

City Council Questions

November 17, 2020 Council Meeting

ITEM 3.1 Traffic Operations Center Feasibility Study, Project 19-51-Overview

1. Once the TOC is established, how difficult is it to move it if there is a better location?

Moving the TOC equipment and furniture (e.g., the video wall, computers, work stations, etc.) would not be that difficult. However, a TOC requires a communication connection to the signals and, if a new location does not have a connection, a capital project may be required to provide this new connection (e.g., install new fiber lines, etc.).

2. How are the existing traffic signals managed without a TOC? Does it vary by type/technology?

The majority of the City's existing traffic signals are not currently proactively managed on a regular basis. Changes to signals are done in the field by a technician in response to resident or staff reporting or as part of timing projects. Some corridors, namely Grant Road and Shoreline Boulevard, have more advanced technologies, such as adaptive signal systems, but have very limited capabilities for remote management.

3. Will we have a phased plan for the TOC, or is it all or nothing right from the start?

The TOC implementation will be phased. The first step would be to establish the TOC itself with limited communication connections to certain signals/corridors, which would be expanded over time as more of the signals are replaced/upgraded and new fiber or other communication lines are installed throughout the City.

4. How much will just the TOC cost for a complete TOC, without replacing all of the existing infrastructure in the field?

The cost estimate for the computers, video wall, and information technology equipment, workstations, etc. is still being developed. It will depend on facility identified and the space and structural modifications needed that are specific to the site.

5. In other cities that have implemented this, have there been concern about cameras and privacy and if so, how have they dealt with them?

It is not uncommon for cities to receive complaints related to privacy invasion of traffic cameras. However, cameras are for monitoring only and do not record ongoing video. Additionally, the quality of video is often not of sufficient resolution to clearly identify individuals.

6. Can the facilities be combined with some other facilities such as the new police building or some other building?

Yes

7. As far as phasing goes what can we do to make sure the first phases enhance and incentivize alternative modes as opposed to just moving SOVs, ride share vehicles and driverless cars around faster?

The first phases will likely primarily consist of preparing the TOC space and hardware modifications at intersections that already have communications to the TOC; the initial maintenance and management improvements will be initially limited to those intersections. Improvements to alternate mode operations will be more feasible as the system expands to other intersections in future phases, with the more advanced signal technology infrastructure and software.

8. Are costs likely to go down over time as more cities adopt this technology and it becomes more standardized and streamlined?

Improved technologies, signal hardware, and construction costs tend to increase over time; therefore, overall costs are not likely to go down.

9. What percent of cities of our size have traffic operation centers with the features specified in this report?

Information on the percentage of cities with TOCs and all the various features is not available. However, other smaller cities in Santa Clara County that have TOCs are Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, Milpitas, Palo Alto, and Cupertino. We don't know the full features of their TOCs, but they have some of the core elements such as communication to their traffic signal network and the ability to make remote adjustments.

ITEM 6.2 44-Unit Condominium Project at 2645 and 2655 Fayette Drive

1. Were there any other public comments at the EPC meeting besides the two cited in the Council staff report?

No other comments were received beyond the two letters that were attached to the report. A representative for one of the groups that submitted a letter spoke at the meeting.

2. Is it possible to have an increase in the tree canopy coverage? If not, why not?

It would be very difficult to have an increase in tree canopy at this site because the proposed building and other non-plantable areas, such as the pool, have a significantly larger footprint than the existing site structures and improvements. Additionally, tree planting options are significantly diminished over a podium as they need to be in planters and the size and weight are limited to manage the structural integrity of the podium.

3. What is the reasoning behind not requesting a General Plan amendment?

A General Plan Amendment is not necessary for the project since it complies with the density of the existing General Plan designation which is High-Density Residential (80 dwelling units per acre). The corresponding General Plan designation for this area of the Precise Plan is Mixed-Use Corridor (60 dwelling units per acre); however, under SB330 the City cannot approve changes which reduce residential densities and the density for the Mixed-Use Corridor designation is less than the maximum density in the existing designation.

4. Are any of the parking spaces tandem spaces? Do any use stackers? Do any use puzzle lifts?

All spaces are standard and there are no tandem, stacker, or lift spaces proposed.

5. It looks like the tree inventory/evaluation was done in 2014. Is it likely that anything would change in six years? Could there be more heritage trees now?

City staff reviewed the non-Heritage trees this week, and determined that none had grown into Heritage size. Since the preparation of the arborist report, four Elms and three White Mulberries located on the adjacent SFPUC property have been removed.

6. Is it typical to consider the HOA reserve fund a public benefit? Have other projects established such funds? Were they considered public benefits?

It is typical for affordable housing costs in excess of City requirements to be considered a public benefit. Because this project is not subject to BMR Phase 2, the HOA reserve is not a requirement. One other development has provided similar funds and they were not included as a public benefit because the project was not required to provide public benefits. However, the amount was deducted from their remainder BMR in-lieu fee.

ITEM 6.3 600 Ellis Street Office Development Project

1. Does the private roof top deck count towards the open space requirements?

Yes, roof decks may count as open space per the EWPP Section 3.3.3 General Open Area Standards which states “Common Useable Open Space and Open Area may be above grade, such as roof decks”.

2. Where do I find the list of the species of trees that are to be planted?

Please see Attachment 4-Project Plans, Sheet L-02, for the proposed plant palette.

3. How would Stormwater Protection areas to meet the open space requirement. What features usable to the public would be included?

The Stormwater Protection contribute to the project’s open space by programming these areas for passive use such as providing butterfly garden, soft gathering plaza, and a bioswale deck overlook. A ped/bike pathway that goes from Fairchild Drive to the east side of the parking structure and along the south side of the parking structure would have a public access easement over it and would be available for the public to use.

4. What will the Parking Management Program consist of? What incentives and policies to manage daily parking demand would be included?

The Parking Management Program will identify a combination of incentives and policies that work to manage the daily demand for parking and shift users to alternate modes as efficiently as possible. Such programs could involve points, awards for joining a commute program, large awards for hitting milestones, or daily charges or incentives. In addition, other incentives could include a parking cash-out program and preferential parking for carpools/vanpools.

5. What are the community benefits that staff recommends?

The project is not a standard Gatekeeper project which seeks to change the General Plan or Zoning designations so a community benefit that typically accompanies such a request is not included. The EWPP

requires a community benefit payment in exchange for additional intensity above 1.0 FAR (Bonus FAR) and this contribution is estimated at \$2,909,475. The community benefit negotiated as part of the DA includes \$200,000 and payment of the future East Whisman Development Impact fees in the estimated amount of \$3,253,550 which would not otherwise have been collected from the developer as the fee has not yet been adopted.

6. Does the extended entitlement period imply that this project may not get done?

No, the requested seven-year DA term is in response to the uncertainty of the development implications of the COVID -19 pandemic and would allow flexibility in the construction timeline for the project.