

# City Council Questions

## May 10, 2022 Council Meeting

### ITEM 3.1 Affordable Housing at 87 East Evelyn Avenue

1. What is the status of the area adjacent to the Shoreline safe parking lot, which had been used as supplemental parking for the Project Homekey site? Have staff evaluated the possibility of using this area for additional safe parking, and is Council direction necessary to convert this area to a safe parking site?

#### **Shoreline Lot Contractual Terms and LifeMove Lease of Shoreline Lot B**

Staff has discussed the issue with Live Nation several times, and they have asked the City to stay close to the “existing footprint” for any homeless parking or safe parking. There is no indication that they will be open to adding more spaces beyond what they gave us in 2021. This included extending use until 2025, allowing use of the lots non-stop, during concert season, and providing the additional space for Homekey off-site parking.

The Council provided staff flexibility in 2021 to focus on addressing priority projects, such as Project Homekey first with the option to relook at the lot for future safe parking, based on Homekey site needs. At this time, LifeMoves is using on average less than 10 spaces in Lot B as off-site parking for the new LifeMoves MV interim housing facility. Their current agreement is extended to December 2022, and will be monitored after the new parking lot on Leghorn comes online in 2022-23.

The gain in capacity for the new living spaces if not used for Homekey is limited. A conversion to safe parking for living would gain about 11 Oversized Vehicle Parking Spaces (10’ spacing buffers are required). Staff continues to strategically monitor this for next year review, since access to the Alta Housing - Terra Bella lot (9 spaces) beyond 2022/2023 is unlikely. Staff would strive to maintain overall program capacity (9 -11 spaces) for as long as possible, with the Shoreline end Evelyn lots having a stable use through approximately 2025.

#### **Considerations of Applicable Expansion**

The safe parking program is brought annually to the Council for authorization. This item will be on the June 14, Council agenda at which time staff will be recommending continuing the existing scope of the program.

There are number of steps that would be taken to expand any use of the lost at Shoreline, within the existing footprint, if not longer needed for Homekey parking. This includes:

- The expansion of the service provider scope and funding necessary for expansion would need to be secured through a negotiation process, and amendments to the existing contracts with the County, as well as environmental permits secured.
- The City had to apply for an amendment to the City’s Post-Closure Maintenance Plan (PCMP) for the Safe Parking Program as safe parking (living in a vehicle) was not a designated use for the parking lot. The City is only allowed to operate under current scope. Another amendment (taking approximately 6 months or more, and significant staff time therein), would need to be completed to add any living spaces to the site and the vehicles would require the same landfill gas monitoring that is done presently for each vehicle used for living.

## Private Lot Outreach

Local outreach for additional lots has been conducted widely over the years, by the City, Human Relations (HRC) Safe Parking Subcommittee, and the County throughout the region. Though there is no known, active Mountain View lot prospect currently, the City maintains the largest safe parking program in all of Santa Clara County.

2. What other areas may be available for new safe parking?

Please see the response to Question 1.

3. Can staff provide information about the amount of City affordable housing funding available, anticipated additional funding from development fees, commitments for housing in the pipeline, and what other (unfunded) affordable housing projects are currently in the pipeline?

- Affordable housing funding available: The City's primary funding sources are generated through the housing impact fee program, the BMR in-lieu fee, and the now discontinued Rental Housing Impact fee. As of March 31, 2022, the City had \$42,674,574.06 unreserved in those three funds. Projects with funding encumbered, or with funding reserved/appropriated but not yet encumbered, are excluded from the unreserved amount because the funding has already been set aside.
- Anticipated additional funding: The last fee projection analysis anticipated approximately \$44 million in additional housing impact and BMR in-lieu fees over the next two years.
- Commitments for housing in the pipeline: The \$42.67 million available unreserved funding above excludes the City's contribution for three pipeline projects with funding already appropriated or encumbered (La Avenida, Montecito, and Lot 12). It also does not include funding for the rehabilitation of the Crestview hotel, for which the City is using federal funds.
- Unfunded affordable housing projects in the pipeline: Staff are working on 6 projects that are at different stages in the pipeline that do not yet have funding reserved, appropriated, or encumbered, including 4 projects that have submitted NOFA applications (1020 Terra Bella, 89 W. El Camino Real, 96 W. El Camino Real, and 1012 Linda Vista), one project that is anticipated to submit a NOFA application (57-67 E. Evelyn which is the adjacent Evelyn site owned by Charities Housing) and 87 E. Evelyn. In addition to this unfunded pipeline, funding will be needed for developing future projects on sites to be dedicated to the City in the North Bayshore and East Whisman Precise Plan areas.

4. What is the parking ratio of the Franklin Street Family Apartments? What is the mix of units there in terms of the number of bedrooms?

The Franklin Street Family Apartments has 1.8 parking spots/unit. The site has four one-bedrooms, 32 two-bedrooms, 15 three-bedrooms.

5. Where is the closest grocery store to the Evelyn site? How far is it from the site?

The Sav More Food stop is the closest grocery store, at .9 miles from the site at 689 Calderon Avenue. Ava's Downtown Market and Deli is 1 mile from the site at 340 Castro Street. Smart & Final at 141 E. El Camino Real is 1.4 miles away. The Mountain View Farmer's Market is 0.5 miles away at the Mountain View Transit Center (Sundays only).

6. The project will involve ground leasing the site. Ground leasing is consistent with Community Land Trust (CLT) permanently affordable housing. Can we keep CLT housing open as an option for all or any portion of this housing?

Community Land Trusts (CLTs) can serve various purposes, depending on the goals of a program and how a CLT is structured. Staff is not aware of a CLT that has implemented an affordable housing project when the City is the land owner and the units are already intended to be affordable housing. However, staff can evaluate whether there is a CLT model that would be appropriate for the Evelyn site. If Council directs, staff can include Council's interest in a CLT partnership in the RFP. Whether or not a CLT would be an appropriate model for the Evelyn site specifically, staff will be studying CLT's in general as part of the affordable housing funding strategy and Housing Element Update.

7. Given that there are no SF homes or low-rise apartments adjacent to this property whose residents might object, why aren't we going for even taller buildings and thus greater density that would serve more people and drive unit cost down?

The recommended density, unit, and height range in the staff report is based on the following considerations:

- When going beyond 7 to 8 floors, construction costs change dramatically, as the required construction type and materials change to support the height, for example, going from wood-frame construction to steel. Because of the significant cost increase associated with crossing over into steel construction, developers typically need to significantly increase the unit count and the height to decrease the per unit steel construction cost and make a project economical. In other words, if a developer is considering going beyond 7-8 stories, they will need to go significantly higher – about 12-14 stories - to make a steel construction project economically viable.
- The majority of our affordable housing developers have noted that they have not ventured into steel construction for the above reasons.
- As noted in the staff report, tax credit funding is typically awarded for affordable housing projects with 60-120 units. The Evelyn project may already need to be in two phases given the potential unit count for the site based on the feasibility scenarios analyzed. Adding even more density – and therefore more units, resulting in an even larger project – could make financing the project even more challenging.

8. Can any of the adjacent properties be rezoned for higher density housing?

Adjacent properties for higher density housing would require rezoning and General Plan amendments. This change is not currently on staff's work plan and would require Council direction at the next Council Strategic Priority and Goal-Setting Process.

#### **ITEM 4.2 Parks and Open Space Update**

1. Cuesta Park neighbors have been working with staff regarding a Bubb Park signage issue. Can staff provide an update on these efforts?

The City has been discussing standards and guidelines related to donated signs, and with the refreshed visual identity, the conversation expanded to include the goals and elements in that effort. Because of staff shortages and the need to determine next steps, the Bubb Park signage request has been delayed. As we fill positions and identify opportunities for park/city signage, we will reach out to the Cuesta Park neighbors with solutions.

2. Does the Parks and Rec draft Strategic Plan scope include looking at types of parks (dog parks, linear/walking/running parks, toddler lots, athletic fields, nature-based parks, etc.) needed and wanted by the full spectrum of park users, sometimes referred to as those of all ages, abilities? Also does the Parks and Rec draft Strategic Plan scope include looking at recreational preferences of the full spectrum of park users (pickle ball, tennis, outdoor exercise equipment, picnic areas, ping pong, etc.)? These may be somewhat overlapping questions.

Yes, the scope for the Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan will include a comprehensive look at the different types of parks, open spaces, and recreation programs for different types of individual and group uses. The scope will also include a robust public outreach process to determine community needs and interests for all ages and abilities. A draft of the full scope for the Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan will be presented to the PRC and City Council for review and input prior to issuing an RFP.

3. The staff report say, "The Citywide Biodiversity Strategy would include a chapter entitled Urban Forest Plan... that would replace the existing CTMP." Was this topic discussed during PRC and/or CTMP subcommittee meetings and, if so, what were the main points raised?

At the April 13, 2022 PRC meeting, PRC members and the public expressed a desire for a more thorough update to the CTMP to include biodiversity and confront current drought conditions and the impacts of climate change. Biodiversity was a primary and consistent point raised during the meeting with respect to the update to the CTMP. Based on that feedback, staff identified the opportunity to incorporate the CTMP goals, objectives, and implementation into the Citywide Biodiversity Strategy. Each PRC member has been briefed on the intent to include an Urban Forest Plan component in the Biodiversity Strategy and this concept will be discussed at the May 11, 2022 PRC meeting.

4. There are some concerns that the urban forest might not be viewed as important/prominent if it's only a chapter of the biodiversity strategy and does not have its own stand-alone tree master plan any more. A stand-alone tree master plan would address not only biodiversity but also trees and carbon capture, urban heat island effect, air purification, flood prevention and other kinds of climate adaptation. Will these concern be addressed in an Urban Forest Chapter as part of a Citywide Biodiversity Strategy?

Staff has been balancing the desires of the PRC and the public for a more robust Urban Forest Plan with current workload and budget deadlines. Staff is suggesting that the Urban Forestry Plan be included in the Biodiversity Plan, and that it illustrates the benefits and functions of trees, addresses concerns related to the urban forest, and outlines a progressive framework with goals and strategies to preserve and enhance tree canopy. Staff has also suggested additional public outreach for the Urban Forest Plan component and a focused communication and reporting approach to ensure awareness and progress of this significant piece of the biodiversity strategy. Staff will work with the PRC, the public and the consultant team to review the current CTMP and make recommendations on how to meet all of the goals identified.

#### **ITEM 4.4 Plant-Based Eating Resolution and Program**

1. Have City employees been engaged about the potential program affecting City operations? If not, could staff provide a survey to employees about receptiveness to various ways to reduce public money spent on animal-based food products?

Sustainability division staff met with representatives from key departments to begin discussions on the plant based eating program and to identify preliminary concepts for consideration to include within an internal, employee facing program. The initial program elements identified were related to hosting more sustainable events and consistently offering plant based food and beverage options for staff to select

from to raise awareness. Staff also discussed evaluating the potential to establish goals related to the percentage of plant based food offerings provided at City-funded events and programs, which include senior nutrition programs, preschool and school age programs, community celebrations, employee appreciation and recognition events, and meals for shift employees.

Conducting an employee survey would be an important next step to gauge employee interests and concerns related to potential plant based eating policies and programs and to assess any impact to city operations, employee morale, and potential meet and confer implications that may be associated with various plant based eating programs or requirements. Additionally, further community and stakeholder engagement to reach participants from City programs that serve food, restaurants that source food for City events, and members of the public who attend City events, is anticipated as the plant based eating program is launched.

#### **ITEM 4.5 Economic Vitality Strategy Consultant Contract**

1. Who are the “partners” being referenced? Is it local government, business, and nonprofit representatives and stakeholders as stated on page 4 of attachment 1? Is the Chamber of Commerce included?

Partners and stakeholder engagement include Mountain View Downtown Association, Mountain View Chamber of Commerce, NOVA Works, small business services organizations (SCORE, SBDC, etc.), NAIOP, broker community, small and large businesses and neighborhood associations at a minimum. Staff will engage as many stakeholders and individuals as possible to help inform the Economic Vitality Strategy. As outline in Task 3 Public and Stakeholder Engagement, there are several proposed ways the City and CAI are looking to engage people.

2. Will the travel and hospitality sector analysis include an assessment of whether or not the city’s TOT rate should be increased? And, if so, when is good timing?

The scope of work does include a projection of Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) revenue as the sector rebounds from the impacts of the pandemic. The scope can be augmented to analyze the impact of increasing the TOT rate on City revenues and hoteliers as well as identify considerations for Council discussion on timing of a potential increase.

3. Former Councilmember John McAlister was always concerned about the optimal percent mix of land use. Would it be possible to have the consultants provide this, even if it is just an estimate?

As part of the landscape assessment in the scope of work, CAI will look at how well balanced is the Mountain View economy, with a particular focus on access to living wage jobs for local residents and economic leakages in retail sales. The landscape assessment does include analysis of the local and surrounding real estate markets. The assessment will yield an understanding of the current mix of industries and land uses in Mountain View, and set the stage for strategic discussions and changes of interest to stakeholders and Council. Areas within the city where land use is a concern can inform the strategic discussion.

## ITEM 6.1 Residential Development at 555 West Middlefield Road

1. I appreciate staff meeting with BAAQMD staff to discuss further requirements for air quality control. The staff reports that some of BAAQMD's recommendations were incorporated into the conditions of approval. Were there other recommendations that are not being included?

After the EIR was certified for this project on February 8, 2022, BAAQMD staff provided City staff some additional measures to consider which they pulled from past projects in other jurisdictions. Staff considered the additional measures and spoke with BAAQMD on the feasibility of implementing some of the suggested additional measures. BAAQMD acknowledged the provided measures are not standard measures appropriate for application to all projects on a broad basis so their feasibility of implementation and appropriateness in relation to this project should be evaluated by the City prior to adding them to the project conditions of approval. Therefore, staff in consultation with BAAQMD, revised the language of some of the measures to make them more implementable. These are noted below:

- On-site monitoring – one of the BAAQMD measures asked for “zero-fugitive dust and fence line air monitoring” and “to suspend all excavation, grading and/or demolition activities when average wind speeds exceed 20mph.” In discussion with BAAQMD, they indicated that BAAQMD on-site monitors can be designated to ensure that all of the dust control measures are being implemented. This has been added to the list of conditions.
  - One of the recommended measures said “water all exposed surfaces at a frequency adequate to maintain minimum soil moisture of 12 percent and verify moisture content by lab samples or moisture probe.” This recommendation is intended to water exposed surfaces more frequently than is already required to reduce dust impacts during high wind conditions but would be difficult to implement as written. The language was revised to say: “water all exposed surfaces at a minimum frequency of two times per day and more frequently whenever dust or wind conditions warrant it” which BAAQMD agreed achieved the same objective in an easily implementable manner. The onsite monitor would ensure that the work was being done during construction.
  - Forbid idling of heavy equipment for more than two minutes – this had been originally proposed by BAAQMD in the Guidelines. Based on comments from various stakeholder that the timeline made it hard to enforce, the Guidelines were revised to five minutes. BAAQMD staff acknowledged the enforceability issue and advised that the timeline could be kept at five minutes.
2. Avalon claims that making the wing of Block C apartments closest to HWY 85 into a single-loaded corridor and thus saving the berm adjacent to HWY 85, would cause the project to lose or relocate 66 units, the Sierra Club reps claim that the change would cause the project to lose or relocate 24 units. Which does staff believe is accurate?

Staff has not had a chance to do a detailed review of the number of units needed to be removed from Block C to make the eastern side of the building a single-loaded corridor. However, based on a quick assessment of the plans, staff estimates approximately 36 units and 100 parking spaces in the underground garage below would need to be removed.

3. The Sierra Club reps suggest moving 24 or more units from Block C to Block B, but wasn't Block B reduced in density at the request of some community members earlier in this process? If this is true, what was the date that Council requested the reduction in Block B density?

The original plans showed both Blocks B and C as four story buildings and a fifth story tower element on Block B. During the project study sessions EPC and Council gave direction to study ways to reduce the massing of both the buildings. The applicant revised the building massing in both Blocks B and C to set back the fourth story and to remove the fifth story tower element in Block B. As a result, the density of Block C was reduced by six units. There was no reduction to the number of units in Block B.

4. The Sierra Club reps suggest that their recommended changes will only need minimal reevaluation of EIR. Does staff believe this to be true? What does a minimal reevaluation of EIR really mean?

The Sierra Club design revisions would require re-evaluation of the following in the EIR:

- Additional excavation under Block B to add parking
- Additional stories to add 28 units to Block B
- Any resulting tree removals due to the revisions

Revisions to the site design, including modification of unit placement and density allocation, would require further assessment or reassessment of certain sections of the EIR. The extent of evaluation is dependent on the proposed revisions and could take the form of an Addendum or Supplemental EIR if project revisions were found to create new impacts not previously evaluated and disclosed in the Certified Project EIR. Additional evaluation and preparation of the appropriate CEQA document would require additional time and would need to be completed prior to a decision on the project.

5. The parking study cited claims that the project only needs X parking spaces. The staff report calls out that the modeled parking demand for this project "range from 632 spaces to 827 spaces with an average parking demand of 726 spaces" Even with staff's currently proposed parking reduction, the project will build 926 spaces, 200 more than even the upper end of the study's projected demand. Would it be feasible to reduce the number of parking spaces proposed for Block C in response to the community's demand for less parking at the end of Cypress Point?

Based on the results of the parking study, reducing parking further on site is feasible. However, staff has received a significant amount of feedback from the surrounding community throughout the entire development review process opposing parking reductions at the site for concerns around a potential for parking spill-over onto the surrounding public streets, particularly Cypress Point Drive.

6. Is the dog park proposed with Astro turf or real turf?

The dog park is proposed to have synthetic turf.