

## City Council Questions

### March 9, 2021 Council Meeting

#### ITEM 3.1 Google Middlefield Park Master Plan

- Can staff provide the public benefits/dollar contributions required from previously approved Development Agreements, including the LinkedIn project and the Sobrato project in East Whisman? On a per-square-foot basis, how do these DAs compare with the proposed DA for Middlefield Park?

<b>Project (Year Approved)</b>	<b>DA Term and Total Public Benefit Value</b>	<b>Total Square Footage (Public Benefit Per SF)</b>
700 E. Middlefield Rd (LinkedIn, 2018)	7 years at \$350,000 (monetary contribution)	763,000 SF office  = \$0.46 per SF
2600 Marine Way (Intuit, 2014)	7 years at \$175,000 (monetary contribution)	364,000 SF office  = \$0.48 per SF
600 Ellis St (Sobrato, 2020)	7 years at \$400,000 (monetary contribution)	259,000 SF office  = \$1.54 per SF
369 N. Whisman Rd (The Quad, 2011)	10 years at \$100,000 (monetary contribution)	180,000 SF office  = \$0.55 per SF
Google Middlefield Park (Proposed)	20 years at \$11 million (monetary contribution and in- kind/programmatic benefits)	1.3 million SF office, 1.9 million SF residential, and 50,000 SF retail/community space  = \$3.38 per SF  (\$8.46 per SF office only)

- How much in community benefits (not from Development Agreements) did previously approved projects in the East Whisman area provide? On a per-square-foot basis, how do these compare with the Middlefield Park proposal?

Community benefits are an adopted value established with the East Whisman Precise Plan on a per square foot basis. So, the value is consistent across all development projects at \$25 per net new square foot of office and \$5 per net new square foot of residential. Google's proposed \$19 million community benefit package exceeds the required community benefit value for the net new office and residential development of \$15.6 to 17.7 million, by \$1.3 to \$3.4 million (depending on the range of development square footage).

3. When would the 20-year community benefit to subsidize “community space” begin? What happens when the 20-year period ends? Would the space still be available for community use, only at market rent?

Per Google, approximately 14,000 square feet of space is targeted to be delivered in Phase 1 of development at the R1 and R2 locations. The 20-year lease term would start concurrent with the effective date of each lease within the community spaces. After 20 years, there will be a review period for each space with an option to renew if certain predetermined criteria are met. Staff does not currently have details of Google’s intended leasing strategy.

4. After the Master Plan is approved, how much discretion does the City have to modify or deny the development proposal?

The City has very limited discretion to modify or deny a development proposal that is consistent with an adopted Master Plan. Any major modification to the Master Plan would require City Council review and approval.

5. In Section E: Alternative Mitigations of the BMR Phase 2 Administrative Guidelines, dedication of land requires that “the value of the dedicated parcel shall be greater than the value of providing the BMR housing units on-site.” How did staff define “value” when drafting these Guidelines? What is the methodology for determining whether the value of the dedication is greater than the value of BMR units on-site?

The Guidelines provide flexibility for determining value. It requires applicants to provide a rationale for why their proposals are of greater value. For example, the evaluation criteria would include, but is not limited to, the following 1) whether the proposal creates more affordable housing opportunities than on site affordable units (e.g. more units, deeper affordability, etc.), and 2) the value of the proposal relative to the value of the onsite units. The City has hired a consultant to assist us in reviewing Google’s BMR Alternative Mitigation Plan.

6. Is the Bernardo Ave bicycle/pedestrian undercrossing/connection eligible for transportation impact fee funding?

The Bernardo Avenue bicycle/pedestrian connection is not eligible for the Transportation Impact Fee funding, as it was not included in the nexus study to establish the impact fee. However, VTA is providing a Measure B grant of \$18 million, with the City matching up to \$5 million dollars and the City of Sunnyvale also providing matching funds, for the design and construction of the connection. City staff is determining whether the City’s matching funds for the Bernardo Avenue connection could be provided through the East Whisman nexus study for infrastructure improvements (currently under way).

7. Is a voluntary school contribution proposed?

City staff has met with the Mountain View Whisman School District to introduce the Google Middlefield Park project. Google is proposing to provide some funding to the school districts, but no more specifics are available at this time. Any funding would be negotiated between the school districts and Google, and would not be part of the City’s consideration of land use approval for the Master Plan.

8. Has any community/non-profit space in previously built developments been occupied or used yet? If so, what is the use?

There are multiple developments under construction that include a space for community/non-profit use, including:

- Google has a 2,860 square foot Neighborhood Partnership Center (NPC) at their office development at 2000 N. Shoreline Blvd (Charleston East) for Google-hosted community events, which may also be used by community/non-profit groups;
- LinkedIn has a 3,000 square foot retail space at their new office development at 700 E. Middlefield Road, which is also proposed to be available for reservation by community members; and
- Greystar has a 4,285 square foot space available for nonprofit organizations or other cultural/public service providers within their mixed-use Master Plan development at 2580 and 2590 California Street and 201 San Antonio Circle.

Aside from developments under construction, there is an existing space that community/non-profit groups have utilized for meetings at The Sobrato Organization's office building at 2350 W. El Camino Real. Otherwise, spaces for hourly rent are available at existing businesses listed on the Mountain View Chamber of Commerce website: <http://chambermv.org/meeting-spaces>.

9. On the survey Google conducted, how was residency validated? Was it self-reported?

It was self-reported by the survey participant.

10. What would a "service street" be used for? What would a service street look like? How wide might it be? Would it have sidewalks? Why do the service streets go about half the length of the building on either side?

Service streets are described in the Mobility Chapter of the [East Whisman Precise Plan](#) as slower, narrower streets that provide access to parking garages, space for loading/delivery and trash trucks, for example (see Pg. 132 of Precise Plan). They are private streets with public access and include sidewalks on both sides for pedestrians, as well as tree plantings. Pg. 149 in the Precise Plan provides a cross-section graphic of the service street. All service streets in the Middlefield Park Master Plan must comply with Figure 35 on page 149, which Google is proposing to do.

Google is proposing four of the five new service streets as dead-end streets to provide access to the parking garages and service loading/access for the adjacent building locations. Google's graphic on Pg. 11 of Attachment 4 (Project Plans) is conceptual in representing the service street locations and is not intended to represent the details of the service street, such as length.

11. How does the proposed parking compare to the model parking standard?

The East Whisman Precise Plan has the same parking per bedroom count as the City's Model Parking standard: one space per studio and one-bedroom unit, two spaces per unit with two bedrooms or more, with guest parking included in these counts. However, the defining difference is the Model Parking standard is a minimum requirement, while the Precise Plan is a maximum requirement. So, less residential parking can be considered by the City Council for new residential development in the Precise Plan.

Google is generally proposing one parking space per residential unit in the Middlefield Park Master Plan, which is lower than the Model Parking standard, but aligns with what can be considered in the Precise Plan. A Parking Study for the Master Plan will be prepared and can help staff and Council assess the parking proposed, including district and shared parking.

12. Over what time period is the \$10 million small business diversification program?

Is the “Small Business Diversification Program” community benefit a temporary program or a permanent one? If it is temporary, when would it expire?

These two questions are answered collectively.

Per Google, the bulk of the program will be concentrated in Phase 1 of the project with rent structure and incentives for the first 10 years of occupancy. The small business diversification program targets the retailers in Phase 1 of the Master Plan development. In addition to the costs required to establish and provide appropriate services to the retail tenants (e.g. a building shell with basic mechanical and utilities), the program includes allowances to support local business operators with capital costs for tenant improvements and rental allowances that can be tailored to each type of tenant. Rental allowances may range from an initial rent-free period to rent structures that gradually increase over the lease term until the small business can support market rents.

Following the Study Session and based on EPC and Council input, staff will work through the details of the program with Google and an outside economic consultant to ensure value assumptions and estimations are transparent, and that the program structure and implementation is clear.

13. Is staff interested in having civic space in the East Whisman area for something like a satellite library?

City staff has not identified a need for a satellite library space within the East Whisman Precise Plan area. To consider a city-leased space, like a satellite library, would require: (a) an identified service need or deficiency by the City, (b) an analysis to identify what long-term costs, staffing, liability and ongoing responsibility would occur for the City for such a leased space, and (c) City Council authorization. City Staff has not identified this need nor heard direction from Council on this need to date.

14. Housing - with Google's proposal to dedicate 2.4 acres of land for affordable housing, in order to meet the 20% goal, it looks like the developments would have to be built at close to 140 units/acre. Do we have any developments at that kind of density?

With the ranges of residential units being considered in the Master Plan, the density of the stand-alone affordable housing developments as outlined by Google could range from 140 to 160 units per acre, based on 335 to 380 affordable units (20% target) and 2.4 acres of land.

A comparable project is the proposed 1100 La Avenida affordable housing project in the North Bayshore Precise Plan area, which has a proposed density of 104 units per acre (100 units on a 0.94-acre parcel). However, that development is limited to 55’ in height (4 stories), whereas these sites in East Whisman are proposed up to 75’ in height (6 to 7 stories), which allow for significantly more units per acre.

Please note, City staff has not vetted Google’s proposal for land dedication to confirm the specifics of their proposals compliance with the City’s BMR requirements. This analysis may look at different scenarios of greater affordability, such as more affordable units, fewer but larger units, or fewer units but deeper affordability.

15. Parks- My understanding is that Google is proposing the dedicate land for Maude Park, but the construction of the Park will be the responsibility of the City. Do we have enough Park In lieu fees, or do we expect to generate enough, to build the park along with the housing construction timeline?

Whether the City would have enough Park In-lieu fees available to build the proposed Maude Park in parallel with the housing construction timeline depends on several factors that are difficult to predict at this time, including:

- There is one approved residential development project (355 E. Middlefield Rd) and another proposed residential development project (400 Logue Ave) in the Whisman Parks and Open Space planning area (Whisman planning area) that combined could provide substantial Park In-lieu fees when, or if, they pull building permits. There could also be other new residential development in the Whisman planning area in upcoming years that could also provide park in-lieu fees.
- There are multiple park lands proposed in the Master Plan and there could be other potential new parks in the Whisman planning area that may require design and construction funding during the same timeframe as the build-out of Middlefield Park Master Plan.
- At over 4 acres in size, Maude Park qualifies as a citywide park under the Parks and Open Space Plan and, therefore, could utilize Park In-lieu fees from other planning areas in the City. This approach would help ensure there is sufficient funding for Maude Park at the right time; however, it could result in having less funding available for parks in other planning areas that are deficient in open space.

Ultimately, it will depend on the level of priority the City Council gives for constructing Maude Park compared to other new parks in terms of allocating both Park In-lieu fees and staff time. Council looks at funding and staff allocations for parks as part of the five-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

16. Development Agreement - Google has stated that they are asking for a 15 year + one 5-year extension term, not 20 years. Can staff confirm/clarify? How can we ensure that the housing and community benefits elements are built on the front end?

From City Staff's perspective, Google's request for a 15-year DA with a 5-year extension is collectively viewed as 20 years, since it is the total duration the DA would be active and the office development reserve of up to 633,000 square feet would be for set-aside for Google's sole use.

As staff has identified in the staff report, a shorter DA term of 15 years would provide the City with a timelier guarantee for the build-out of the Master Plan, including delivery of various elements. Based on input from the Council and the City's consultant, staff will work with the applicant to draft a DA with appropriate development timelines and deliveries for the various components.

In terms of the delivery of housing and community benefits, Council input at the Study Session will help staff frame the delivery of the various components when drafting the DA.

17. Are there TDM requirements the project will need to meet, especially if the applicant is asking for a reduction in parking?

Yes, all residential and commercial development within the Master Plan will be subject to TDM requirements, which are set by the Precise Plan, but also must support their proposed parking supply. The proposed TDM program will be reviewed as part of the Transportation Analysis for the Master Plan.

18. Can you give me some rough figures regarding the following: What is our current office/housing ratio? What is our ideal goal? Is it 1,000 square feet of office floor area to three residential units (as reflected in the Precise Plan)? How do we see that ratio playing out over time, such as now VERSUS if all currently entitled office and housing was built VERSUS if all currently proposed office and housing was built, including Google Middlefield Park office and housing? Can we track that ratio in an ongoing way and report it to Council regularly such as quarterly? Do we, and have I been missing it somehow? Have we figured the changing density of office use into our plans over the years?

Staff estimates the current Citywide housing to office ratio to be approximately 1.8 residential units per 1,000 square feet of office. If you include entitled (not yet built) residential and office development projects, the Citywide ratio is estimated to go down to 1.77 residential units per 1,000 square feet of office. Alternatively, including all residential and office development projects under review (not yet approved, including Google's proposed Master Plans in East Whisman and North Bayshore), the Citywide ratio would increase to 1.97 residential units per 1,000 square feet of office.

The City has not adopted a citywide job to housing goal. This goal ratio would depend on a lot of different factors, including the balance of jobs to employed residents, resident density, job density and other employment-generating uses (like retail or medical), which staff has not historically analyzed.

The 3 residential units per 1,000 square feet of office space is specific to the East Whisman Precise Plan, as it's based on several other aspects of the Plan:

- It is the outcome if you assume the number of employed residents equals the number of jobs: jobs per 1,000 sq. ft. of office space (~4 employees) divided by employed residents per housing unit (~1.3 persons) = ~3 residential units per 1,000 sq. ft. Note, this analysis includes assumptions about the job density of office, which we periodically update.
- It is also roughly the ratio (rounding up) of net new units to net new office, when considering other standards in the Precise Plan.

This job to housing ratio is not meaningful to report quarterly since the City does not approve nor is construction completed on a significant number of development projects every quarter. While City staff could track this information annually, the correct method and format to do so would need to be further considered by City staff.

19. What are the rough proposed dimensions for the Hetch Hetchy Linear Park, P2 Pathway, Ellis Park, Canopy Walk and Gateway Park? Please confirm that Ellis Park is the only proposed POPA in the Google Middlefield Park Master Plan.

Yes, Ellis Park is the only proposed POPA open space in the Middlefield Park Master Plan.

The estimated dimensions for each of the open spaces are summarized based on existing County Assessor Parcel Maps and information provided by Google:

Please see below.

<b>Open Space Location</b>	<b>Approximate Dimensions</b>
Canopy Walk	<u>On Ellis Side of VTA Tracks:</u> 50' x 400' <u>On Logue Ave side of VTA tracks:</u> 80' x 300'
Ellis Park	<u>Linear Portion:</u> 90' x 800' <u>Plaza Portion:</u> 120' x 200'
Hetch Hetchy Linear Park	50' wide x 1000'
P2 Pathway	20' x 230'
Gateway Park	160' x 170'

20. What does the land for affordable housing being dedicated at the beginning of Phase 1 mean in terms of getting the Affordable Housing built? For instance, you could certainly get started on planning even before the formal date. Could a formal application be made for the AH before the land was formally dedicated if an expected date of that dedication was known? Could the project apply for financing before the formal dedication?

With the BMR Alternative Proposal, City staff and Google have discussed the coordinated effort required from both sides to ensure the best results for this type of affordable housing approach. As noted in the question, this coordinated effort includes the City looking at the timing of an RFP to announce land is available for affordable housing, but it also requires knowing the timing of anticipated City funding for assistance. These details, along with many others, are part of what City staff would work on in reviewing Google's proposal, if there is Council support to consider the BMR Alternative Mitigation Plan.

Additionally, City staff will look at where City-led processes for affordable housing could be done simultaneous with the review of the Master Plan. The timing for a City-issued RFP for both of the affordable housing sites would need to be considered in the context of at least two other awaiting RFP's for affordable housing over the next few years (as well as consideration of staff capacity), including the Evelyn Avenue VTA Site and the Sobrato/Pear Avenue site in North Bayshore.

21. Report didn't mention mapping the apartments that are proposed for condos. How would mapping for condos impact costs and schedule?

Google has not submitted an application for a Tentative Map for condominium purposes on any of the residential development in the Master Plan. Should Google pursue a condominium map, there would be minimal added cost to the City's project review process with providing some additional application materials. There would be some additional construction costs to meet Building and Fire code requirements for condominiums, which are different than apartments. However, these additional costs would likely be absorbed in the long run based on the ability to sell the residential units at a future value.

In terms of project schedule for City review, introducing a condominium map would not alter the review timeline. In terms of construction, it may add a nominal amount of time as there is additional construction details required, but Google would account for that time and cost in their construction planning and phasing.

22. Do we have any dual plumbing requirements for residential?

No, the current City Code exempts residential developments from dual plumbing requirements.

23. What sort of review is standard for development reviews? Does the developer have to make an annual report? If so, what's included?

Staff believes this question may be referring to the review of DA's, as any future development permit under an adopted Master Plan would go through the City's standard development review process unless otherwise specified in the Master Plan.

Consistent with State law, the City Code does require an annual review of DA's to ensure applicants have performed in good faith with the terms of their DA. The burden of proof is on the applicant to demonstrate compliance. The applicant would submit a written document to the Community Development Department outlining how they have met or anticipate meeting the schedule of improvements, funding, or other details outlined in their approved DA, which City staff reviews and confirms.

24. For the 555 Middlefield Road Project Study Session on 2/23, I had asked about what housing units'/development projects could be counted for the sixth RHNA cycle (2023-2031). Staff responded that "For the sixth cycle of RHNA (2023-2031), projects that have been approved, permitted, or received a certificate of occupancy since the beginning of the RHNA projected period may be credited toward meeting the RHNA allocation based on the affordability and unit count of the development." For ABAG jurisdictions, the beginning of the projection period is June 30, 2022. In other words, if projects in the pipeline are approved, permitted, or receive a certificate of occupancy on June 30, 2022 or later, they can count in the sixth cycle site inventory." This sounds like the City has the option as to when to count a development - at the time of approval, permitting or Certificate of Occupancy. Is that correct? Can we be sure to have the housing in Google Middlefield Park Project counted towards our 6th RHNA cycle #'s?

In order to be counted towards the next (6th cycle) of RHNA, the City would have to issue building permits or occupancy permits after June 30, 2022. Based on the estimated Master Plan review timeline, staff does not anticipate issuance of building permits for the Phase 1 to begin any earlier than late 2022. All of the construction phases are anticipated to occur after the June 30, 2022 date and may span multiple RHNA reporting cycles based on when building permits or occupancy permits are issued. Additionally, the City is required to process applications in a timely manner and cannot delay project entitlements, building permits or dictate the construction of projects to count them towards a future RHNA.

### **ITEM 3.3 COVID-19 Update by City Manager Kimbra McCarthy**

1. How many households have requested more than 2 months of rent assistance?

Approximately 550 households have requested more than two months of rent assistance (i.e., third and fourth month).

2. What is the average amount of time taken for a household to receive one month of rent relief?

Approximately 1 month or less. CSA is working on building up staffing capacity to shorten this amount of time. There are also some factors that are not in CSA's direct control, including how long it takes for



the client and landlord to get paperwork back to the case manager, the amount of time it takes for the USPS to deliver the check, etc.

## **ITEM 7.2 Park Land Dedication or Fees In Lieu Thereof Ordinance Amendments**

1. On page 10 of the staff report, staff proposes amendments related to Zoning Calculations: “Added clarifying text that dedicated park land can count toward development standards of a project related to floor area, lot size, and density.” Does allowing dedicated park land to “count toward development standards” encourage or discourage the dedication of park land?

Historically, the City has allowed applicants to count the entire project site, inclusive of the proposed dedicated park land, toward lot size minimums, allowable floor area, and allowable density. Allowing these basic zoning development standards to count toward the entire project site, inclusive of the proposed dedicated park land, encourages the creation of parks. It allows a developer to remain whole by allowing the same development intensity as if they had constructed a project over the entire site versus a reduced portion of the site with a proposed park.

2. Can a developer propose a POPA as part of an SB35 application or through some other streamlined development review process? Or are POPAs only allowed with Council approval, which would mean they are not possible for streamlined/ministerial approvals?

The proposed park land ordinance amendments would not preclude an SB 35 project from requesting any park land credit under this ordinance, including the POPA open space credit. As part of their formal application, the project applicant would need to demonstrate compliance with the application requirements and standards outlined in the Ordinance for the park land credit they are seeking.

Additionally, with the ministerial approval required under State Law, any proposed SB 35 development requesting a park land credit cannot be approved by the City Council at a public hearing, but, instead, would be subject to ministerial approval by the designated City staff member (yet to be determined for SB 35 projects).

Although subject to a different approval authority than standard development projects, it is important to note these projects are much less frequent than standard development projects due to the qualifications for SB 35. Additionally, to qualify for a POPA open space credit, the development site would need to be large enough to accommodate both the proposed development and a 0.4-acre POPA open space, or greater than 1 acre POPA open space for an Alternate Proposal. This would be a project size not yet seen for an SB 35 development application. Should a SB 35 compliant project be submitted, however, it would be eligible for a credit amount of 75%. In addition, while flexibility was included in the ordinance with the inclusion of an Alternate Element or Alternate Proposal, should a SB 35 project propose either that demonstrates compliance with the ordinance requirements, these would be subject to ministerial approval.

3. In the study session, Council provided some direction related to memory care/senior housing, which may benefit from credits for enhanced private open space that would be more appropriate given the demographic groups served by this kind of housing. Is this something that will be explored in Phase 2?

While the topic was discussed at the Study Session, the majority of Council provided direction to remove the Private Open Space Credit as part of these Phase 1 amendments. If Council is interested in evaluating a development-specific private open space credit, then it is a topic that could be considered in Phase 2 of the Ordinance Amendments.

4. For Alternate Proposals, could Council consider a discretionary additional credit for significant amenities, like a community center or aquatics facility? For example, up to 100% credit to incentivize a POPA that will include special features that would otherwise be very difficult to get through dedication of land?

At the Study Session in October 2020, staff presented an option to provide an additional credit of up to 25% the value of the land credit for spaces greater than 1 acre in size due to the ability to provide more significant amenities. Council's direction was to not include this additional credit amount and keep the value of land credit for Alternate Proposals at an amount up to 75%. While the proposed ordinance could be revised to include a land value credit of up to 100% for Alternate Proposals, which already includes a general requirement to provide design benefits in excess of those included in the general POPA requirements, should Council wish to include additional requirements to obtain a 100% credit for an Alternate Proposal such as significant amenities, staff would need to evaluate such revisions and return to Council at a later date or address in Phase II of updating the ordinance.

5. Is 3 acres per 1,000 residents a requirement, or a goal, of the Quimby Act when considering the amount of park space per 1,000 residents on a city-wide or park/open space planning area basis?

The Quimby Act allows cities to have Park Land Ordinances that can require parkland dedication or fee requirements on new residential development that establishes the proportionate amount necessary to provide three acres of park area per 1,000 persons. Consistent with the Quimby Act, Chapter 41 establishes a requirement of 3 acres per 1,000 residents for new residential development to offset the impact of new residents on park and recreation facilities.

Separately, the City has a citywide goal in the Parks and Open Space Plan of 3 acres per 1,000 residents for each park and open space planning area. This goal is not directly tied to new development as it accounts for existing and projected populations. The goal will be reviewed as part of the update to the Parks and Open Space Plan and the Requirement will be reviewed as part of Phase 2 of the Ordinance update.

6. What are the purposes of the Quimby Act?

The purpose of the Quimby Act is to mitigate the impacts of new residential development on existing parks and/or recreational facilities by authorizing local governments to require land dedications or in-lieu fees for parks or recreational purposes as a condition of approval.

7. Will all proposed POPAs come to the council for approval?

Under the proposed ordinance, all proposed POPA open space credits must be approved by City Council, unless the project is subject to SB 35 as outlined in Council Response No. 2.

8. How do we currently select park design firms? Is it from a premade shortlist of some sort and how is any list we might have updated?

Park design consultants are selected through the Request for Proposals (RFP) process prepared for each project or through the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process to establish a prequalified list. For the RFP process, staff evaluates proposals received based on the criteria set forth in the RFP to select a preferred consultant. Using the RFQ process, staff similarly evaluates qualifications and establishes a prequalified list for consultants deemed qualified. Staff still requests RFPs for those on the prequalified list at the time a consultant is needed. The prequalified list is valid for 2 years and updated through the same RFQ process.

9. Clear that there has to be a section that is at least 100X100 square feet. What about off-shoots from that? Could a connected section that was less than 100 feet wide on a side count if it provided usable open space such as tot lot, picnic area, fitness area count? In other words, does a POPA need to be a rectangle?

Staff included the 100' minimum size requirement on all sides in order to prevent credit applications for POPA open spaces that are irregular in shape limiting long-term functionality of the open space. The 100' minimum provides a large enough size of quality open space that allows for a variety of elements. The POPA open space could take multiple shapes so long as there are clear dimensions of at least 100'.

10. Want to make sure that future POPAs and parks are plumbed to use recycled water as soon as it is available in that part of the City. What is required to add that here? Great to suggest some appropriate language.

Requiring POPA open spaces and City parks to be plumbed for future recycled water use would require an amendment to the utility requirements in Chapter 35 of the City Code, outside of the parameters of the park land requirements of Chapter 41. Currently, the City can only require properties in North Bayshore to be plumbed with recycled water. If Council request this to be considered citywide, it should be reviewed comprehensively, not exclusively for parks and open spaces.