

City Council Questions

June 9, 2020 Council Meeting

ITEM 3.2 COVID-19 UPDATE

1. Can staff provide information to the Council about the composition of the Resiliency Roundtable, as well as the agenda and minutes if available?

The Roundtable consists of stakeholders from multiple sectors in the community coming together to provide ideas, share information, and leverage resources for identifying community action steps to support Mountain View's recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic. These sectors include schools, nonprofit organizations, health service providers, community-based groups representing immigrant/diverse populations, business associations, large and small businesses, faith based organizations, and other public agencies. The roundtable is expected to meet monthly and continue through the end of the calendar year. The first meeting was on June 3rd with the following agenda topics: Welcome and Introductions; Santa Clara County Shelter in Place Update; Why are We Here; Summary of City of Mountain View COVID-19 Response Efforts; Roundtable Questions and Discussion (What will it take for businesses and Organizations (e.g. schools) to be able to open? What do you envision as the next normal for our community?); Good of the Order; and Next Steps. Minutes have not yet been prepared for last week's meeting.

ITEM 4.4 2017-18 STREET RESURFACING AND SLURRY SEAL PROGRAM, PROJECT 18-01-ACCEPT CONSTRUCTION

1. Does it really take 2 years of a process to get the point that the city does resurfacing? Why does it take so long?

Although there were various delays in the project due to weather and contractor delays, a majority of the resurfacing work was completed by August 2019. At that time, there was a staffing shortage in Construction, making it difficult for the existing staff to expeditiously address the final project close out work. The contractor then delayed addressing the final project close out items until February 2020. The project acceptance process began in March 2020 but was stalled due to the COVID-19 crisis.

ITEM 4.6 ADOPT A RESOLUTION EXTENDING THE DECLARATION OF A SHELTER CRISIS

1. Is there any downside to extending the shelter crisis?

It is recommended based on the findings and data on homelessness. There could be concerns that designating a shelter crisis could mean more resources, or actions to address homelessness. However, the City already funds a robust program of basic services, outreach services, short-term housing solutions like rental assistance, a safe parking program, and is a recognized leader in addressing the regional problem of insufficient housing supply over the long-term.

2. Why was 2022 picked over 2021? The first Declaration was for only one year?

The first declaration was approved in March of 2019, and set to coincide after the next County Point in Time count of the homeless. Similarly, the new action is set to coincide with the next count in 2021.

3. Please expand on the inadvertent creation of a RV park. What does it mean to the city?

If an RV park is created inadvertently it would be subject to state RV park laws. These laws regulate park construction, maintenance, use, occupancy, and design. In addition, the City's Zoning Code limits RV parks to the MM (General Industrial) Zone with a Conditional Use Permit.

ITEM 4.7 MOUNTAIN VIEW TRANSIT CENTER MASTER PLAN GRADE SEPARATION AND ACCESS PROJECT-AGREEMENT FOR FINAL DESIGN

1. On page 4 of the staff report it says "The design will include architectural and urban design elements that have been presented and reviewed at community and Council meetings." Does this mean future meetings? Shouldn't it say "The design will include architectural and urban design elements that ~~have been~~ will be presented and reviewed at community and Council meetings"? If not, when did the community and Council reviewed architectural and urban design elements?

The architecture and urban design elements are general in nature at this time and reflect key design principles discussed at previous Community Meetings and Council Study Sessions. These include, for example, the desire for wide, well-lighted, attractive under crossings, provisions for public art, separate paths for bikes and pedestrians where possible, and bike channels on stairways. Specific designs for these and other elements will be developed by Caltrain during Final Design and will be reviewed by the City. In addition, a Community Meeting will be held in fall 2020 to review the project design, including architecture and urban design elements, and provide for public input to help guide the hand-off of the project to Caltrain.

2. On page 5 of the staff report it says "As part of approving execution of the Cooperative Agreement by the City Manager, the Council will be agreeing to support Caltrain studying a potential four-track segment in the northern segment of the City. This is consistent with the previously approved principles, which did not oppose a four-track segment north of the Mountain View station but stated feasibility studies must be conducted before any locations are selected." When were these principles approved by the City Council?

The principles for the Caltrain Business Plan Service Vision were approved by Council on April 9, 2019.

3. I can't get this staff report to display contents beyond the first page. It just shows me blank white pages. How much of this might limit the design interface with people who use our downtown, or maybe I should say the user experience of our downtown? I'm thinking safety and perceived safety of underground spaces and spaces near the tunnel, possible underground vendors, interface with public plazas above including how possible it is to landscape with mature trees, pedestrian right-of-way, biker right-of-way, etc.? How will the public have input?
The design will be consistent with the project definition previously approved by the City Council and defined in the City's preliminary engineering plans and the environmental documents. The

design will include architectural and urban design elements that have been presented and reviewed at community and Council meeting. There will be another community meeting in fall 2020, before the project hand-off to Caltrain, to present the concept design elements previously approved by Council and to allow Caltrain staff to receive first-hand initial input from the community leading into final design. More community meetings and reports to Council will follow over the next two years as final design proceeds.

ITEM 4.8 MUNICIPAL GREEN BUILDING POLICY

1. For non-municipal buildings, does the City require the certificate, or just the actions to meet the intent of the LEED standards?

The policies in proposed Council Policy K-25 do not change the standards for non-municipal buildings. For non-municipal buildings, Mountain View's Green Building Requirements state that buildings, other than single-family homes or duplexes, must "Meet the intent of LEED Gold," but do not require certification. Single-family homes or duplexes do not have any LEED-related standards. Projects may be subject to additional requirements as specified in the applicable Precise Plan.

ITEM 4.10 PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2020-21 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

1. For El Camino Real Bike Improvements, Design (Project 20-61), is changing the borders for bicycle improvements on El Camino Real between the City limit bordering Sunnyvale and Castro Street, a change from what the Council previously approved? If not, what is the impact of this proposed change?

This change is consistent with the Council's action on June 18, 2019 to direct staff to work with Caltrans to identify and advance opportunities to install bicycle and pedestrian improvements consistent with the El Camino Real Streetscape Plan as part of Caltrans' repaving project. At the time, Council approved pursuing the protected bikeways from Castro to Sylvan and providing pedestrian improvements for the full length of El Camino Real within City limits. In the June 18, 2019, Council Report, staff indicated that the name and scope of Project 20-61 would be modified as part of the next CIP adoption action.

2. When will project 21-39 Grant Road and Sleeper Avenue Intersection Improvements, Design and Construction come to Council for review/approval of the changes to this intersection?

The Grant Road and Sleeper Avenue Intersection Study (Project 18-68) is evaluating potential improvements to this intersection and is scheduled to be completed by the end of 2020. Staff will provide an update to Council on the Study (Project 18-68) in November/December 2020. The Grant/Sleeper design and construction project (Project 21-39) will commence once the Study (Project 18-68) is complete. It is anticipated that Project 21-39 would go to Council for approval of plans and specifications in the first quarter of 2022.

3. It is possible to create charts that show proposed projects by funding source (similar to the charts that show projects by category)? I recognize that some projects are funded by several sources, so listing the project in several areas is fine with a note that the project is listed in several areas.

Composing these charts will take time and can be sent to Council before the budget is adopted on June 23, 2020.

4. The budget document notes a deficiency of \$5 million for wastewater capital improvements that are needed. Should we look at using other funding sources for these projects? Is there a risk of not doing these capital improvements sooner rather than later?

Funding is available for Fiscal Years 2020-21 and 2021-22 recommended wastewater capital improvements. The deficiency for the wastewater capital improvements begins in Fiscal Year 2022-23 for planned projects. As part of next year's 5-Year CIP planning process, staff will evaluate and assess projects and funding options for Fiscal Year 2022-23 and forward years for Council consideration and approval. The assessment will include a consideration of risks involved if a project is deferred due to lack of funding.

5. In attachment 4, there are proposed projects and planned projects, which of the two is build?

The Proposed Projects are those recommended for approval and funding in Fiscal Year 2020-21. The Planned Projects are those to be recommended for approval and funding in the future (Fiscal Year 2021-22 and beyond).

6. There are couple projects (21-27,xx-02,xx-27) to replace traffic signals, it appears that there is not enough money to do a proper job, \$289k , I was told that traffic signals were much more and that to replace one would require 2 years of budget to get the job done.

The Traffic Infrastructure – Miscellaneous Replacements and Modifications, Projects XX-02, are typically for replacing failed or damaged equipment at signalized intersections such as traffic signal controllers or cabinets, battery back-up systems, traffic detector loops, LED traffic signal lights, etc.

The Intersection Traffic Signal System – Major Replacements and Upgrades, Projects XX-27, are for traffic signal replacements and the amount allocated each year is not enough to design and construct a new traffic signal. Staff has combined multiple years of funding to fund these replacement projects, and in some cases grant funding has also been used to close the funding gap.

7. Was there any project for Stevens Creek Trail extension to Mountain View High?

Council previously adopted the Stevens Creek Trail Extension from Dale/Heatherstone to West Remington Drive in Mountain View (Project 20-50) which proposes to extend the Stevens Creek Trail from Dale/Heatherstone to West Remington Drive in Sunnyvale and includes an overcrossing from the trail to Mountain View High School.

8. Project 23-40, has any one reached out to Google? They had expressed some interested in get this done.

The Rengstorff Avenue Adaptive Signal System, Project 23-40, has been discussed with Google. As part of the Google's 1860-2159 Landings Drive development project (Landings), Google is proposing to contribute partial funding to this project as part of their Community Benefits package. At Council's discretion, if the development project is approved, these funds could be used towards Project 23-40.

9. Cash flow analysis of the various funding sources shows deficits in upcoming years, what does it mean, and what effect does that have on CIP projects?

The first year is the only year that is adopted and funded. All funds must balance for the first year. In the outer years for planned projects, funds do show a deficit. In the next CIP cycle, staff will evaluate and prioritize projects to balance funding for Council consideration and approval.

10. Active projects are about 311, is the close?

There are currently 288 active projects and 43 projects to close.

11. How many projects get done in an average year?

Twice a year, project managers provide updates on status of CIP projects and based on those updates, projects are either closed or remain active. In the last five years, an average of 45 projects per year have been closed. However, the number of projects closed does not necessarily equate to the number of projects completed due to various reasons including:

- Some projects remain active even after construction is complete due to project closeout procedures that project managers have to complete.
- Not all CIPs are projects; some CIPs are created to fund staff time coordination and effort (examples include Sea Level Rise Flood Protection Coordination, Capital improvement Program Development, etc.). These CIPs may be closed once funds have been depleted.

12. What is the status of the proposed bicycle boulevard/traffic safety improvements for Latham/Church? I couldn't find anything in the CIP schedule.

At the May 15, 2018 Study Session for the Latham/Church Street Bike Boulevard Feasibility Study, City Council did not support the major elements that would create a true bike boulevard along Latham and Church Streets, and preferred a modest set of improvements. As staff was not able to move forward with the bike boulevard concept, no funding has been budgeted in the CIP to further develop plans to implement a bike boulevard project and staff committed to making the more modest improvements as part of other projects as opportunities arose.

However, with less vehicular traffic on the roads and more people riding bicycles during the COVID-19 shelter-in-place, staff plans to submit a consent item to City Council on June 30th requesting approval to improve Latham Street for bicyclists based on the bike boulevard study. One of the main elements identified to enhance bicycling on Latham Street was to lower traffic volumes and divert traffic to parallel arterials by installing diverters at the intersections of

Latham/Shoreline and Latham/Ortega to prevent through traffic. Bicyclists will not be impacted by these diverters and may continue straight across the intersections. These would be temporary, quick-build diverters. Staff would then observe traffic patterns and hold a series of community meetings as traffic returns to determine how well these diverters are helping keep Latham more bike and pedestrian friendly and gauge general support for making the diverters permanent. More details will be provided in the Council Report on June 30.

13. In light of COVID and Shelter in Place with less car traffic, is there a way to move up some of the bike projects we have listed such as California Street? Could we get an update on where we were on that project? Any chance for a Slower Streets initiative on other streets in the City?

The California Street (West) Complete Street Improvements Pilot, Project 21-40, is proposed as part of the Fiscal Year 2020-21 CIP. This project scope involves the design and construction of complete streets improvements (bulb outs, midblock crossings, lane narrowing and lane reduction) along California Street between Showers Drive and Ortega Avenue. Community outreach and design for the project will commence in Fiscal Year 2020-21.

Staff is already working on a number of bike projects, some of which were delayed due to COVID-19. Bike projects require substantial community outreach efforts as they may require removing parking, narrowing or removing traffic lanes, etc. Examples of recent projects delayed due to the need for community outreach include the design of the Stierlin Road Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements and completion of the El Monte Corridor Study. Staff is working on developing new community outreach/input strategies via Zoom and on-line surveys. This has to be thoughtfully set up to ensure the community members can be engaged, informed, and able to provide input. Some projects require permitting from other agencies who were delayed in working on “non-essential” permits during the Shelter-in-Place, such as Caltrans permitting for the Shoreline Transit Lane, which includes constructing protected bikeways on Shoreline.

There are currently around 60 active CIP projects that include bicycle/pedestrian improvements or otherwise will benefit bicyclists and/or pedestrians. The proposed Fiscal Year 2020-21 CIP includes 11 more projects that will include or benefit bicyclists and/or pedestrians. If Council would like to add more bike projects or move some forward, other CIP projects or work assigned to Traffic, Capital Projects, and/or Transportation would have to be deferred.

In terms of a “Slow Streets Initiative”, staff has been reviewing other cities’ efforts, including the workload impact. The cities setting up soft closures (closed to through traffic, advisory only/not enforceable) are either hand picking a few streets that they had already planned for bike-related improvements or have set up a substantial multi-departmental effort involving evaluating streets against certain criteria, extensive community outreach, and implementation. Rather than an all-out effort for soft street closures that could be fairly short term as local traffic increases with more businesses opening up, staff recommends that the City continue to focus on the Castro Street Closure, continue work on the current active bike/pedestrian projects, and initiate the new Fiscal Year 2020-21 bike/pedestrian projects as quickly as possible in the new fiscal year. In addition, staff is planning to propose a new quick-build project for Latham Street to reduce through traffic volumes and improve bicycle conditions. Staff will continue to look for and propose other opportunities for quick-build, pop-up, and/or pilot programs as workload allows.

ITEM 4.12 RESOLUTION CLOSING CASTRO STREET AND MODIFYING PARKING RESTRICTIONS

1. Why is the city providing chairs and tables?

Staff explored different options as to who would provide the chairs and tables and recommends the City provide chairs and tables. This will create an open dining concept for all downtown restaurants and not just restaurants specifically on Castro Street. Several restaurants who do not front the right of way expressed concerns about availability of space. Staff can also design the outdoor dining to meet social distancing, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and accessibility needs and emergency paths of travel. However, if after the pilot program launches, the City identifies an opportunity or need for businesses to provide chairs and tables, staff will make program modifications.

2. Why is there a recommendation without a cost estimate?

Staff had been working proactively and quickly on the concept of outdoor dining along Castro Street. The original schedule was to bring the resolution for street closure and parking modifications to Council on June 23 for implementation in July or later. However, notification that outdoor dining (but no indoor dining) would be allowed as of June 5 was released on June 1. In an effort to move quickly to help out the restaurants, staff is bringing the resolution to Council on June 9 before all the details and cost estimates are fully developed, with the goal of implementing during the week of June 22. Staff is continuing to work to develop and refine street layouts that incorporate all of the needed elements, which will form the basis of cost estimates. Staff is also working to understand which costs can be absorbed, and which items can be borrowed from other entities.

3. If the city wanted to upgrade the appearance and a bit of uniformity to the city sidewalk dining, could this be the time to state the discussion?

Staff is not proposing any changes to the current Sidewalk Café License requirements or process as part of the temporary Castro Street closure. Amendments to this would need to be part of a separate discussion pertaining specifically to Sidewalk Cafés.

4. Is there any update on the Castro Street Pedestrian Mall Feasibility study?

Because of the COVID-19 Shelter in Place Public Health Order, the Castro Pedestrian Mall Feasibility Study has been delayed by a few months. This feasibility study will explore creating a pedestrian mall or public plaza along all of or a portion of the 100 Block of Castro Street between Evelyn Avenue and Villa Street. The foundational approach to this study is for the consultant, Gehl Studios, to conduct a Public Life Public Space (PLPS) assessment, which requires active observation of public use of Castro Street and on-the-street surveys. The original study schedule called for the PLPS assessment to be conducted in late April. The PLPS assessment has now been postponed until the shelter order is lifted and people adjust back into a more public life. The consultant is continuing to work on collecting and analyzing existing conditions data, and staff will provide schedule updates as soon as we can determine the best timing for the PLPS assessment.

5. If the county ban on in store dining is lifted sooner, would the street dining end sooner than Sept 30?

Council could choose to end the street dining earlier; however, staff recommends continuing through September 30 due to the likelihood that restaurants will have to reduce the inside capacity of their restaurants to provide social distancing. In order to maximize the potential for economic recovery during the period of peak restaurant demand in Downtown Mountain View, street dining should continue through to September 30, regardless of whether the ban on indoor dining is lifted.

6. I notice staff is working with Gehl Studios on this. Will this work be used to inform Gehl's work analyzing and suggesting design for our eventual pedestrian mall area?

As a part of Gehl's work on Castro Street outdoor dining program, they will be collecting data for analysis and evaluating the program. This analysis will help to understand how the summer closure is performing and how it might inform long term changes for the 100 block of Castro Street (i.e., the Castro Pedestrian Mall Feasibility Study).

7. How will the outdoor dining interface with food delivery robots?

Food delivery robots will remain on the sidewalks and yield to pedestrians. Staff will coordinate with Starship Technologies to ensure the robots do not interfere with the outdoor dining.

ITEM 6.1 PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2020-21 PROPOSED BUDGET

1. Do we have to set timing for gatekeepers to be considered? Can timing be open ended?

There is no specific timing requirement for gatekeepers to be considered. However, historically, they have been considered as a group for the following reasons:

- It allows Council to review the effect of the gatekeepers on the timing of Council goals and staff workload in a more efficient manner rather than on a case-by-case basis.
- It allows a comparison of the merits of each gatekeeper application before the Council makes a decision.
- Grouping applications incentivizes applicants to pay more attention to their application and community benefit package.

Due to current significant workloads, it is recommended to postpone the consideration of gatekeeper projects until at least Fall 2021.

2. How much was spent on the antique fire apparatus in the 2019-2020 fiscal year? How much has been raised from other sources?

The City has three antiques:

1917 Ford Model T

1924 American LaFrance

1930 Ford Model A

Between all three, we have spent \$32,954.68 to date. We have received approximately \$8000 in donations for labor and material cost from vendors. Firefighters have contributed over 500 hours

in donated labor hours. The 1924 American LaFrance was very dilapidated and it has taken extensive reconstruction and hand machining of body and engine parts. We are about 70% done with getting it fully restored to when Mountain View ordered it in 1924.

3. On page 7-6, it says the City's membership in NOISE is \$22,800. On NOISE's website it says membership for a City our size is \$1,540. What is driving the different numbers? Perhaps the Regional Airplane Noise Roundtable and NOISE are being confused.

Yes, the amount on page 7-6 is not \$22,800. This amount represents the Regional Airplane Noise Round Table as noted on page 7-23. This will be corrected for the Adopted Budget document.

4. On Attachment 3, page 2 (if the pages were numbered) it says Jun 2021 for implementation of item 1.8. If the voters approve the ordinance in November, how long will this take to implement?

It took 3 months, \$55,000 in material costs, and over 700 hours of staff time to install the bike lane signs restricting oversized vehicle parking on the 24 streets with bike lanes. The effort to install signs on streets 40 or less feet wide Citywide will take considerably more time, effort, and resources. According to City GIS records, there are over 500 streets that may qualify as being 40 or less feet wide and every block on these streets would need to be signed if the ordinance is approved in November. If all work is done by City Engineering and Streets staff, 2 to 3 years would be required and this would take away from other project and maintenance activities. It may be possible to hire a Traffic Engineering design consultant to prepare the installation plans (conduct all field checks, identify sign locations, etc.) and then bid out the sign installation to a contractor. This would take 9-12 months but will require a project budget. An estimated cost for such a project has not yet been developed.

5. On Attachment 3, page 5 (if the pages were numbered), it is not clear if staff is working on item 2.5. Is staff saying they are not working on this because the RHC put it on their agenda? Can the Council not work on something independent of what the RHC is doing?

Staff is not proposing a change to the project. However, there have been delays to the project due to staff having to focus on COVID-19 issues and other state and federally mandated projects such as the CDBG Consolidated Plan and Action Plan. Council direction was to review options other than a mobile home park rent ordinance and bring it back for their review. A study session on the issue will be scheduled as the next step. The Council can work on an item independent of the RHC. Information about the RHC's intention to agendize consideration of mobile home inclusion in CSFRA is being provided for Council's information.

6. On Attachment 3, page 6 (if the pages were numbered), I was under the impression that the next step would be a Study Session with the Council for item 2.9 as the Council needs to provide direction before an application can be submitted. Is this not staff's understanding?

Staff intends to bring this item to Council in a Study Session in Q3 2020.

7. What is the “target” funding status for the safety and miscellaneous plans, or the goal we are aiming for? What is a “healthy” funding status?

In the past, a target funding in the mid 80% was considered to be a healthy funding status.

8. How does the City materially benefit from lump-sum payments to CalPERS to pay down the unfunded liability? Are there short- or medium-term savings we enjoy from large lump-sum payments?

Because CalPERS assesses interest on the City’s outstanding unfunded liability, making extra or lump-sum payments to reduce this balance can save the City money over time. However, the opportunity cost needs to be considered to determine what other uses are being foregone by applying these funds to reduce the liability. There is also a potential market risk by making a large payment all at once. For example, should CalPERS experience a significant investment loss soon after the payment is made, the benefit of the extra payment could be lost or take years to recover.

9. Can the City place the Google Parking Lease revenues in a reserve to pay the anticipated additional annual pension contribution costs if/when CalPERS reduces the discount rate?

Yes, it is currently tracked in the General Non-Operating Fund, however, if Council wishes to place it in other fund/Reserve until spent, that is possible.

10. What are the deliverables/desired outcomes for the “Strategic Planning and Innovation” and “Organizational Analysis” proposed expenditures?

The outcome of funding Strategic Planning and Innovation would be creation of a process that engages the City Council, staff, and the community in defining Mountain View's mission, values, priorities and vision for the future, and an implementable plan document that identifies the steps needed to achieve this vision. Progress would be tracked and reported to the Council and the community on a regular basis. Consultants would be hired as part of this process. Innovation initiatives include hiring a consultant to assist with the City’s new marketing/branding/website overhaul to align with the vision and Strategic Plan, as well as implementing technology solutions that will help with reporting data and analytics.

The outcome of funding Organizational Analysis would be assessment of City administrative functions (personnel, technology and finance) to identify and implement changes needed to modernize and streamline these functions so that they are more effective and efficient in serving Mountain View's customers, with a focus on implementing innovative solutions. Desired outcomes include enhanced and more user-friendly online services for residents, integrated systems and other technology for identifying, tracking and responding to community needs, and tools to support employee engagement and performance.

11. Is the \$600,000 recommended to fund COVID-19 emergency expenditures eligible for any kind of reimbursement/CARES Act funding?

The \$600,000 is needed up front. There are anticipated grants and FEMA reimbursement that we most likely won't receive for a while. The City does not qualify for the CARES Act funding which provides funds to agencies with a population of 500,000 or greater.

12. On page 1-19, staff provides information regarding \$1.0 billion commercial property transactions in North Bayshore. How much did the City collect in transfer taxes (real property conveyance tax) from these property sales?

The City received \$3.3M in December 2018, that were deposited to the Construction/Conveyance Tax Fund.

13. Where is the City's Full Cost Allocation Plan available for public review?

The city's last cost allocation plan was completed in FY 2015. It is not available online currently, but is available upon request. The document, is updated periodically and used as a basis for fee studies and is available for review.

14. Are there any major fleet replacement or equipment replacement projects scheduled over the next few years?

The Equipment Replacement Fund includes several categories: Computers/Computer infrastructure (networks, etc.), CAD/RMS, Communication Center, Fire Radios, Police Radios, Fleet and Golf Fleet. Yes, there are large purchases expected in the next few fiscal years, the largest being the Fire Fleet (7 Engines, 1 Aerial Ladder Truck) in FY22-23 at a cost of approximately \$9.0M.

Large Fleet items scheduled to be replaced in FY21-22 are 5 Police Cars (\$325,000), 3 Safety SUVs (\$225,000), 7 ¾-ton trucks (\$420,000), the bookmobile (\$225,000), and the Grader (\$350,000). Also in FY21-22 are the Fire Radios (\$539,000).

Large Fleet items schedules to be replaced in Fiscal Year 22-23 are the 6 Police Motorcycles (\$210,000), 9 Hybrid SUVs (\$321,000), 4 Police Cars (\$260,000), and 4 Patrol Tahoes (\$240,000). Also in FY22-23 are some Police Radios (\$434,000, all are scheduled over 3 years with \$280,000 remaining in the following two FYs).

Large Fleet items schedules to be replaced in Fiscal Year 23-24 are 7 Hybrid SUVs (\$251,000), 6 Police Cars (\$390,000), 2 Backhoes (\$300,000).

15. Can staff provide clarification on the CDBG funds that were allocated for rent relief? Some funds were appropriated from future allocations of CDBG funding, meaning that we'll have a corresponding decrease in future years – is that correct?

No, the City did not borrow or appropriate from future allocations. On April 14, the Council appropriated unused FY 19/20 funds, its FY 20/21 CDBG entitlement funds and CARES Act CDBG funding for the Rent Relief Program. Please note that FY 20/21 capital project applications are still recommended for full funding using past FY 2015-18 unspent CDBG funds. The following table summarizes the funding by category type:

Group 1: Reallocate FY 2019-20 funds	\$435,000
Group 2: CDBG FY 20-21 funds	\$351,000
Group 3: CARES Act funds	\$348,702
TOTAL	\$1.13M

16. Page 4-61 – staff recommends \$22,800 for participation in the Regional Airplane Noise Round Table. What exactly is this expenditure used for? What does the City lose if we no longer participate in this Round Table?

The purpose of the Round Table is to "foster and enhance a cooperative relationship to develop, evaluate, and implement reasonable and feasible policies, procedures, and mitigation actions that will further reduce the impacts of aircraft noise in neighborhoods and communities in Santa Clara and Santa Cruz Counties." The funding requested would continue to pay the dues set for membership in the Round Table. These membership payments fund the administrative and analytical staff work needed to support the Round Table. If Mountain View did not participate in the Round Table it could not bring the interests of our community forward and be part of the discussion and efforts to develop solutions to aircraft noise concerns.

17. What is the status of the Public Art Strategy? I thought it was near complete.

Staff has begun work on the Public Art Strategy, including hiring a public art consultant to on the strategy, receiving initial feedback from the Visual Arts Committee; and a review of public art programming in neighboring cities. However, due to reprioritization of and bringing forward earlier other Council goal work items (i.e., Small Business Strategy and Downtown Parking Strategy), as well as significant workload impacts from COVID-19, staff is recommended deferring the item to next fiscal year.

18. Page 4-188 – Staff recommends \$18,000 for an annual financial audit for commercial cannabis businesses. Are there any cannabis businesses close to opening? What is the likelihood that a cannabis business will open during the 2020-21 fiscal year?

There are two active cannabis applications currently in process. Staff expects at least one of the two to begin operations in FY 20-21.

19. How has the City taken advantage of the AAA credit rating? What are savings or actions the City has benefited from that would not have been possible without the AAA credit rating?

The City typically benefits from a strong credit rating when issuing debt as it will allow lenders to provide a lower interest rate due to the lower risk profile. The City currently has little outstanding debt, but is planning on issuing new debt over the next couple years that should benefit from its high rating.

20. Can staff provide a history of the activity for the General Fund Reserve and the Budget Contingency Reserve since the Great Recession?

GF Reserve (Prior to 6/30/2006 was called Operating Contingency Reserve, FY06-07 combined w Emergency Reserve and renamed)

FY99-00 \$61,000 to the GOF, various Council actions

FY00-01 \$810,935 to the GOF, \$60,000 to the Liability Insurance Fund. Various Council Actions

FY01-02 \$179,437 to the GOF, various Council actions

FY02-03 \$126,261 to the GOF, various Council actions

FY03-04 \$110,000 to the GOF, various Council actions

FY04-05 \$37,700 to the GOF, \$10,000 transferred to the GNOF, \$50,000 to the Liability Insurance Fund. Various Council Actions

FY05-06 \$102,328 to the GOF, \$35,000 transferred to the GNOF, \$175,000 to the Liability Insurance Fund. Various Council Actions

FY06-07 \$155,725.42 to the GOF, \$32,035 to the GNOF. Various Council Actions

FY07-08 \$1,221,736 to the GOF, \$165,000 to Other Funds. Various Council Actions

FY08-09 \$128,500 to the GOF, various Council actions

FY09-10 \$60,000 to GOF, 2 Council actions

FY10-11 \$25,000 to GOF, \$65,000 transferred to CIP, 2 Council actions

FY11-12 \$187,000 to GOF, 2 Council actions

FY12-13 \$15,000 to CIP

FY13-14 \$135,000 to GOF, \$15,000 to GNOF, \$32,000 to SGL, \$65,000 to CIP. Various Council actions

FY14-15 \$147,300 to the GOF, \$165,798.11 to the Self Insurance Fund. Various Council Actions

FY15-16 \$110,285 to GOF, \$610,000 to GNOF. Various Council Actions

FY16-17 \$20,000 to GOF, \$497,000 to GNOF, \$362,000 for CSFRA. Various Council actions

FY17-18 \$59,000 to GOF, \$3,391,174 to GNOF (\$3,171,174 adopted for CalPERS Contribution as part of \$10M total). Various Council actions

FY18-19 \$392,750 to GOF, \$350,000 to CIP. Various Council actions

FY19-20 \$975,100 to GOF, 2 Council actions

Budget Contingency Reserve (created in FY06-07)

FY09-10 \$250,000 used to transition positions eliminated from budget, \$200,000 MY action for retirement incentives, \$1,608,544 budgeted to balance GOF (not needed), \$540,000 to GNOF for LP items (not needed)

FY10-11 \$128,000 used to transition positions eliminated from budget, \$138,400 to GOF for revenue backfill, \$2.0M to GNOF for LP items

FY11-12 \$60,000 midyear closed session, \$359,000 to GOF contingency for State Budget, \$500,000 to GOF contingency to transition SGL to different Op model, \$588,000 to GOF contingency for RDA elimination

FY12-13 \$175,169.28 to transition RDA to GOF

FY18-19 \$200,000 to SGL (mid-year action for shortfall)

21. Is the Charleston East prepaid rent intended to act as something like an endowment, with the principal kept intact and the interest earnings to be invested or expended?

The \$30M prepaid rent is considered unearned, and revenue is recognized as it is earned monthly. The City Council previously directed the \$30M principal be available at the end of the term, but the interest could be used. Initially \$350,000 was transferred to the GOF, however, due to declining interest rates the amount transferred to the GOF was more than the interest earned, and effective FY16-17 Council approved stopping the transfers.

Are there more active uses of the principal that could provide more value to the City – for instance, expenditures that could reduce future costs?

Staff believes the City could only use the earned portion plus interest (estimated to be \$7.0M). However, Council approved using up to \$3.0M of this for the MV Homebuyer program (through FY29-30).

22. Where/how exactly is the Charleston East prepaid rent invested?

It is part of the City's pooled investment portfolio that is invested in accordance with the City's investment policy.

23. On page 8 of staff report, the pie chart on Expenditures, the item General Fund reserves \$16m, what is that for?

Please refer to page 5-32 and 5-33 of the budget document that provides a breakdown for this balance by expenditure reserve and type:

General Non-Operating Fund: \$8.2 M made up of \$5.7M limited-period funding (\$3.9M new \$1.8M re-budget) pages 7-19 to 7-27, \$338,200 re-budget capital outlay pages 7-36 and 7-37, and transfers of \$600,000 to General Fund Reserve from carryover, \$1.3M to Compensated Absences Reserve from carryover, and \$225,000 parking lot rent transferred to the CIP Reserve.

Graham School Site Maintenance Reserve: \$250,000 for expenditures related to the maintenance for the reservoir

Transportation Reserve: \$1.2M CIPs

Capital Improvement Reserve: \$4.0M CIPs

Strategic Property Acquisition Reserve: \$2.3M made up of \$2.0M re-budget for 777 W Middlefield Development approved by Council 5-21-19, \$110,000 for maintenance of 4 properties offset by rent revenue, and \$140,700 lease of property from Castle Farms (final year)

Childcare Reserve: \$105,000

Minor Estate Trust: \$11,500

24. CHAC requested additional funding. How much are the other JPA City members contributing to cover the budget shortfall, relative to our proposed \$75K?

The CHAC Executive Director noted that the City of Los Altos committed to contribute \$20,000 and the City of Los Altos Hills committed \$2,000.

25. Page 3-10 - are we planning to not contribute to our GF reserve after FY20-21?

The \$600,000 recommended from the GNOF balance available will bring the reserve to the policy balance minimum of 20% for Fiscal Year 20-21. Any recommendation for FY21-22 will be brought forth with the FY21-22 Budget.

How does that affect our policy of at keeping at least 20% in our Reserve?

With the additional \$600,000, the GF Reserve will be within the minimum 20% policy.

26. Similarly, with CalPERS contributions, is the plan not to do anymore prefunding?

For Fiscal Year 2020-21, there are no “extra’ funds currently estimated to be able to make additional contributions to CalPERS. However, Council previously adopted a strategy to contribute significant lump sum payments to CalPERS which includes \$10M from future Google Parking Lease revenues (5-year lease). These lease payments are on a calendar year basis and begin January 2021 with \$1.0M available to contribute to CalPERS in FY20-21; however staff recommends making the contribution the fiscal year after the funds are received. (page 1-10)

27. Page 3-61 - How many PEPRA employees do we now have?

In January (reported in the negotiations binder), there were 212 Misc. and 34 Safety PEPRA members

28. 5-26 - Equipment Replacement Fund - There seems to be a large reserve in this fund. Is there a large purchase expected, or is it what the policy requires?

The Equipment Replacement Fund includes several categories: Computers/Computer infrastructure (networks, etc.), CAD/RMS, Communication Center, Fire Radios, Police Radios, Fleet and Golf Fleet. Yes, there are large purchases expected in the next few fiscal years, the largest being the Fire Fleet (7 Engines, 1 Aerial Ladder Truck) in FY22-23 at a cost of approximately \$9.0M.

Large Fleet items scheduled to be replaced in FY21-22 are 5 Police Cars (\$325,000), 3 Safety SUVs (\$225,000), 7 ¾-ton trucks (\$420,000), the bookmobile (\$225,000), and the Grader (\$350,000). Also in FY21-22 are the Fire Radios (\$539,000).

Large Fleet items schedules to be replaced in Fiscal Year 22-23 are the 6 Police Motorcycles (\$210,000), 9 Hybrid SUVs (\$321,000), 4 Police Cars (\$260,000), and 4 Patrol Tahoes (\$240,000). Also in FY22-23 are some Police Radios (\$434,000, all are scheduled over 3 years with \$280,000 remaining in the following two FYs).

Large Fleet items schedules to be replaced in Fiscal Year 23-24 are 7 Hybrid SUVs (\$251,000), 6 Police Cars (\$390,000), 2 Backhoes (\$300,000).

29. Page 7-6 - what is the Alliance for Innovation?

The Alliance for Innovation is an organization partnered with the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) and Arizona State University (ASU) to connect local

governments across North America and serve as a resource for emerging practices in local government. The City is a member of the Alliance, and all City staff have access to the member benefits such as the innovation newsletter and journal, trainings, workshops and conferences; and access to ASU led research on local government innovation.

30. 7-36 Capital Outlay - CDD - CSFRA startup software purchase. Since the RHC is fully functioning and collecting fees for their operational purposes, can they purchase their own software, or are we getting reimbursed?

This is in the CSFRA, not the City's Budget. Although it is combined in the Housing Division of Community Development, it is accounted for in its own Fund – please see the CSFRA Fund Schedule page 5-13.

31. In Attachment 3 regarding Council major goals I read these notes: “4.9 Implement the Public Services Study actions, including population updates, study of police staffing levels, and Fire Community Risk Assessment.” In the first column of the table and “Regarding the Police Department staffing study, based on a variety of factors, including shortcomings from the contracted vendor and drastic changes to police operations into the foreseeable future due to COVID-19, PD has canceled the contract for this work study and recommends removal of project from the work plan,” in the last column. Might this present us with an opportunity to rethink how we're structuring policing as our population grows? Any ideas?

A comprehensive look at the future of policing could be an opportunity in place of a traditional staffing study. Staff is considering alternatives for exploring this further.

32. Can the following budget requests be clarified (drones, 3-D laser scanner, special operations vehicles, rifles, parking enforcement/towing)?

- Drones – Following the City Council's approval of the citywide policy defining the specific uses and reporting of unmanned aerial systems, the Police Department already acquired two small “drones” for such uses as searching for missing persons or fleeing suspects, and photographing crime scenes. This is a re-budget of the remaining balance from the initial \$28,000 budget that would purchase ancillary equipment, such as batteries, a viewing screen, and carrying cases.
- 3-D Laser Scanner for Crime Scene Investigations – This system provides the capability to efficiently “map” and diagram a crime scene, or the intersection of a fatal or serious injury collision as opposed to doing it by hand. Completing these at scale diagrams by hand requires a significant amount of resources. This system will save time and money.
- Special Operations Detective Hybrid Vehicles – This request replaces a more cost prohibitive alternative of renting or leasing two vehicles by purchasing two unmarked vehicles for use by investigators and administration.
- 30 patrol rifles – The department's initial patrol rifle inventory was purchased over 20 years ago. This procurement ensures an adequate number of rifles are available for issue to each officer (they are fitted to each officer), as well as provides replacement equipment. Rifles are essential for ensuring officers are able to protect the community from serious threats, such as an active shooter or violent criminal armed with similar weapons.

- Upfitting vehicles - Upfitting is the cost for equipment and labor to install the emergency equipment (lights and siren), radio, computer, prisoner transport equipment, and additional safety equipment in patrol cars. This is for patrol cars that have been ordered to replace old patrol cars that are being retired due to age, wear and tear.
- Expand parking enforcement and towing RVs - This request provides resources to enforce the parking restrictions for oversized vehicles and a towing subsidy when impounding RVs in disrepair.

33. Can any of these items be deferred or changed?

The drone equipment, patrol rifles, parking enforcement, and RV towing subsidy could be deferred until mid-year. It is not recommended to defer the upfit the new police cars, replacing detective vehicles, or purchasing crime scene investigation software.

34. Are the drones needed right now? What would they be used for?

As noted above, following the City Council’s approval of the citywide policy defining the specific uses and reporting of unmanned aerial systems, the Police Department already acquired two small “drones” for such uses as searching for missing persons or fleeing suspects, and photographing crime scenes. This is a re-budget of the remaining balance from the initial \$28,000 budget that would purchase ancillary equipment, such as batteries, a viewing screen, and carrying cases.

35. Regarding the Golf Course, could staff provide past history back to 2007 on yearly revenues and expenditures?

See attached.

ITEM 6.2 ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS REGARDING FAMILY DAY-CARE HOMES AND PLANNED COMMUNITY PERMITS

1. Since the Council already discussed this and made a change to the staff recommendation why are we not just re-approving our previous direction?

The Day Care and Planned Community ordinance amendments were bundled together with the ADU amendments in one ordinance initially. When the ADU sections were separated from the ordinance on May 12th, this resulted in a material revision to the ordinance which required re-introduction. Rules governing the adoption of ordinances are strict so although Council has already discussed these portions of the ordinance, procedural requirements require re-introduction and adoption. Additional edits were made by Council at the introduction of the ordinance on April 28th regarding small and large family day care centers in the CRA Zoning District. While the staff report does not call out these specific edits, the proposed ordinance itself includes the modified Commercial Land Use table to include small and large family day care as permitted in the CRA Zoning District.

2. Is there a difference between Planned Community District (PPD) and Precise Plan? Page 3 of staff report mentions PPD. If there isn’t, why are we using the phrase one over the other?

A Planned Community District is any area in the City that is zoned "P". Most areas zoned "P" have an associated precise plan however a few areas of the City that are zoned "P" do not have an associated precise plan which govern the area.

ITEM 8.1 CITYWIDE SCHOOL STRATEGY

1. Are voluntary contributions subject to the same restrictions as the state fees? What are those restrictions?

Voluntary contributions may be subject to any restrictions agreed upon between the developer and the school districts. Developers will likely expect school districts to use the funds for similar purposes as the State mitigation fees, which includes construction, reconstruction or other costs incurred to expand student capacity. Under State law, up to 3% may be used to administer the funds and the funds may also be used for necessary justification analysis and adoption of fees.

2. Will the City always have visibility into voluntary contributions that are made?

The City may not always be made aware of the voluntary contributions, though the information could arise during the project entitlement process and school districts and developers may have an incentive to publicize them. Agreements between the parties, once signed, will become public information.

3. When would the voluntary contributions be paid?

State mitigation fees are paid at the time of building permit, but the terms of voluntary agreements would be between the school districts and the developers.

4. How soon does a school district need to use the fee money it collects, and if it doesn't use it in the required time frame, what happens to the fees?

School mitigation fees are subject to the same timing requirements as other mitigations fees (such as the transportation impact fee or water/sewer capacity fee levied by the City). Every five years the School District must identify the specific projects for which all collected fees will be used, the additional funding is necessary to complete those projects, and an approximate date by which that funding will be secured. If it cannot do so, the money must be refunded.

5. The staff report says, "Incentives for Dedication. The City could allow developments that dedicate school land to allow development rights associated with that land elsewhere within their project area..." What does this mean?

This is similar to past development project approvals that have dedicated land for public parks. For example, "The Dean" development at 400 San Antonio Road dedicated land for a public park. It was allowed to accommodate the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of the whole site, including the park, on the smaller piece of land remaining after dedication. It was also allowed increased height to accommodate that floor area.

6. What work is staff doing to ensure that any shared city park/schoolyards function well both for city park users and for students?

When MVWSD is preparing to make site-specific changes at existing shared facility locations, City staff provides feedback regarding public access, safety and functionality. Both agencies must agree to changes affecting ongoing maintenance. For larger changes, such as Crittenden field improvement project, City staff meet with MVWSD staff regularly through the design process to ensure the project will meet the needs of the public.

The City and MVWSD are in the process of updating the Master Agreement for all shared locations, which lists each agency's responsibilities.

Staff from multiple departments has been collaborating with Los Altos School District on design of the future San Antonio-area school, including school layout, shared outdoor facilities, student and public access, safety concerns and integration with the planned adjacent City park. Should additional school locations be designed with any school district, the process already in place with Los Altos School District can be replicated to ensure the City's early involvement in design.

GENERAL FUND: SHORELINE GOLF LINKS/MICHAELS AT SHORELINE RESTAURANT

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Balances

	<u>Audited Actual 2006-07</u>	<u>Audited Actual 2007-08</u>	<u>Audited Actual 2008-09</u>	<u>Audited Actual 2009-10</u>	<u>Audited Actual 2010-11</u>	<u>Audited Actual 2011-12</u>	<u>Audited Actual 2012-13</u>	<u>Audited Actual 2013-14</u>
Revenues and Sources of Funds:								
Total	<u>3,630,907</u>	<u>3,587,710</u>	<u>3,264,456</u>	<u>2,935,285</u>	<u>2,637,532</u>	<u>2,556,242</u>	<u>2,279,484</u>	<u>2,544,058</u>
Expenditures and Uses of Funds:								
Total	<u>3,665,785</u>	<u>3,780,826</u>	<u>3,701,804</u>	<u>3,586,800</u>	<u>3,390,418</u>	<u>2,777,557</u>	<u>2,239,722</u>	<u>2,534,141</u>
Revenues and Sources Over (Under) Expenditures and Uses	(34,878)	(193,116)	(437,348)	(651,515)	(752,886)	(221,315)	39,762	9,917
Transfer from Budget Contingency Res	0	0	0	0	0	234,771	0	0
Transfer to General Operating Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(44,679)
Beginning Balance, July 1	<u>2,056,287</u>	<u>2,021,409</u>	<u>1,828,293</u>	<u>1,390,945</u>	<u>739,430</u>	<u>(13,456)</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>39,762</u>
Ending Balance, June 30*	<u>\$ 2,021,409</u>	<u>1,828,293</u>	<u>1,390,945</u>	<u>739,430</u>	<u>(13,456)</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>39,762</u>	<u>5,000</u>

Shoreline Golf Links/Michaels at Shoreline Restaurant includes revenues and expenditures related to the operation of the golf course and restaurant. Effective January 8, 2012 the City entered into an Operating Management Agreement with Touchstone Golf, LLC. On 10/23/18, City Council approved amending the operating agreement with Touchstone to include management of Michaels at Shoreline Restaurant. The amended operating agreement began January 1, 2019.

* Balance remaining for cash and encumbrances set aside for Touchstone Golf operations.

- (1) First half year of operations for Restaurant expected to be negative due to start up costs and came in with a net loss of \$60,800.
- (2) Due to shelter-in-place restrictions related to COVID-19, both operations ceased in March. Golf operations were able to resume, with limitations, in May.

GENERAL FUND: SHORELINE GOLF LINKS/MICHAELS AT SHORELINE RESTAURANT

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Balances

	<u>Audited Actual 2014-15</u>	<u>Audited Actual 2015-16</u>	<u>Audited Actual 2016-17</u>	<u>Audited Actual 2017-18</u>	<u>Audited Actual 2018-19</u>	<u>Estimated 2019-20</u>	<u>Proposed Budget 2020-21</u>
Revenues and Sources of Funds:							
Total	<u>2,482,764</u>	<u>2,342,177</u>	<u>2,259,870</u>	<u>2,323,228</u>	<u>2,655,943</u>	<u>2,839,000</u>	<u>4,228,000</u>
Expenditures and Uses of Funds:							
Total	<u>2,304,353</u>	<u>2,233,328</u>	<u>2,094,545</u>	<u>2,249,833</u>	<u>2,919,060</u>	<u>3,273,745</u>	<u>4,012,931</u>
Revenues and Sources Over (Under) Expenditures and Uses	178,411	108,849	165,325	73,395	(263,117)	(434,745)	215,069
Transfer from Budget Contingency Res	0	0	0	0	200,000	0	0
Transfer to General Operating Fund	(176,669)	(108,414)	(150,000)	(88,512)	0	0	(200,000)
Beginning Balance, July 1	<u>5,000</u>	<u>6,742</u>	<u>7,177</u>	<u>22,502</u>	<u>7,385</u>	<u>(55,732)</u>	<u>(490,477)</u>
Ending Balance, June 30*	<u><u>6,742</u></u>	<u><u>7,177</u></u>	<u><u>22,502</u></u>	<u><u>7,385</u></u>	<u><u>(55,732)</u></u> ⁽¹⁾	<u><u>(490,477)</u></u> ⁽²⁾	<u><u>(475,408)</u></u>

Shoreline Golf Links/Michaels at Shoreline Restaurant includes revenues and expenditures related to the operation of the golf course and restaurant. Effective January 8, 2012 the City entered into an Operating Management Agreement with Touchstone Golf, LLC. On 10/23/18, City Council approved amending the operating agreement with Touchstone to include management of Michaels at Shoreline Restaurant. The amended operating agreement began January 1, 2019.

* Balance remaining for cash and encumbrances set aside for Touchstone Golf operations.

(1) First half year of operations for Restaurant expected to be negative due to start up costs and came in with a net loss of \$60,800.

(2) Due to shelter-in-place restrictions related to COVID-19, both operations ceased in March. Golf operations were able to resume, with limitations, in May.