

Council Questions

December 5, 2023 - Special City Council Meeting

ITEM 3.1 Gatekeeper Process Updates

1. In Table 1: Gatekeeper Volumes, how many applications are duplicates (submitted in multiple authorization hearings)? How many are LASD TDR gatekeepers? Table 1 shows the number of Gatekeeper projects submitted in various years. How many of the projects in 2014 to 2018 were repeat projects? For instance, the Ambra project was submitted multiple times.

Of the 128 Gatekeeper applications received, 14 projects appear more than once (for a total of 36 applications, or 28% of the Gatekeeper applications received).

There were eight (8) LASD TDR Gatekeeper applications that were authorized in 2018 and 2020 by Council.

2. Are privately-initiated conforming rezonings required to go through the Gatekeeper authorization process? What are staff's thoughts about including conforming rezonings as "streamlined" gatekeepers, allowing them to bypass the authorization hearing?

Historically, a privately-initiated rezoning proposing to conform to the General Plan would require a Council Authorization hearing under the current Gatekeeper process. However, Staff has initiated a number of these conforming rezonings as part of the current Housing Element and based on State law, Staff will continue to address these clean-ups. Should an applicant submit a project on a site with nonconforming zoning prior to the City addressing the inconsistency, based on State law, staff will update the zoning in tandem with the project – therefore, not requiring a Gatekeeper process.

3. Can staff propose objective standards for "spot-zoning" and share some examples of "spot-zoning" in Mountain View? Is the Alta Housing 100% affordable housing project on Terra Bella, next to Public Storage, an example of spot-zoning? Is there an exact definition of spot zoning that is not subject to interpretation? If so, what is it? How does the city define "spot-zoning" and "isolated land use"?

There is not a standard definition of spot-zoning. Staff is utilizing the term "spot zoning" to refer to introducing a land use that is completely isolated or incompatible with surrounding uses – such as a residential development introduced midblock within an area of industrial manufacturing.

Some standards to consider include:

- a. The project cannot introduce a land use that directly conflicts with an adjacent use in terms of negative operational or environmental impacts (e.g., significant nighttime commercial operations next to a residential use, odorous activities next to residential use, etc.)
- b. The proposed new land use must align with the goals and policies of the General Plan and/or expands upon an existing adjacent zoning designation.

Staff does not perceive the Alta Housing affordable housing development to be spot-zoning as it is adjacent to a use (personal storage) with no direct or indirect negative impacts to future residents; the project aligned with the City's General Plan goals and policies; and is located adjacent to a mixed-use development with housing under construction at 1001 N. Shoreline Blvd. However, staff will note, individual developments such as the Alta Housing-Public Storage development and 1001 N. Shoreline Boulevard are best introduced within the context of a neighborhood-wide plan (such as a Precise Plan or Master Plan) where amenities, such as public parks or commercial retail services, can be planned for to support residents and employees in the long-run.

While City staff does not believe Mountain View has any significant spot-zoning, an example of an existing spot zone could be 161 to 191 W. Evelyn Avenue, which includes auto repair shops immediately adjacent to multifamily residential. While these sites were not specifically spot-zoned, they represent the historic auto-oriented nature of Evelyn Avenue, which has largely been rezoned to multifamily residential over the decades – leaving a remnant block of auto repair uses.

4. Can staff provide more information about “net-zero buildings and site design?” What are some objective standards the City would use to discern compliance? What is the community benefit value of net-zero buildings and site design?

A net-zero energy buildings is a building that is optimally efficient, and over the course of a year, generates energy onsite, using clean renewable resources, in a quantity equal to or greater than the total amount of energy consumed onsite. This is typically through a combination of renewable energy sources, such as photovoltaic (solar) panels and geothermal heating and cooling. The following objective standard could be used to discern a project's compliance:

- Projected consumed energy is less than or equal to renewable energy generated on-site over the course of a year.

A net-zero energy building can provide various community benefits, including enhancing energy security, maximizing grid capacity so that we are able to electrify existing buildings without putting more pressure on the power grid, and providing potential resiliency benefits if the building provides battery backup systems. Additionally, it allows the City to accelerate its progress toward it's decarbonization and resiliency goals and may provide a model for other sustainable development in the City.

5. For the Community Benefit contribution proposed for smaller projects, what value would staff recommend? Can staff remind the Council how the community benefit fees are calculated for each of the recent precise plans? What is the fee/suggestion for Community Benefits in a few Precise Plans such as East Whisman or ECR? Is it indexed? How so?

While not discussed in the report, Staff's intended approach is to establish a dollar amount per square foot based on the public benefit values already adopted in the East Whisman Precise Plan (\$31.09 per sq. ft. or \$6.22 per sq. ft.; annually increased by Engineering News-Record Construction Cost Index). Other adopted public benefit values in the City include the El Camino Real Precise Plan (\$26.88 per sq. ft.; increased by Consumer Price Index), and San Antonio Precise Plan (\$26.88 per sq. ft.; increased by Consumer Price Index).

These public benefit fees were adopted in tandem with the development of each Precise Plan based on economic analysis completed that determined a proportional amount per square foot (over a certain square footage threshold) that allows a reasonable return for a developer on a range of parcel/project sizes while also allowing the City to receive a portion of the development value increase from redevelopment. Specifically, the fees are applied in each of the Precise Plans on a per square foot basis on new development that exceeds a minimum FAR limit (for example, exceed 0.4 FAR for office or 1.0 FAR for residential in East Whisman Precise Plan).

6. What does incorporating input from the EPC mean? Will the council see the staff recommendation, and any EPC proposed changes noted, but the EPC recommendations do not change the staff recommendation? Or will the EPC proposed changes change the staff recommendation?

Staff anticipates there will be amendments to the Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 36) to accommodate changes in the Gatekeeper procedures as directed by Council at this Study Session. Amendments to Chapter 36 require review by the EPC, who could have suggested modifications to those amendments. Should EPC have recommended modifications, Staff will include that information in the Council Report for consideration by Council.

Unfortunately, at this time, without knowing the potential feedback from EPC, staff cannot confirm if the staff recommendation will be the same or differing from EPC's recommendation. Should there be a difference in recommendations, Staff will make this clear in the Council Report and materials.

7. For split-zoned parcels, what is considered an existing zoning district? For example, if an applicant has a parcel that is zoned R2 and R3-2 and wants the entire parcel zoned R3-4, would that be considered a streamlined project?

When referring to a split-zoned project, the potential Streamlined Gatekeeper category is referring to the project proposing to rezone to match one of the existing zoning designations on the site today. So, if a project site was split-zoned with existing zoning designations of R2 and R3-2 districts, then it would need to propose to rezone the entire project site to either the R2 or R3-2 zoning district in order to be considered a Streamlined Gatekeeper. Rezoning to R3-4 would not match the existing zoning on-site.

8. When did the council decide that there is a need for a branch library?

A branch library was listed as an example of a type of community facilities that may be needed by the City. Typically, the City would conduct a service study to determine the need for a city facility (like a branch library) and potential areas in the City it would be most prudent to locate. There has not been a study to date by the City to determine the need for a branch library. (Note, however, that a future branch library has been discussed in North Bayshore as housing is developed).

9. How would the state density bonus law be factored into the qualifying criteria?

State Density Bonus Law applies to existing zoning and general plan designations on a property and so would not directly relate to the qualifying criteria. A Gatekeeper project, by nature, is proposing to amend the general plan land use designation and/or rezoning, so State Density Bonus would not directly apply.

However, should a Gatekeeper project be approved with a rezoning and the original development proposal is not pursued, then the property owner could propose a State Density Bonus project based on the recently rezoned property. In other words, State Density Bonus Law would come into play only after a Gatekeeper has been approved, the property has been rezoned, and an applicant pursues a new development proposal.

10. How would intensity be measured (e.g., units/acre, FAR)?

Intensity of a project can be measured in units per acre, if a residential development, or by Floor Area Ratio (FAR). How the intensity would be measured is determined on the zoning designation that applies to the project site – for example, residential density is measured by FAR for the El Camino Real Precise Plan (no matter if the project is residential or nonresidential) and in units per acre for the R3 zoning district.

11. If staff suggested a change to the scope of an application, or suggested a city-led policy planning effort, would there be an impact to the gatekeeper application that drove the change? If so, what would the impact be?

If Staff suggested a change in the scope of a Gatekeeper application, it could impact the Gatekeeper proposal. For example, staff could recommend a change in:

- the zoning or general land use designation proposed,
- density or intensity of the project,
- timing of the project proceeding,
- number of properties involved, or
- potentially the site or design of the project.

However, without a particular proposal, Staff can't definitively outline what the impacts may be, as it would be based on the specific Gatekeeper proposal and other factors such as City priorities and site context. The Gatekeeper process is discretionary, and Council can decide how, when, and in what form to consider a project.

12. Figure 1. Gatekeeper Process Options is an excellent depiction of the alternatives. Kudos for developing it. Please add another column or explain at the CC meeting what the time between the 'Submit Formal Planning Application" and the time the project would be presented to the City Council for approval is.

None of the proposed Gatekeeper Process Options alter the time frame of the City's review of Gatekeeper projects. Depending on the type of project proposed and current workload priorities, a Gatekeeper project typically takes 18 to 36 months from submittal of a formal planning application to being presented at a Council public hearing for a final decision.

13. What are the current Gatekeeper Application requirements? A simple list or graphic helpful.

The following materials are currently required for a Gatekeeper application:

1. A signed Planning Application Form.
2. A Gatekeeper application fee (which only covers the authorization hearing).
3. A Project Letter that includes:
 - a. Information on any other studies that have affected the property or area, or the subject of a zoning text amendment, within the last three years.
 - b. Information about community benefits and other contributions provided by the Gatekeeper proposal exceeding minimum requirements.
 - c. Information about General Plan and Council goals served by the request.
 - d. Information about potential fiscal impact of the proposed amendment;
 - e. Any other information that may be helpful to Council;
 - f. A set of plans with a site plan, floor plans, elevations, and conceptual rendering; and
 - g. Consistency with Amendment Authorization Criteria.

14. Where did the 40% for the moderate AMI criteria come from?

This is a suggestion by Staff as a means to support the City's ongoing interest in serving moderate-income residents with workforce housing.

15. The staff report says, "Gatekeeper projects have contributed to supporting the creation of new Precise Plans..." Can you name one or more examples?

Two examples of the City developing Precise Plans based on developer interest include:

- a. the Mayfield Precise Plan was initiated based on interest to redevelop the HP campus.
- b. The South Whisman Precise Plan was initiated based on interest to redevelop the area near the VTA light rail stop to introduce housing.

16. How did a Gatekeeper create the Mountain View Transportation Management Association?

The Samsung office development at 665 Clyde Avenue was a Gatekeeper project proposed prior to the development and adoption of the East Whisman Precise Plan (project approved in 2013). The project had a condition of approval to create the Mountain View Transportation Management Association. The developer continues to be a founding member of the Association.

17. Is staff recommending that the community benefit does not have to be in the area of the project but instead could be somewhere else that the city needs it most? What are the locational assumptions regarding community benefits?

Staff did not include any locational assumptions in the community benefits. If the majority of Council desires there to be locational limitations to community benefits proposed, then Council can provide that direction at this Study Session.

ITEM 6.1 Amendments to Chapter 8 (Buildings), Chapter 25 (Neighborhood Preservation), Chapter 28 (Subdivisions), Chapter 32 (Trees, Shrubs and Plants), Chapter 35 (Water, Sewage and Other Municipal Services), and Chapter 36 (Zoning) of the City Code

1. Shouldn't "Residential Care Home" also be permitted in the CRA Zoning District, as well as in CN and CS where residential uses are permitted? Will this use also be added to Precise Plans?

State Law requires residential care homes in zoning districts where single-family and multifamily residential units are permitted. In the case of the City's zoning standards, single-family homes are permitted in the R1, R2, R3, R4 and RMH zoning districts and in some Precise Plans (such as Evandale and Mayfield); multifamily residential units (as defined in law) are permitted in the R1, R2, R3 and R4 district, in addition to the CRA, CN, and CS zoning districts and Precise Plans.

In re-reviewing the materials, the CRA, CN, and CS zoning districts would be additional zoning districts where residential care homes are allowed as these districts allow multifamily residential units (CN and CS districts allow it specifically under the general plan mixed-use village center land use category). Staff will include this modification as part of Staff's recommendation at the hearing.

Separately, staff is drafting amendments to Precise Plans to align with recent State Laws and Housing Element Programs, which is anticipated to be brought forward to Council in 2024.

2. Did the City solicit stakeholder input or hold a community meeting regarding the discretionary ADU regulations? What input was received by the community?

Staff proposed discretionary updates to the ADU regulations are based on direct experience in implementing the ADU regulations with homeowners, designers, and architects seeking permits to construct ADUs. The updates are clarifying existing regulations based on frequent questions raised to City staff, permitting scenarios seen, and EPC recommendations. As part of annual or biannual zoning code amendments, City staff will frequently use experience in implementing existing regulations to add further clarifications or clean-ups to the zoning code.

3. Was there a community meeting to get feedback regarding the Microenterprise Home Kitchen Operations standards and the Industrial Zone General Development Standards?

Staff did not hold a community meeting to get feedback on Microenterprise Home Kitchen Operations (MEHKO) as the proposed amendments either align with State Law or Staff proposed discretionary amendments based on potential impacts that could reasonably occur with the allowance of outdoor dining on-site. Since the City cannot prohibit on-site dining for MEHKO's, Staff felt it prudent to introduce objective standards to address potential concerns. As these objective standards are discretionary, Council can choose to remove these proposed amendments or alter them further.

4. Can staff share every instance of multiple applications being submitted for review concurrently for the same parcel over the past 10 years? How many applications for the same property do we typically receive? Is this only related to Builder's Remedy projects? When have we had multiple applications for the same project before and why?

There has been one project in recent years with concurrent zoning permit applications submitted for new development at the same project site: 294-296 Tyrella Avenue (which happens to include a builder's remedy application). Multiple concurrent applications have created confusion in the community as to which application is proceeding in the process.

5. The City of Los Altos and the City of Santa Clara consider the intersection of VTA 22 and 522 bus stops as "high quality transit" under AB 2097. What other cities have this interpretation, and what is their justification?

AB 2097 prohibits a public agency from imposing or enforcing minimum automobile parking requirements on a development project, subject to certain exceptions, if the project is located within one-half mile of public transit. "Public transit" is defined in AB 2097 to mean a "major transit stop" as defined in other sections of the Public Resources Code Section to be a site containing an existing rail transit station, ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.

City Staff has directly communicated with MTC on the definition of a "major transit stop" based on AB 2097 and services available in Mountain View, which aligns with the cities of Sunnyvale and Palo Alto. El Camino Real is considered a high-quality transit corridor but is not considered a major transit stop under AB 2097 as it does not currently include two intersecting bus lines at 15-minute intervals that serve as a major transit stop in Mountain View. While Staff cannot speak as to how other cities are choosing to interpret AB 2097 and bus service on El Camino Real, MTC serves as the resource staff consults for guidance on transportation-related legislation. However, it should be noted, since this requirement is based on service levels, should bus services be changed in the future so that parts of El Camino Real (or other areas) meet the major transit stop definition, then the City would adjust to align.

6. Can staff explain how AB 345 is being implemented? How is AB 345 different from AB 1033?

AB 345 requires jurisdictions to allow the sale of an ADU separately from the primary dwelling unit to a qualified buyer in certain limited circumstances, while AB 1033 is an optional process that a city may adopt to allow the separate sale of an ADU more generally, not subject to the same limitations in AB 345. City staff has not received an inquiry by a party to utilize AB 345 yet; however, should a proposal be proposed, staff would coordinate with the owner to allow the separate conveyance – which could be done in a multitude of ways (a deed transfer, a lot line adjustment, or a condominium map).

City staff plans to study AB 1033 as part of Housing Element Program 1.6, related to allowing two-unit subdivisions with SB 9 regulations, and would coordinate specific updates as needed related to AB 345 at that time as well.

7. SEC. 36.12.8075(d) allows not more than 2 detached ADUs on a lot with a multifamily dwelling, but limits height to 16 feet. This seems to conflict with the 18' height limit in SEC. 36.12.9085. Can staff clarify?

This is an error in the posted ordinance. Staff will modify the staff recommendation to align the language with height limits allowed for multifamily residential ADUs.

8. The proposed amendments include a provision stating that enclosed staircases are counted toward the gross floor area of an ADU. Was this previously not the case? Does state law require this regulation, or is this a discretionary decision? If this is discretionary, what caused the addition of this regulation, and what does it achieve?

This requirement of counting the enclosed staircase of an ADU toward the gross floor area has always been a requirement of the regulations and is consistent with State law. The proposed addition of this requirement is intended to explicitly clarify the existing requirement.

9. Can staff provide the Single Family ADU development standards alongside the DUO standards, with an explanation for why there are differences in the treatment of ADUs created through the DUO standards? What are the differences in height limits and design standards between Duos and ADUs?

While DUO developments and ADUs have the same side and rear setback requirements, DUO developments have different requirements as it is treated as a new primary dwelling unit under State law, unlike an ADU which is treated as an accessory unit to a primary dwelling unit. Additionally, the regulations for each type of development are implemented under separate State laws that have differing standards and requirements. State law provisions that created DUO developments allow the City more discretion in establishing development standards than ADU laws. As a result, the Council adopted discretionary height limits for DUO development to align with the height standards of a single-family home (SB 9 did not include a height minimum). Alternatively, ADU law has specific minimum height limits.

Staff's proposed amendments for ADUs are to reflect recent State laws AB 2221, AB 345, and SB 897, with discretionary recommendations on existing regulations based on experience in implementing these regulations. The Council has discretion to further amend the ADU regulations beyond State Law minimums, if desired.

See the table below on the next page for more details.

Development Standard	DUO	ADU
Height Limits	Maximum Building Height: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1st story: 24' - 2nd story: 28' Maximum Wall Plate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1st floor wall plate: 15' - 2nd floor wall plate: 22' <i>(Discretionary)</i>	Max Building Height: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 18', up to 20' to match the roof pitch of existing structure if located near major transit stop. - 16' <i>(State Law)</i>
Balconies	Not permitted. <i>(Discretionary)</i>	Current: Not permitted. Proposed to be permitted. <i>(Discretionary)</i>
Floor Area	Subject to underlying zoning FAR allowances <i>(Discretionary)</i>	850 sq. ft. max for 1 bedroom or less; 1,000 sq. ft. max for 2 bedrooms or more <i>(State Law)</i>
Landscaping Requirements	25% of required front setback to be landscaped. <i>(Discretionary)</i>	None. <i>(State Law)</i>
Parking	1 space per primary unit. ¹ <i>(State Law)</i>	No parking for no bedroom unit; 1 space per unit with 1 bedroom or more. ¹ <i>(State Law)</i>
Setbacks	Front: 20' <i>(Discretionary)</i> Side: 4' <i>(State Law)</i> Rear: 4' <i>(State Law)</i>	Front: Consistent with underlying zoning <i>(Discretionary)</i> Side: 4' <i>(State Law)</i> Rear: 4' <i>(State Law)</i>
¹ Not applicable if located within ½ mile of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor, or if a car-share vehicle parking space is located within one block of the site.		

10. SEC. 36.44.65 permits the ZA or CDD Director to require any application to go through the design review/development review committee process. Is this legally enforceable for SB 35 (now SB 423) and AB 2162? Can projects subject to the Permit Streamlining Act be required to go through the development review committee/design review process? If not, can staff clarify what this language means?

Sec. 36.44.65 describes the City's development review procedures, which include design review and apply to Permit Streamlining Act applications. Project applications submitted pursuant to SB 35 and AB 2162 are subject to streamlined ministerial review and approval, as required by State law, and do not go through the formal development review process, including design review by the DRC. The City has implemented and followed this streamlined ministerial review process for SB 35 and AB 2162 applications submitted and approved to date.

The primary purpose of amendments to this section and others related to design review are to reflect the current role of the DRC in the City's design review process – which is as consulting design professionals under the Zoning Administrator's design review authority.

11. Is DRC review voluntary or mandatory? Where in the municipal code does it say if DRC review is voluntary or mandatory?

Design review is an integral part of the development review process and is mandatory, under the authority of the Zoning Administrator as proposed in Section 36.44.15.b.2 and Section 36.44.20 (Design Review), except for projects subject to streamlined ministerial review. The Zoning Administrator has utilized DRC to support the design review of new construction projects in collaboration with project applicants and the community. Staff's recommended Code updates amend existing sections of the Code which are outdated and conflict with current design review practices by the City, specifically those that require DRC review on a variety of projects, including those identified in Chapters 8 (Buildings), 28 (Subdivision), 32 (Trees, Shrubs and Plants), 35 (Water, Sewage and Other Municipal Services) and 36 (Zoning).

12. SEC. 28.19.20 allows extensions for approved maps if the "subdivider has made a good-faith effort to comply" with the conditions. How is "good-faith effort" defined? Are there objective criteria/standards defined in the municipal code?

The proposed amendments to this section are intended to clarify existing practices regarding the duration a map may be extended by the City. Currently, there are no objective criteria in the code regarding good-faith effort, but typically the City will consider demonstration by the applicant in: making significant progress on building permits, starting construction activity on-site, payment of impact fees, environmental clean-up on the site, and progress on commercial or residential tenant relocation efforts.

13. When is a map extension discretionary, and when is an extension mandatory under the law?

Some map extensions are discretionary if found to be detrimental to the health and safety of the residents of the subdivision or the immediate community; however, the Subdivision Map Act outlines certain situations where previously approved maps must be granted extensions if certain requirements are met.

14. In the past, in general, EPC recommendations were noted in staff reports, but not yet incorporated. It seems like this has changed, and EPC recommendations are now incorporated. What drives this change?

Staff routinely provides a summary of the EPC's recommendation in Council Staff Reports. Not all EPC recommendations require changes to an Ordinance or Project Resolution to implement. However, if the EPC has recommended a change to an Ordinance or a Resolution (i.e., a finding or a project condition of approval), staff will typically incorporate the EPC's recommendations into the Ordinance or Resolution presented to Council (shown in tracked changes) as the staff recommendation. But, in circumstances where Staff has a business case or other consideration that weighs against inclusion of the EPC-recommended change, staff will present Council with both the staff-recommended and EPC-recommended options.

15. What specifically is the definition/criteria/requirements of employee housing?

Employee housing is a housing accommodation typically supplied by an employer (though it can be privately-owned) in connection with work being performed by the employee. Per State Law, employee housing must be a permitted use and treated as a single-family residence for 6 employees or less, which includes being subject to the same development as a single-family home. In agricultural zones, employee housing is limited to 36 beds in a building or 12 units and would be subject to the agricultural zoning districts development standards. The California Department of Housing and Community Development is the primary agency overseeing these regulations (see [website](#)).

16. Are there other organizations that regulate the number of clients in a residential care home to ensure proper care of the clients? Something like there needs to be one caregiver per four clients.

The California Department of Social Services is responsible for licensing, inspecting, and overseeing required operations of residential care facilities to ensure adequate care of clients.

17. What is the thinking behind having 18' max height, plus 2' for roof pitch, for ADUs that are within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor vs. 16' if not? What does the height tie in with being close to a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor?

The 18' height allowance for ADUs within ½ mile of a major transit stop or high quality transit corridor is a requirement by State Law ([SB 897](#)). While City Staff cannot specifically presume what state legislators were intending with the additional height allowance near transit, one comment staff has heard is that ADUs should be incentivized near transit – in this case granting additional height allowances.

18. What is a low-barrier navigation center?

A low-barrier navigation center is a type of service-rich, temporary shelter that reduces barriers to entry that other types of shelters may historically have, such as allowing domestic partners, pets, storage of goods, etc. To simplify, it is a type of shelter that has expanded services and greater allowances than a traditional emergency shelter operation.

19. Do you have any suggestions of ADU's we could go visit that illustrate these height issues?

There are currently no detached two-story ADUs that have been built under the 2022 laws. Currently, most detached ADUs are proposed either within the 16' height limit for single-story or 28' height limit for ADUs proposed over a detached garage or accessory structure. A large portion of ADUs submitted to the City are attached to the existing house and typically match the height of the single-family home.

ITEM 7.1 Public Safety Building, Project 20-49-Conceptual Design and Public Art Budget

1. Will any improvements be done to Lot 11 to use it for construction staging or staff parking?

Lot 11 will be integral to the phased construction of the Public Safety Building, with several temporary facilities planned to accommodate construction staging, such as temporary power, communications, security fencing, cameras and alarm systems, construction trailers, public safety vehicle parking delineation, and other construction-related activities. Once the project is completed, Lot 11 will be restored as a public parking lot.

2. If someone is arrested and is taken from a patrol car to the holding area, what is the path they take?

As noted on page 3 in Attachment 1 – First Floor Plan, the temporary holding rooms are located on the ground floor of the proposed building. Arrestees would be transported to the site via Oak Street and be driven through a secure entrance and into a sallyport before being taken out of the vehicle and escorted into the intake area for processing. See figure below.



3. Is the shooting range a modular structure?

The details of the Shooting Range construction have not been finalized and would be evaluated during the design phase to verify the best way to integrate it into the secure structure parking garage. If a modular construction method is viable, it will be considered.

4. Will there be parking on the roof along with the shooting range? Will a vehicle be able to get to the level of the shooting range?

The 15-lane shooting range will use nearly the entire upper most level of the parking structure with little to no space available for parking. Police vehicles will have access to the range to provide the option of training from various conditions – including responding to threats while exiting a patrol vehicle.