City Council Questions
October 1, 2019 Council Meeting

ITEM 6.1 PUBLIC HEARING ON DOWNTOWN BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT AREAS

1. Has there ever been any talk of changing the way we do the Art and Wine Festival? The Los Gatos Festival, for example, is more interactive with the businesses.

   The Art and Wine Festival is managed by the Chamber of Commerce. At this time, the intent is that the 2020 festival will be in a similar format as in previous years. The Central Business Association (CBA) sponsored the "A La Carte" in the past.

2. What consultants are being considered?

   The CBA is considering consultants to assist with promoting downtown (such as managing social media) and providing general staff support to the Board of Directors that the Executive Director used to provide (such as advising the board on programming opportunities/strategy).

ITEM 7.1 EL CAMINO REAL STREETSCAPE PLAN

1. When will we see the entire plan for El Camino in terms of pedestrian improvements?

   The El Camino Real Streetscape Plan provides concept-level design guidelines and typical treatments for pedestrian improvements along and crossing the 4-mile corridor. Detailed designs that conform to the Streetscape Plan will be prepared on a site-by-site basis as part of development projects or by the City through the Capital Improvement Program. The timing of these improvements will be based on the timing of property redevelopment and the timing of projects in the Capital Improvement Program. The list of pedestrian improvements that Caltrans agrees to include in their upcoming paving and ADA project should be available in spring 2020 with final design completed by spring 2022.

2. Will mid-crossing islands be added to existing crosswalks to enhance pedestrian safety?

   Staff will work with Caltrans to consider various types of pedestrian safety improvements at intersections, including mid-crossing islands (aka pedestrian refuge islands). The inclusion and design of any mid-crossing islands along El Camino Real will need to be site specific based on the width of the median, roadway geometry, traffic engineering requirements, and Caltrans approval.

3. Does staff see parts of the El Camino Streetscape Plan that might be modified to respond to the growing green streets movement and sustainable urban rewilding with items like swales, lengthier, more continuous and taller and thicker planting strips along much of the amenity zone, denser tree canopy, etc.?

   The El Camino Real Streetscape Plan provides concept-level designs and recommendations based on the 2014 El Camino Real Precise Plan policies and principles. Consistent with green streets and sustainable strategies for the region, the Streetscape Plan calls for tree wells with decomposed granite surface, a landscape strip as a buffer between pedestrians and motorists,

addition of trees throughout the corridor, and green stormwater infrastructure (rain gardens and bioswales) while also ensuring pedestrian safety and sight lines between drivers and pedestrians. The relatively constrained area behind the curb in some areas may limit options compared with some other streets in the City. Having said that, perhaps a sentence can be added to "landscape strip" on page 40 to further articulate Council's desire to maximize greet street strategies to the extent possible, should that be the direction.

4. Why is there only a 4-foot ROW easement zone for expanded sidewalk and public realm? Given that the properties on El Camino vary widely in depth, couldn't that easement zone also vary more widely depending on conditions, and allowing an urban greenway or linear park for some stretches of the boulevard?

   The 4-foot right-of-way easement dedication for new development was established in the Precise Plan. The Precise Plan project team included an urban designer who determined that a 4-foot easement added to the existing eight feet behind the curb would be enough room to create a comfortable pedestrian environment and maintain the goal of keeping buildings closer to the sidewalk to encourage more active street frontage.

5. Will permeable paving be used anywhere? Where can I find information on that? I thought I saw that before.

   Permeable pavers can be considered as part of green infrastructure elements in the design of sidewalks, landscaped areas, curb extensions, and a future public plaza when the El Camino Real/El Monte Avenue intersection is reconfigured.

6. Can we add mid crossing islands to existing crosswalks?

   Please see response to Question 2 above.

7. Can we incorporate public art, like crosswalk art or bench art?

   Any public art concepts within the right-of-way would be subject to Caltrans approval. Caltrans typically will not allow treatments on the road pavement that are inconsistent with established standards and guidelines in the Highway Design Manual and Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices; therefore, it is unlikely that crosswalk art would be approved. Art on City-owned site furnishings, such as benches, may be allowed by Caltrans. Any art on VTA-owned benches would require VTA approval and VTA would require that the City assume full responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of the bench.

8. P. 55 of the El Camino Precise Plan describes higher visibility crosswalk markings and shows markings in a brick color. Is that what will be used?

   The El Camino Real Streetscape Plan proposes high visibility crosswalk ladder style markings consistent with Caltrans standards.

9. How can we maintain some flexibility in the plan to improve our green street amenities as this movement evolves?

   The plan allows for some flexibility over time. Current and future best practices for green street strategies that conform to Caltrans standards and requirements would be considered as part of the design process for specific development and capital improvement projects.

10. I'm reading online that the minimum width for Class II bike lanes is 4 feet when there is no gutter (gutters replaced by swales) and also that bike lanes separated from auto lanes by planting strips are safer and more pleasant for bikers. Could we reduce the bike lane to 4-5 feet to make room for a planting strip/swale separation?

    The use of swales in place of curb and gutter requires extensive engineering analysis involving drainage, soil conditions, and traffic safety. This design treatment is generally used along parking lots and low volume roads that include driveway culverts to channel the water. Replacing curb/gutters with swales is not consistent with Caltrans standards for a major arterial with high traffic volumes, bus stops, and multiple driveways.

    The Caltrans District 4 Bike Plan calls for Class IV protected bikeways along El Camino Real, and the Mountain View Bike Transportation Plan also requires prioritization of protected bikeways along facilities with a posted speed limit higher than 30 miles per hour. Caltrans recommends that one-way protected bikeways be 7-foot wide, with a 1.5- to 3-foot buffer.

11. What kinds of bicycle and pedestrian grants are available?

    There are some regional grant programs that can provide small grants for qualifying bicycle and/or pedestrian improvements (e.g., Transportation Fund for Clean Air and Transportation Development Act Article 3). A source for larger funding amounts ($1 million or more) is the highly competitive, statewide Active Transportation Program. On the local level, bikeways on El Camino Real are eligible to compete for VTA's 2016 Measure B Bicycle/Pedestrian Competitive Grant Program.

ITEM 9.1 GOOGLE LANDINGS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

1. How many trees will be removed on site? How many trees will be planted on site?

   Staff is still working with Google on the removal and replanting plan, but at this time the proposal requests a total of 877 trees be removed from the office site (339 are Heritage trees). The Huff Garage and green loop extension areas propose to remove a total of 75 trees (48 are Heritage trees). In total, 952 trees are proposed to be removed (of which 387 are Heritage trees).

   In total, 1,228 new trees are proposed to be planted. 819 trees are proposed to be planted on the office site, including 167 (48") box trees and 65 (60") box or larger trees. 111 trees are proposed to be planted on the Huff Garage and green loop sites, including 32 (48") box trees and 30 (60") box or larger trees. An additional 298 (24") box trees are proposed to be planted offsite.

2. On page 9 of the staff report, it says that staff believes Google should incorporate the proposed public access alternative through the site into their current plans. Does staff mean to build this path rather than the one Google is proposing that goes through the 1875 Charleston site? Or does staff mean to plan for it but not build it yet? Or perhaps something else?

   Staff recommended the alternative access plan that shows the path close to the office building and does not go through the 1875 Charleston site; choosing this option now would prevent the access and project design from being potentially impacted by future 1875 Charleston leasing decisions. Alternately, the Google proposal provides a slightly more direct path and a condition could be added to require adjustments if 1875 Charleston was no longer available in the future.

3. What is the dollar amount of the required city-wide transportation impact fees? And, what is the dollar amount of the required North Bayshore transportation impact fees? Are these amounts included in the $17.5 million transportation infrastructure? If so, how much is included?

   The total City-wide Transportation Impact Fee for the development (Google Landings Office and Huff Garage) is approximately $2.87M, and the total North Bayshore Transportation Impact Fee is approximately $13.3M. These fees are project requirements and not included in the $17.5M transportation infrastructure Community Benefit contribution.

4. It looks like $8,306,700 of required North Bayshore transportation impact fees was not included in the Community Benefits calculation in 2015. Is that correct?

   The North Bayshore Transportation Impact Fee was not included in the Community Benefits calculation in 2015.

5. Is Landings Meadow Park the open space on the leased property at 1875 Charleston? If not, where is Landings Meadow Park?

   A portion of Landings Meadow Park would be located on the leased property at 1875 Charleston. This landscaping is not being counted towards the project's open space requirements but could be impacted at a later date.

6. Does the Council need to allocate the community benefit money for specific purposes at this time? Or do we have the discretion to place the money in a reserve/fund and determine the use later?

   Money can be placed into a reserve for later use.

7. The staff report suggests that the following proposed community benefits, Transportation Infrastructure @ $17.5 million, Rengstorff Avenue Signal Timing @ $1.2 million, Net-Zero Water @ $5.8 million and Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge over Permanente Creek @ $2.3 million, may be considered project requirements rather than community benefits. Is staff then suggesting that we might have up to $26.4 million in community benefits to request?

   Correct, there is up to $26.8 million in proposed community benefits that could be considered project requirements. However, the Transportation Infrastructure funding and Rengstorff Avenue Signal Timing project (totaling $18.7 million) would depend on staff review of the

pending traffic study to determine if any portion of those projects would be considered project requirements. The amount needed to fund a project requirement would not be counted as a community benefit.

8. If we were to ask for a bike/ped bridge over Rengstorff, about how much would that cost?

   The cost to construct the Rengstorff bicycle/pedestrian bridge over US 101 is estimated to be approximately $20M-$30M. The North Bayshore Circulation Feasibility Study, which is currently underway, will evaluate active transportation strategies for the area, including the Rengstorff Avenue interchange improvements and alternatives for bicycle and pedestrian connections. The results of this study may inform Council's decision to ask for the bicycle/pedestrian bridge.

9. Does staff have suggestions for how we might best ask for housing affordability and homelessness mitigations like community land trusts, emergency shelters, SROs, safe parking lots or permanently affordable housing?

   Flexible funding to facilitate a housing preservation strategy or to finance permanent supportive housing could help address two housing issues that have currently lacked funding. Staff has had some discussions with Google about potential affordable housing options as part of the community benefits package, primarily focused on the possibility of providing funding for a housing preservation strategy. The funding could be a flexible funding source without the same limitations as the City's housing fees or traditional external funding sources, and could therefore be more effective in funding acquisition/rehab opportunities, preventing tenant displacement, and providing permanently affordable housing.

   - **The City could potentially partner with a community land trust to implement a preservation strategy, and the initial funding could potentially leverage other funding sources for housing preservation. Various program parameters would need to be considered, including the number of units that could be preserved and the amount of funding needed, if the Council were interested in this direction.**
   - **Alternatively, funding for permanent supportive housing (PSH) to respond to homelessness could also be beneficial, as it could help achieve the City's goal of 250 PSH/rapid rehousing goals. Staff continues to work with the County in accessing Measure A funds but, until such funding comes to Mountain View, other funding sources could help.**

   Ultimately, affordable housing was not included in the Landings community benefits package but Google has indicated it is open to continued discussion and that it recognizes the importance of the various housing issues in Mountain View.

10. Can Council recommend/require different, or additions community benefit projects to the list Google has provided?

    In 2015, the project was granted bonus FAR based on a community benefit package of $35.55 million. When adjusted to inflation, the amount is $41.59 million. Google has proposed a package of $44.6 million, which slightly exceeds the community benefits amount adjusted to

inflation. If the Council wishes to address priorities other than those identified in the community benefits package, it can recommend/require different public benefits or other projects as part of the final package.

11. Could staff provide a list of the recommended Transportation related capital improvement projects related to North Bayshore as well as the Shoreline corridor, and include what items are already funded vs. those not funded?

    Table 20 of the North Bayshore Precise Plan includes a list of priority transportation improvements (see attached). The following improvements from the list have been funded:

    - **Shoreline Blvd Transit Lane & Protected Bike Lanes (Middlefield Rd to Space Park Way)**
    - **Plymouth St/Space Park Way Realignment**
    - **Charleston Rd Phase 2 & 3 Improvements – Design Funded/Construction Not Funded**
    - **Shoreline Blvd Bike/Ped Bridge over Hwy 101**
    - **Shoreline Blvd NB Off-Ramp Realignment**

    Additional improvements will likely be identified in the North Bayshore Circulation Feasibility Study, which is currently underway.

12. Is there any reason that Google cannot build houses over the parking building or any other part of the Landings?

    The office and garage site are not located within one of the Complete Neighborhood areas in the North Bayshore Precise Plan which are the areas that allow residential units in the North Bayshore Area. The Precise Plan would need to be amended to allow housing on that site.

Table 20: Priority Transportation Improvements

Roadway	Boundary	Existing	Proposed	Existing Curb-to-curb (midblock)	Proposed Right-of Way (midblock)*	Role
High Priority						
Shoreline Boulevard	Highway 101 to Plymouth Street	3+2 lanes Turn pockets Bike lanes both directions	Same, plus improved sidewalks and two-way cycle tracks per Table 24, plus possible reversible transit-only lane.	84′	98′ to 108′ (an additional 14′ to 24′ on each side for cycle tracks per Table 24, landscaping, and improved sidewalks)	Serves as a gateway to North Bayshore and primary transit, bicycle, and pedestrian connector to the Transit Center
Shoreline Boulevard	Plymouth Street to Amphitheatre Parkway	2+2 lanes Turn pockets Bike lanes both directions	Same, plus improved sidewalks and two-way cycle tracks on both sides.	70′	98′ (14′ on each side for dual direction cycle tracks and landscaping)	Serves as a gateway to North Bayshore and primary transit, bicycle, and pedestrian connector to the Transit Center
Charleston Road	Shoreline Boulevard to Amphitheatre Parkway	2+2 Turn pockets Bike lanes in both directions	Rebuilt to accommodate 1 general purpose lane and 1 transit-only lane in each direction, plus two-way cycle tracks on both sides, plus median.	72′	82′ (cycle tracks replace bicycle lanes and landscaping added) to 131′ (transit waiting areas, widened sidewalks)	A primary transit street providing fast and reliable east-west connections across North Bayshore and to the core of the district.
Garcia Avenue	Amphitheatre Parkway to Bayshore Parkway to San Antonio Road	1+1 lane Turn pockets Bike lanes in both directions	Same, plus improved sidewalks and two-way cycle tracks on both sides	50′	50′ to 101′ depending on configuration. The existing path on the park side could be used for the cycle track	A primary transit street serving the northwest corner of the district.
New east-west direct crossing across Shoreline Boulevard	Potential connections include modifying Plymouth Street to connect with Space Park Way	NA	1+1 lane Bicycle lanes on each side	NA	52′ (11′ travel lanes, 5′ bicycle lanes, 3′ buffer, 5′ sidewalks, and 5′ buffer)	Enables drivers to cross Shoreline directly without having to use Charleston Road.

Roadway	Boundary	Existing	Proposed	Existing Curb-to-curb (midblock)	Proposed Right-of Way (midblock)*	Role
High Priority						
East-west greenway connection #1	South of Charleston Road connecting to Permanente and Stevens Creek trails	NA	Multiuse path	NA	18′ to 24′	Separated bicycle and pedestrian facility to connect to regional trails without having to interact with vehicular traffic.
E-W greenway connection #2	Between Amphitheatre Parkway and Charleston Road connecting to Permanente Creek Trail and Shoreline Boulevard	NA	Multiuse path	NA	18′ to 24′	Separated bicycle and pedestrian facility that enables users to connect to regional trails without having to interact with vehicular traffic.
Bridge over Highway 101 west of Shoreline Boulevard	NA	NA	Bike and pedestrian only	NA	Unknown	Provide a protected bicycle and pedestrian crossing to improve safety and ease of access to North Bayshore.
Signalized bike crossings	EW greenway #1 & #2 at Shoreline	NA	NA	NA	NA	Provides protected and prioritized crossing for cyclists
Shoreline Boulevard NB off-ramp	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Improve vehicular operations and capacity at one of the primary entry points.
Stevens Creek Bridge	NA	NA	Feasibility studies are needed to determine design parameters	NA	Unknown	Provides a direct east-west connection to NASA Ames

Roadway	Boundary	Existing	Proposed	Existing Curb-to-curb (midblock)	Proposed Right-of Way (midblock)*	Role
Medium Priority						
Frontage Road along Highway 101	Landings Drive to Plymouth Street	NA	1+1 lane	NA	42' minimum (11' vehicle lanes, 5' bike lanes on both sides of the roadway, 5' sidewalk and 5' buffer on the north side of the street)	Shift vehicular traffic traveling to the northwest corner away from Shoreline Boulevard and Charleston Road*
North – south connection between La Avenida Street and Charleston Road east of Shoreline Boulevard	La Avenida Street and Charleston Road	NA	1+1 lane	NA	42' minimum (2 11' vehicle lanes, 5' sidewalk and 5' buffer on the each side of the street)	Provides a direct north-south connection east of Shoreline Boulevard.
Rengstorff Avenue	Charleston Road to Highway 101	2+2 lanes Turn pockets Bike lane in n-s direction	Same, plus improved sidewalks and two-way cycle tracks on both sides	Varies	An additional 14' to on each side for dual direction cycle tracks and 2' buffer	Main entry point to the district.
San Antonio Road	Bayshore Parkway to Highway 101	1+2 or 1+1 depending on segment Turn pockets	Same, plus improved sidewalks and two-way cycle tracks on both sides	Varies	An additional 14' to 20' on each side for dual direction cycle tracks, 2' buffer, and improved sidewalks	Gateway to North Bayshore

** Note: Adequate clearance under Permanente Creek is still being determined.*

Roadway	Boundary	Existing	Proposed	Existing Curb-to-curb (midblock)	Proposed Right-of Way (midblock)*	Role
Medium Priority						
Amphitheatre Parkway	Shoreline Boulevard to Charleston Road	3 to 4 travel lanes Turn pockets Bike lanes both directions	Same, plus improved sidewalks and two-way cycle tracks on both sides	56 to 82'	An additional 14'to 20' on each side for dual direction cycle tracks, 2' buffer, and improved sidewalks	Provides drivers with a more attractive option than Charleston reducing congestion on Charleston Road. By shifting traffic from Charleston Road to Amphitheater Parkway, Charleston Road can more efficiently serve transit.
Bicycle facilities connecting Highway 101, Shoreline Boulevard, and Plymouth Street	The alignment is TBD but would likely run through properties in the vicinity of Shoreline 101 to provide a connection from Shoreline and/or future pedestrian bridge and Plymouth Street	NA	Multiuse path	NA	18' to 24'	Improve bicycle entry to North Bayshore from the potential new bridge and Shoreline Boulevard.
Charleston-101 Undercrossing	NA	NA	Feasibility studies are needed to determine design parameters.	NA	Unknown	Provides a direct connection to improve access to North Bayshore.

*Exact right of way dimensions will vary by location and will depend on impacts to existing trees and landscaping