

City Council Questions

June 30, 2020 Council Meeting

ITEM 4.2 ANNUAL WATER AND SEWER MAIN REPLACEMENTS, PROJECTS 17-21 AND 17-22-AMEND PROFESSIONAL DESIGN SERVICES AGREEMENT

1. Is staff suggesting the sewer lines be replaced one year later than currently planned?

The sewer mains in the project area (Spring St, Morgan St, Rock St, etc) are in good condition and have 10 years or more of service life remaining. For this reason, staff is recommending to defer replacing this project area's sewer mains and using the sewer main replacement CIP funding for a higher priority location elsewhere in the City.

ITEM 4.8 WATER AND SEWER MASTER PLAN UPDATE, PROJECT 20-43-AUTHORIZE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT

1. Will this also evaluate the impact of state legislation that may allow for duplexes/triplexes/quadplexes in existing single family neighborhoods?

The main purpose of the Water and Sewer Master Plans is to review the existing condition of the City's water and sewer infrastructure and to predict locations where capital improvements will be required. Typically, Master Plans evaluate the build out land use identified in a City's General Plan and do not consider potential legislation. For each land use designation, water demand and sewer flow factors are estimated based on current conditions and projected to the future (2030) based on a wide range of factors, including planned growth, water conservation, and water planning. The Master Plans are updated periodically and at that time can account for changes in the City's planned land uses, including the impact of any new legislation that has been adopted.

ITEM 6.1 SENATE BILL 743: CEQA TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS

1. On page 5 of the staff report, does affordable mean subsidized? Or does it also include naturally affordable units?

The OPR Technical Advisory includes both subsidized and naturally-occurring affordable units in this definition.

2. Was the EPC vote unanimous for adopting OPR guidelines regarding TPAs? If not, what was the vote?

The EPC recommended the entire SB743 policy, which included transit proximity screening. The EPC did not vote for individual screens or thresholds. The final EPC recommendation was 4-3 regarding the entire SB 743 policy as proposed.

3. The flow chart on page 11 of the staff report does not seem to match the words describing the process on page 12 of the staff report. The flow chart seems to say that “large” projects that are not screened out of CEQA, will not have to do the MTA. Does the dashed line box signify that both the MTA and CEQA VMT Analysis need to be done? If not, what does the dashed line box mean?

The small project screening occurs first. As shown in the flow chart, projects that qualify as small projects do not require either the MTA or CEQA VMT analyses. Projects that do not pass the small project screening are subject to the MTA, regardless of whether they pass one of the other CEQA VMT screening factors. If a project does not pass the CEQA VMT screening, this project will need to undertake the VMT analysis in addition to the MTA. While the flow chart shows the MTA occurring before the CEQA VMT analysis, the dashed line box indicates that the CEQA VMT analysis could be undertaken simultaneously and in conjunction with the MTA.

4. On page 12 of the staff report, geographic study areas are proposed. How does this compare to the geographic study areas required in CEQA?

Prior to implementation of SB 743, motor vehicle level of service (LOS) was used to determine transportation impacts under CEQA. The study area for LOS was based on identifying intersections where the project was expected to add 10 or more peak hour vehicle trips per lane to any intersection movement regardless of distance from the project as well as all freeway segments where the project may create a significant LOS impact. For many projects, this would lead to study areas that extended far into other cities and resulted in mitigations that favored automobile travel over active transportation. For non-auto CEQA analysis, there were no geographic study areas defined. With the implementation of SB 743, there is no “study area” under CEQA. The project’s estimated VMT is compared to a geography such as the city, Santa Clara County, or the Nine-County Bay Area regional reference average VMT.

5. On Attachment 1 it says “WHEREAS, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has **recommended** using Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) to analyze transportation impacts; and”. Should this be the word required rather than the word recommended?

VMT is still a recommendation. The requirement is that LOS may no longer be used to establish significance of transportation impacts of a project under CEQA. OPR was required by the State to update the CEQA Guidelines with criteria for analyzing transportation impacts that shall promote the development of multi-modal transportation networks, land use diversity, and greenhouse gas emissions reduction. OPR is required to recommend potential metrics that achieve the three ends mentioned above, where the metrics include, but are not limited to VMT.

VMT is identified as the best, and most widely used metric able to achieve the development of multi-modal transportation networks, land use diversity, and greenhouse gas emissions reduction. VMT is the metric used in other CEQA impact categories already, and it is used to measure greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector in emissions inventories and climate action plans.

6. A large factor in whether outcomes of this change in policy are good or bad for the city will be the quality of the supporting and interfacing policies like the MTA, the Pedestrian Master Plan, Parkland Ordinance, etc. Can staff make a short list of some interfacing policy documents beyond the MTA and provide links to them?

The City's supporting and interfacing policy documents include:

- 2030 General Plan and Precise Plans located at <https://www.mountainview.gov/depts/comdev/planning/regulations/general.asp>
- 2014 Pedestrian Master Plan, 2015 Bicycle Transportation Plan, and Vision Zero Policy located at <https://www.mountainview.gov/depts/pw/transport/walkingandbicycling/default.asp>
- City's Sustainability Program located at <https://www.mountainview.gov/depts/manager/sustain/default.asp>

7. The OPR website now includes some FAQs regarding Covid-19 and SB 743 (<https://opr.ca.gov/ceqa/updates/sb-743/faq.html# covid-19>), specifically on building more places to walk and bike, helping us exercise and accessing new daily destinations, which are often closer to home. Are these new goals being written into the MTA and other policy documents?

These goals are already reflected in the City's General Plan and various Precise Plans, which promote walkable and bike-able communities through more housing, mix of land uses for healthy and sustainable communities, and complete streets. The MTA helps implement the policies and achieve the goals established in these planning documents. It analyzes the effects of a development and then requires public improvements consistent with the vision of the planning documents (such as public walkable places and active transportation) to address these effects.

8. Are Covid-related impacts on mass transit being considered?

There are several ongoing studies on the impact of COVID-19 on transit. This study from the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) <https://www.apta.com/public-transit-response-to-coronavirus/> includes some of the recent findings. It should be noted, however, that COVID-19 impacts on transit use may be relatively short term (less than 5 years). The land use developments subject to an MTA analysis over the next year will take 2 to 4 years before construction is completed, by which time COVID-19 may not be impacting transit use.

ITEM 6.2 NEW MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT AT 1001 NORTH SHORELINE BOULEVARD

1. Can parkland dedication in-lieu funds be used for San Veron Park improvements requested by the neighborhood?

Park in-lieu fees can be used for rehabilitation and renovation at existing parks. They cannot be used for general maintenance. Based on staff's understanding of the park improvements requested by the neighborhood for San Veron, staff believes they would be able to use Park in-lieu fees. Similar park improvements include new irrigation pumps, restroom improvements, and the trellis replacement at Sylvan Park.

Typically, these type of improvements using park in-lieu fees are reviewed and approved by the PRC. Depending on the type of improvements being requested and the cost, staff would determine the project scope. Following the scope, staff would review available funding sources including park in-lieu fees as well as available CIP park renovation funds.

Should Council direct staff to review the neighborhood requests, staff will review what funds are most appropriate. If Park In-Lieu fees are determined as the best source and funding is available, the project would be reviewed by PRC and funds could be approved for this purpose.

2. Will recycled water infrastructure be extended into the Terra Bella neighborhood? Can this development help expedite that?

There is no plan to provide recycled water to the Terra Bella neighborhood. Consistent with the 2010 Recycled Water Master Plan and Council's input for planned expansion shortly after that Master Plan effort, the next planned expansion will be to the NASA area east of Stevens Creek, followed by extension to the East Whisman Precise Plan area. There is nothing the development can do to expedite extending recycled water into the Terra Bella neighborhood.

3. Has a feasibility study been done to determine whether a connection to Stevens Creek Trail from the Terra Bella area is possible?

No, a feasibility study has not been completed.

4. Does the Bike/Ped Plan specify that there should be bicycle improvements along Terra Bella?

There are no improvements for Terra Bella Avenue in the Bike Transportation Plan.

5. Does the Terra Bella and Shoreline intersection currently operate at an acceptable level?

The project traffic report indicates that the existing level of service for the Terra Bella and Shoreline intersection is LOS C+ in the AM and LOS B in the PM. Both of these are considered acceptable as the current city policy for an acceptable level of service is LOS D.

6. Will any of the 155 relatively new trees that were planted in 2017 be planted elsewhere? (Page 12 of the staff report)

Most the trees are in the parking lot and are proposed to be removed. This is because construction is expected take up a large part of the site and will be phased over a long period of time. As a result, there are few areas that are not impacted either by construction or utility lines. Additionally, the success of replanting depends on the season and this is not easy to determine for a phased long-term construction process. However, one existing Oak tree is being transplanted on site at the entrance to the condo building along Terra Bella Avenue.

7. The only step taken so far to plan for potential conversion of apartments to condominiums is the mapping of the parcel, correct? The individual units are not mapped, correct? What is the incremental cost of mapping the parcel?

The project includes a tentative map to create five parcels: for the office building, parking garage, apartment building, condo building and a common lot which includes the open space. In addition, a condominium map is also being proposed for both residential buildings which would make each unit a separate unit and allow the sale of the apartment units in the future.

The City approves the tract map which creates the five parcels and allows the set number of condominium units. The individual units are approved by the Bureau of Real Estate. The City's map fee would apply and is based on the number of parcels proposed and not the number of condominium units.

8. Are the affordable units (both rental and ownership) affordable in perpetuity? If not, can they be?

This development falls under the BMR Phase 1 and so the affordability term would be 55 years.

9. Who decided that \$2,879,270 of the community benefits would be credited for a public utility easement? Can the credit still be provided, but \$2,879,270 taken from the CIP budget/reserve for investment in the surrounding neighborhood?

Previous utility studies identified the need to replace the water and sewer utility crossings over U.S. 101 at Shoreline, and staff determined that the most favorable alignment for the replacement utility crossing was through this development's site. As this utility crossing project is independent of the development project, the City would typically be required to pay fair market value for this easement to the property owner. In discussing the need for the easement with the property owner, they agreed to provide the easement as part of the community benefits for the project.

On June 23, 2020 City Council adopted the FY 2020-21 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Budget that reflected the CIP budget reserve being fully allocated. The CIP reserve is funded by surpluses from the General Fund operating budget, and given the continued expected COVID-19 financial impacts, staff does not anticipate receiving new CIP reserve funding in the near future.

10. What are the "other neighborhood-serving uses listed in the Commercial Neighborhood (CN) District?"

Other uses allowed in the CN district include a variety of neighborhood serving commercial uses such as restaurants, banks, childcare, indoor recreation and fitness centers, grocery stores, studios for dance, art, music, photography, martial arts, personal services etc. The complete list of uses allowed in the CN district can be found at the following link ([SEC. 36.18.05](#)).

11. The staff report lists six specific capital improvement project requests that a community member or members would like to use project community benefits to fund. Which of those improvements could be implemented easily using community benefit funds and which would require further study?

All the listed improvements except the San Vernon Park updates would require feasibility analysis and also a cost estimation process before staff can determine if the specific improvement(s) is feasible. Since the community benefit contribution is not assigned to a specific fund, Council can provide some direction to staff and flag projects that there are interested in pursuing and direct staff to bring specific items to discuss during the next CIP process.

12. According to the staff report new homeowners will also have the option to purchase a monthly membership to use the apartment community's pool and fitness amenities. Can that be extended to other neighbors? I know other developers have done so on other projects outside Mountain View.

Extending access to other neighbors is not part of the proposal at this time.

13. How wide are the sidewalks on Terra Bella now? Will they be widened from what they are now and if so to what dimension?

New 7' wide sidewalks with 5' planter strips were installed along Terra Bella Avenue as part of the construction of the office building on the site and there are no plans to reconstruct them as part of this project.

ITEM 6.3 ADOPTION OF CONSOLIDATED PLAN AND APPROVAL OF FISCAL YEAR 2020-21 CDBG/HOME FUNDING CYCLE

1. Is the Consolidated Plan used for anything other than CDBG/HOME fund allocations?

Besides the CDBG/HOME funding allocations, the Consolidated Plan priorities and goals also applies to General-Funded public service activities as part of the two-year CDBG public service funding cycle. The Consolidated Plan also functions as a policy document that guides the City's housing and community development activities, in conjunction with other policies/ documents such as the Council Major Goals, General Plan, Housing Element, etc.

2. Does staff use the Consolidated Plan at all when doing other housing policy/planning work?

As noted above, the Consolidated Plan serves as a policy document that may guide housing policy/planning work, in conjunction with other City policies/ documents.

3. How much is Prometheus providing for Bridge Housing's acquisition of the Mariposa Club Apartments? I thought Prometheus was supposed to transfer ownership of the property to Mariposa in lieu of providing onsite BMRs?

Prometheus is providing a minimum of \$12.4 million for the acquisition and rehabilitation of the Mariposa Club Apartments as part of their alternative mitigation requirement. Bridge Housing is securing other funds, including HOME, for the remaining amounts needed for the acquisition.

4. Is there any value in including more detailed language, including policy solutions, regarding demolition of "naturally affordable" units and displacement of lower-income residents?

Section MA-40 of the Consolidated Plan includes a discussion on tenant displacement. That section also refers to the Council Major Goal to evaluate options for a displacement response strategy, which staff have been actively working on prior to and subsequent to the October 2019 Study Session on this topic. Various policy options have been identified and are under evaluation but are not yet ready to be included in this document. Additionally, it is staff's experience that the Consolidated Plan functions well as a document that includes broader policy framework. This

provides jurisdictions the flexibility to evaluate and implement programs/policies during the five-year period, without being overly prescriptive.

5. Given limited CDBG/HOME funds, does staff have any concerns that we are spreading the money too thin? Would it make sense to focus on fewer priorities to more effectively use the money?

Staff have attempted to consolidate a wide range of identified needs into six goals in a clear yet flexible manner to provide the City and Council the flexibility to respond to needs over the next five-years. This is a policy tradeoff: more goals provide greater flexibility, while fewer goals could allow limited resources to be deployed in a more focused manner. The Council can provide direction on whether there should be fewer priorities/goals than the six currently identified.

6. There are quite a few spelling/grammatical errors in the draft. Will staff continue to proofread and correct these?

These will be cleaned up prior to finalizing the document and submitting to HUD by the August deadline.

7. Has the city ever been involved in work force development or job readiness programs? (Page 6 of the staff report)

Yes. For example, the City currently funds the Mountain View Day Center from the General Fund (as part of the two-year CDBG public service funding cycle), which includes job skills training and safety training. Besides providing funding, the City also partners with the Mountain View Chamber of Commerce and NOVA to support businesses with hiring and employment needs. For example, NOVA provides workforce development services for the North Santa Clara County cities. Mountain View residents can participate in their job development classes. When the City has events, NOVA sends staff to participate and to promote their services.

8. Does the number of homeless people helped assume it is 3,000 different people each year, meaning there is no overlap in the 15,000 persons assisted? Is this a realistic assumption?

The 15,000 goal is an estimate as part of Goal 2: Respond to Homelessness. This is a broad and flexible Goal, and includes activities to assist individuals and households who are already homeless, as well as those who are not yet homeless but may be at-risk. The estimate was based on data from the 2015-20 Consolidated Plan on persons served annually as part of homelessness response. Additionally, the Goal includes the ability fund a broad range of services, including not limited to basic needs services, supplies, and general assistance. Finally, the Goal includes persons who may need assistance multiple times.

9. How did staff come up with the 5,740 persons assisted for the Enhance Physical Infrastructure goal?

This estimate is based on past CDBG-funded infrastructure projects and the number of persons served. The estimate considered the broad, flexible nature of this goal, which includes the ability to invest in infrastructure projects by external partners/non-profits or City projects. Finally,

certain projects may have the ability to serve residents Citywide, which can increase the benefit and persons served.

10. What activities does the city currently do in the Support Economic Resiliency goal? Has the city ever done any of the activities listed?

This goal includes more traditional economic development activities (such as job training/readiness programs) which the City has collaborated on/funded in the past, such as job skills training. Regarding economic resiliency, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and its economic impacts, the City recently launched programs to support business and economic resiliency. This includes a Small Business Loan Program, business impact survey, small business call center, closing Castro Street to vehicular traffic and to provide the ability to facilitate social distancing to support the reopening of restaurants and store, and zoom webinars on business resiliency in partnership with the Chamber of Commerce. Additionally, because it is unlikely that the full impacts/ramifications of COVID-19 have been seen yet, this goal was written broadly to allow the City to respond to future needs that may not be known at this time.

11. Are the Consolidated Plan and the Action Plan monitored for progress or compliance with the plans? If so, by what agency?

Subrecipients of CDBG/HOME funding are required to submit quarterly reports to the City to demonstrate their progress/performance towards their annual goal. These quarterly reports are compiled and reported by the City as part of the Consolidated Annual Plan and Evaluation Report (CAPER) each year. The CAPER is a HUD required document by HUD that reports on the performance of each subrecipient for the previous fiscal year. . In addition, jurisdictions are required to monitor subrecipients during the five-year period.

12. What does TBRA stand for on page 3 of the Action Plan?

TBRA stands for Tenant Based Rental Assistance, which is an eligible HOME funded activity. It provides rental assistance similar to the Housing Choice Voucher (aka Section 8) program.

13. Why did LifeMoves not use the CDBG award from 2018?

The contract was less than \$60,000 and because of the high demand for contractors at that time, it was difficult to find a contractor for such a small contract. Also the project was determined to be subject to Davis Bacon labor requirements. Therefore between the small contract amount and the wage requirements, it became more difficult to find a contractor. However, a contractor was found and so now the project is moving forward. The additional funding request is the cost differential for the project to meet its labor requirements as required by HUD.

14. If we have helped through CSA about 600 families with one month of rent, and the goal is 1800 families for rental assistance, does that mean a family already helped cannot receive any more help?

Per the current program parameters, a family may qualify for up to two months of rental assistance. However, due to the initial demand, the duration is currently for one month. If all

eligible applicants have received one month of rental support and there is funding remaining, then households could receive a second month.

15. How will the funding for LifeMoves' transitional housing and the purchase/rehabilitation of the apartments on Mariposa reduce homelessness? Aren't both of these projects already filled with residents?

Mariposa is a Goal 1 (Increase affordable housing) project. The intent is that by preserving the naturally affordable housing units and converting them to deed-restricted units in perpetuity, this can prevent displacement and therefore potential homelessness. If the apartments were purchased by a market rate developer, the existing households, which 44 of the 46 occupied units are low or very low income, could be displaced with potentially higher rents and some of the households, especially the VLI households, would be vulnerable to becoming homeless. This would also support the City's efforts to respond to tenant displacement as part of the Council Major Goals workplan item.

LifeMoves is a Goal 2 (Respond to homelessness) project, whose rehabilitation will further the ability of the agency to provide housing for those who were previously homeless. Having the transitional housing at Graduate House will provide homeless or previously homeless persons a stable living environment. Without the facility, the person would remain/become homeless or unsheltered.

16. The staff report states that the Covid-19 emergency has affected both funding and Consolidated Plan priorities and goals, including "supporting economic development and resiliency... the disproportionate impact COVID-19 has had on lower-income workers and on specific industries and jobs" and more. I assume Covid-19 will impact housing, homeless, strengthening neighborhoods and social service needs as well. When and how will Council have the space to weigh in on meaningful policy responses in these areas in the context of Consolidated Plans and CDBG/HOME Funding?

The impact of COVID-19 was considered in the development of each of the six recommended Consolidated Plan Goals. This public hearing provides Council the opportunity to provide input on both the Consolidated Plan and the FY 2020-21 Annual Action Plan. Additionally, Council has the opportunity to provide input on funding recommendations as part of the subsequent Annual Action Plan processes each year.

Comment:

On page 23 of the consolidated plan the paragraph in bold font that starts with "Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons" appears twice.

The duplication will be removed.