

City Council Questions

October 26, 2021 Council Meeting

ITEM 3.1 City Park and Los Altos School District Community School Sites-Master Planning Update

1. Just to be clear, there will be ~4 acres of joint use property, and an additional ~2 acres of city owned property for a city park, correct?

This is correct. Pursuant to current agreements there will be approximately four acres of joint use open space on the future LASD school site, in addition to the roughly two-acre City Park.

2. Will the track, soccer field, and baseball field fit on the ~4 acres of joint use property?

Based on the size of other joint use areas with active recreation facilities on other school sites in Mountain View, it will be challenging to construct a full-size competition track, soccer field and baseball field on the four-acre joint use property. The next step of the master planning process will more fully evaluate design options for the joint use property, including alternative configurations of these facilities.

3. Will any of the city's property be needed for the track, soccer field, or baseball field?

The two-acre City Park is separate from the recreational facilities required for the joint use property pursuant to the Funding and Joint Use Agreement. No current agreements assume the City Park land would be used to provide for these facilities. If Council wishes staff to consider using any portion of the two-acre City Park land area to support provision of those recreational facilities, this direction could be provided at this Study Session or when Council provides input on the joint use open space master planning.

4. Will the ~2 acres for the city park be open to residents even when school is in session?

Yes. The two-acre City Park is planned to be open to residents even when school is in session. This objective was a factor in evaluating the recommended location and identifying design considerations for the master planning process.

5. Will any of the ~4 acres of joint use property be open to residents even when school is in session?

Pursuant to the Funding and Joint Use Agreement, LASD would have sole access to the joint use property during school hours.

6. If the city park is located where proposed, it will not be continuous to the ~4 acres of joint use property, correct?

The master plan considerations identified in the Study Session Memo include a design objective to locate the City Park and Joint Use Open Space adjacent to each other, at most separated by an access road and/or parking area. The JUOS configuration will be analyzed in the next step of the master planning process and more fully designed in subsequent detailed design and permitting processes for the school site.

7. What percent of the purchase price of the ~4 acres of joint use property is \$23 million?

The reported purchase price for the roughly 11.65-acre site was \$155 million, which translates to approximately \$13.3 million per acre. The City Council committed to a contribution of \$6 million per acre of joint use property (up to \$23 million), which is approximately 45% of the per acre cost of the four-acres of joint use property.

8. Will residents have access to the joint use property at the same percentage of time as the percentage of the purchase price represents?

Staff cannot definitely answer this question at this time. There are several factors that have not yet been determined and will ultimately impact City access to the joint use property, including whether the future school will have after-school sports programs or similar programming, and whether the joint use property will have lights allowing recreational activities to continue into evening hours. The City would have “full-time” access to the joint use property on weekends, summertime and other non-school days as well as after-school hours during the week when school activities have ceased.

9. Are lane reductions/”road diets” proposed for either Showers or California St?

The adopted San Antonio Precise Plan (SAPP) street standards do not include any lane reductions/ “road diets” for these roadways. Instead the SAPP seeks to add wider, detached sidewalks and buffered/protected bikeways to both roadways by modifying the existing lane widths and public access easements on adjacent private property. On Showers Drive, center medians and more limited turn lanes would replace the existing double-left turn lane.

10. What are the lane widths on Pacchetti Way and California St?

The San Antonio Precise Plan street standards assume 11-foot wide through lanes and 10-foot wide turn lanes on California Street, and 11-foot travel lanes on Pacchetti Greenway (within San Antonio Center). Portions of both roadways were modified as part of the Merlone Geier Phase 2 development project. In general, the SAPP standards assumed narrower lane widths than pre-development/existing conditions.

11. Why have so many of the TDR projects fallen thru? Is this rate normal for the number of projects that submit an application, but don't get built for one reason or another OR is something going on specifically related to the TDR issue?

Currently, there is one TDR project application that was withdrawn, and a second TDR project proponent (SummerHill Homes) who decided not to proceed with their TDR project after Council approval. These projects cumulatively included less than 10% of the total 610,000 TDR square feet permitted by the TDR Program. In Mountain View, while a significant percentage of proposed/approved projects are constructed, it is also not uncommon for some projects to “fall through” or be substantially change before being constructed. To staff’s knowledge, the TDR square footage was not the sole reason for either of these two project proponents to not proceed with the TDR projects.

12. The staff report says, “the City’s financial support would help achieve roughly four acres of JUOS on which recreational amenities would be built by LASD and improve publicly accessible open space resources in the San Antonio neighborhood during nonschool hours.” How are non-school hours defined? Do they include hours of weekday afterschool programming? What would be the hours available to the public during the school year? Is the number of hours likely to change over the years?

Pursuant to the Funding and Joint Use Agreement, LASD shall have exclusive use of the gymnasium and all joint use open space facilities/improvements on the school site during all school days, between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and until all school-sponsored activities are concluded. The City would have access to the joint use property during all non-school days and during non-school hours, including the summer for operation of recreational programs serving the community. The agreement does not specify a time for the end of “school-sponsored activities.” More precise timing may depend on the type of school built on the property and its after-school programs (including team sports associated with a junior high school).

13. How will recreational amenities built by LASD and publicly accessible open space be accessible to the public? Will some or all of them be fenced? If some portion will be fenced, which portion will that be?

At this time, staff anticipates the approximately four-acre joint use open space and school/gymnasium building area to be secured by fencing during school hours, with public access provided during non-school hours/days. More information may be available through the next step of the master planning process, which will focus on the joint use open space on the school site.

14. During what percent of publicly available time are LASD soccer and baseball fields rented by leagues and how much are they open to the public? Does the public use them often for more informal games or are they primarily for leagues?

LASD did not have this information readily available. The design and associated amenities of the shared joint use open space will be the subject of a subsequent agenda item for Council to consider. This type of information can be prepared for this future meeting.

15. During what percent of publicly available time are MVWSD soccer and baseball fields rented by leagues and how much are they open to the public? Does the public use them often for more informal games or are they primarily for leagues?

Staff does not have this information readily available. Each school field is used at different levels by the public and sports leagues based on what amenities are available, including lights to extend play into the evenings.

16. What percent of soccer and baseball leagues are male and what percent are female? What is the income profile of league member families? In other words, are they open to children from low-income families or do they primarily serve higher-income families? What age groups do they serve?

The City does not directly implement these activities therefore does not have direct access to this data. Each of the youth sports leagues do provide their own financial assistance program to support lower income families. This data can be prepared for when this project returns to review design of the joint use open space.

17. What elementary school will LASD locate on this site and how will that be decided?

The LASD Board will determine the type of school to be located on the property as part of the detailed school design, CEQA and State permitting process. Pursuant to the Funding and Joint Use Agreement, LASD agreed the school would be one or a combination of:

- An elementary school open to neighborhood students;
- A junior high school open to neighborhood students; and/or
- A choice or charter school, if it has a preference for neighborhood students.

18. What number of elementary and middle school aged children are currently living in the San Antonio area? What number are expected at the time the schools will be built? Is LASD attendance rising or dropping?

LASD estimates between 600-700 elementary and middle school-aged children live in this area.

19. Will the school site include Living Classroom outdoor gardens?

School site amenities and programming will be determined by LASD as part of the subsequent detailed school design process. Pursuant to the Funding and Joint Use Agreement, Living Classroom outdoor gardens are not specifically required for the joint use portion of the future school site.

ITEM 4.4 Fiscal Year 2020-21 Annual Compliance Report for Development Impact Fees and Capacity Charges; and Informational Reporting of Park Land Dedication Fee

1. AB 602 updates standards for nexus studies and requires new or updated impact fees to be assessed on a per square foot rather than a per unit basis. Will AB 602 require the City to update or change any existing or proposed development fees, including the parkland dedication in-lieu fee?

Effective January 1, 2022, AB 602 updates standards for impact fee nexus studies, one of which includes requiring jurisdictions to base rate calculations on the square footage of individual units, unless the jurisdiction demonstrates that another metric is more appropriate. AB 602 includes other requirements such as additional public hearing requirements and making additional findings. AB 602 applies to “development fees” as defined in Govt Code 66000, which excludes Quimby Act fees under Govt Code 66477.

AB 602 does not affect the item before Council tonight, but new or updated development fees after January 1, 2022 could be subject to the bill’s requirements. More analysis will be required to determine specifically which City fees are affected by the legislation.

2. Why was a \$1,046 Interfund Transfer made to the Equipment Replacement Reserve from the Housing Impact Fund in FY2020-21? What specifically was this for?

The Housing Impact Fund has an “operating” component – personnel costs (1.1FTEs) and services and supplies. One component of the Equipment Replacement Fund is computer and IT infrastructure replacement. The total annual cost of this is allocated to each fund by FTE. Since the Housing Impact Fund has 1.1FTEs, its share of annual funding was \$1,046 for FY20-21.

ITEM 7.1 Wage Theft and Responsible Construction Ordinances

1. What form does the affidavit or attestation document take?

Staff proposes that the Wage Theft and Responsible Construction attestations and affidavit forms be submitted as a part of the business license tax application and renewal process and the building permit application process respectively. Currently the business license application is available as a downloadable PDF and submittals for a building permit is completed electronically online. As part of the next steps proposed in the study session memorandum staff will work with FASD and Building to incorporate the Wage Theft and Responsible Construction attestation and affidavit forms into the existing submittal processes.

ITEM 8.1 Shoreline Boulevard Interim Bus Lane and Utility Improvements, Design, Project 16-58, and Phase I Construction, Project 18-43-Various Actions

1. Why would the NBS Precise Plan EIR need to be updated?

The environmental review/CEQA process for the project (Shoreline Blvd Interim Bus Lane) tiered off the North Bayshore Precise Plan (NBPP) EIR as an addendum to the EIR. Consistent with the original NBPP EIR, the EIR addendum for the project identified the installation of the additional left turn lanes on W. Middlefield Road as a mitigation measure to the NBPP. Removing this element from the project changes the project scope for the environmental review, and a revised environmental review is needed to remove the left-turn element from the project and as a mitigation measure for the NBPP EIR.

2. Have the traffic signal poles and mast arms been ordered?

The traffic signal poles and mast arms have not yet been ordered. If Council determines to remove the left-turn lanes from the project, ordering of the poles and mast arms would be deferred until after the redesign of the intersection and the construction contract is amended or re-bid.

3. Are there any legal risks or liabilities the City would be exposed to if the Council decided not to implement this mitigation and instead revised the EIR and the Statement of Overriding Considerations?

From a CEQA perspective, the City would not have liabilities if the EIR was revised and a new Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted by Council after any required public review periods prior to taking action to approve an amended construction contract or rebidding the project.

4. Would elimination of this mitigation in any way impact development in the North Bayshore Precise Plan area?

From a CEQA perspective, elimination of this mitigation measure would not impact the future CEQA review of development projects in the North Bayshore Precise Plan area, which will be based on Vehicle Miles Traveled rather than Level of Service (LOS). However, the multi-modal transportation analysis (MTA) for the NBPP development projects would continue to show future LOS F conditions for the Shoreline/Middlefield intersection, including lengthy left-turn queue spillbacks that will: block through lanes; create significant delays for all users, including transit and the Community Shuttle on Middlefield; potentially lead to unsafe lane changes to skirt around the queue spillback; cause peak period spread for more hours of congestion to avoid the peak hour; and potentially lead vehicles to divert off of Middlefield onto other streets such as Terra Bella to access Shoreline Boulevard.

5. Might there be more than one possible location At San Veron Park for the PG&E Gas Regulator?

There are other locations within San Veron Park for this facility, but these locations would impact the usable park space within the existing turf, be in a more visible location and/or require additional easements to be granted to PG&E. Staff coordinated with the Community Services Department and PG&E to identify this location that provides the least impact to park users and aesthetics, and is away from other higher active park features.

6. Might there be ways to add additional trees along Shoreline and in the medians and if so, where might those places be?

The project will be planting 36 replacement trees. Staff plans to prioritize planting the new trees to fill in the landscaping gaps in the W. Middlefield Road medians to the east and west of the project and behind the sidewalks along Shoreline Boulevard with approval of the private property owners.