, the City would hold employers/developers accountable for achieving the SOV rates by using any and all tools necessary to achieve compliance or face financial penalties.