

City Council Questions

September 27, 2022 Council Meeting

ITEM 3.1 Parks and Recreation Strategic Plan Proposed Scope of Work

1. Is it possible to also use an area smaller than the standard planning areas for analysis and planning? If not, why not?

According to the 2014 Parks and Open Space Plan, the planning areas are based on census tract boundaries and are used to facilitate the use of available demographic data. While the planning areas have been the standard assessment tool, it is anticipated that a consultant team will also be able to complete an analysis of metrics on a smaller scale.

2. Can the comparison of facilities and programs with cities our size also include nearby cities even if they are not close in size to Mountain View?

Yes, neighboring cities are expected to be included in the review and comparison of regional facilities and programs.

3. Will the review of fees charged be broken out by resident and non-resident fees?

Yes, a review all existing fees will be completed, including resident and non-resident fees.

4. Can the community input be broken out by verified (not self-reported) resident and non-resident input?

Staff will work with the consultant to determine how best to verify residency where applicable throughout the community engagement process. An analysis of resident versus non-resident feedback may be included.

5. How will the consultant approach identifying future trends in recreation/sports? How will we keep this up to date?

The consultant will identify future trends through the community engagement process, review of national and state parks and recreation standards and studies and will provide feedback based on their professional experience working with other agencies of similar size and demographics. This living document will build in flexibility for the City to adapt to new and emerging trends as they present themselves.

6. I have often wondered about the replacement schedule for play equipment. Do we follow a State or national standard? How is that decided?

Playgrounds have a typical life expectancy of approximately 20 years. Based on several factors, some playgrounds can last longer compared to others. Parks staff complete regular ongoing inspections, including a thorough annual safety inspection. Based on inspections, any safety concerns are identified and quickly repaired or replaced. At this time, no park playgrounds show an immediate need for safety replacement. The Plan will provide staff with any other standards to consider in the future for regular replacement.

7. Recreation events do use volunteers. I think they are an important part of our Recreation program both for the valuable work volunteers provide and also the sense of community promoted by volunteering. How will our volunteer program be part of the strategic plan?

A review of the volunteer program will be included as part of Task 9, Recreation Division Programming, as the citywide volunteer program is led by the Recreation Division. The consultant will review the existing program and may provide recommendations for enhancements to the program based on previous experience and through community feedback about the program.

8. Who is taking part in the RFP interviews? Will we be able to include an outside staff member from a neighboring community, MROSD or County Parks?

At this time, the evaluation team is scheduled to be comprised of staff from the Community Services, Public Works, and Community Development Departments. Outside agencies such as MROSD and County Parks may be included in the community engagement process through Stakeholder interviews and general points of reference in the parks and recreation field.

9. Please tell me more about the Commission for Accreditation of Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA). Do we have accreditation now? I assume we do not, but am I right? What advantages might getting accreditation give the city?

The Commission for Accreditation of Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA) provides a quality assurance and quality improvement process of accredited agencies throughout the United States by providing agencies with a management system of best practices. The City is not currently accredited and the consultant team will review the City's existing parks and recreation programs, facilities, services and processes to provide a path forward on how to become accredited and when an appropriate time may be to apply for accreditation. The full accreditation process is a five-year cycle that includes development of the agency's self-assessment report, an onsite group visitation, and the Commission's review and decision. Upon a successful achievement, the agency recertifies every five years. Achieving CAPRA demonstrates an agency's commitment to providing exceptional programs, services, and facilities to the community. Achieving accreditation may also provide leverage for future grant opportunities compared to non-accredited agencies. Currently there are only two agencies within California that have achieved CAPRA out of the 192 accredited agencies within the United States. Accreditation will also provide the City with a greater opportunity to be considered for the National Recreation and Park Association's Gold Medal, which is the highest award an agency can receive. The Community Services Department has been a finalist twice for the Gold Medal over recent years.

ITEM 6.1 870 East El Camino Real Residential Project

1. Which EPC Commissioner was absent when this project was reviewed for the final recommendation to Council?

Commissioner Hehmeyer was absent.

2. What is the clubroom? (Mentioned on page 3 of the staff report) Is this a permanent enclosure like an apartment? Where is there a drawing of it? Is this permitted or is an exception needed for it?

The floorplan of the clubroom can be found on Sheet A2.05. The clubroom is an enclosed space and is a recreational/entertainment room available for use by all residents on-site. Both the clubroom and rooftop terrace are located on the 6th floor of Building F and require approval of a Provisional Use Permit for amenities above the third floor per the El Camino Real Precise Plan.

3. Where is floor LL1/S1 in building G? Are these apartments on this level?

The floor plans of LL1 and S1 can be found on Sheet A2.02 and are effectively on a split-level. The five apartment units on this level have vaulted ceilings.

4. What is the pedestrian experience (surface material, width (5'-8'?), etc.) now vs. proposed going from Muir to El Camino Real? How will people who do not live at this complex know they can use this path?

The existing site currently has a paved driveway and internal pathways with no continuous pedestrian sidewalk connecting El Camino Real to Muir Drive all of which are not publicly accessible. The proposed project includes a continuous, publicly accessible pathway through the site from El Camino Real to Muir Drive. Staff will work with the applicant on appropriate signage or pavement markings denoting the public pathway through the site.

5. The design conditions are fairly substantial. Is it not possible to wait until these are sorted out before having the council hear this proposed development?

The design conditions are fairly minor in scope and detail, as they focus on landscaping/pavement finishes, railings, low walls, and specific areas of the building façade (like entries) – all of which are typical design refinement topics that will not substantially change the project under consideration and are appropriate to be refined during the building permit review process.

6. Why is building F being combined with the existing units that will remain to do the du/acre calculation? What is the du/acre without including the existing units that will remain?

The existing units to remain must be included when calculating density (du/ac) for the 7.98-acre Low Density Residential Only (LIRO) portion of the project site where Building F is located, as it encompasses all development on-site within that LIRO subarea.

- Not including the existing units to remain, the project would provide approximately 13 du/ac (103 units/7.98 acres).
- The max. base density for the LIRO is 25 du/acre, or 200 units (25 du/ac x 7.98 acres).
- The max. density w/35% State Density Bonus for the LIRO is 33.75 du/ac or 270 units (25 du/ac x 35% → 33.75 du/ac x 7.98 acres)
- The proposed project (existing units to remain and new units) is proposing 241 units in the LIRO portion of the lot, or approximately 30 du/ac.

7. Why are only two native tree species being proposed, where there are nine species being proposed? Can more native species be included?

The project's proposed landscape palette includes 75% of the total tree and landscape plantings as native species. However, a greater variety of native plantings within the palette can be included in the conditions of approval should Council request this change.

8. Just to be clear – in Table 7, all three options will be available to tenants, correct?

The options (as summarized in Table 7 in the Staff Report) are offered to eligible tenants based on income level. Option A, B and C are available to tenants 80% AMI or less, Option B and C are also available to tenants up to 120% AMI.

	CATEGORY A	CATEGORY B	ALTERNATIVE C
Area Median Income (AMI)	80% AMI or less	80% AMI up to 120% AMI	120% AMI and below

9. In Alternative C, Option 2, if a resident moves to a unit in Sunnyvale, will future rent increases on that unit comply with the CSFRA in Mountain View?

One of the options for tenants is to move to a comparable unit on premise at the same rent-stabilized rate or move to a comparable Equity Residential unit in Sunnyvale (Briarwood, Arbor Terrace or Arches) at the same rent-stabilized rate. In Sunnyvale, the Mountain View rent stabilization rent increase limitations will be honored for three years.

10. How many residents attended the November 12, 2019, meeting?

The meeting was attended by seven (7) households.

11. Since this is on the Sunnyvale border, how have we worked with the City of Sunnyvale during this project so far? How will we work with them as construction proceeds?

Project notices were sent to all adjacent property owners and tenants located within 750’ of the project site including properties in Sunnyvale. The City regularly communicates with Sunnyvale Planning staff on projects along or near the City border and were involved with the development of the El Camino Real Precise Plan which this project implements. The City has not received any comments from the City of Sunnyvale on the project.

12. How far is it to Sylvan Park? Are there any Sunnyvale Parks within easy walking distance?

The project site is located within approximately one-quarter mile walking distance to Sylvan Park and within a one-half mile to the Stevens Creek Trail entrance.

13. Please explain both the pedestrian and bike circulation patterns during the presentation.

Staff will provide information regarding this in the presentation.

14. Where is the closest bus stop to the project? Please explain with answers to Question 13.

The project site is located within one-half mile of bus stop locations for the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) local, community, and rapid (express) bus routes, and the Mountain View Community Shuttle. The El Camino Real/Sylvan bus stop (22 bus line) is the closest to the project site within approximately 300 feet.

15. Please go into more detail about the trees.

A total of 202 trees were inventoried across the site, of which 117 are categorized as “Heritage” trees. The project will preserve 162 existing trees and relocate one (1) Heritage tree (London plane, No. 339) elsewhere onsite. The project proposes to remove 39 trees in total, including 15 Heritage trees due to their location within proposed building footprints and/or necessary site improvements, which support the new buildings. The project will provide 153 new tree plantings across the site, including three native species (Calif. sycamore, Calif. Hazelnut, and western redbud), all of which will be at 24” box size or larger. The tree canopy onsite is projected to increase to 3x greater than the existing canopy at full maturity. Additionally, the project is requesting a design exception from the 25’ maximum front setback along El Camino to provide additional root and canopy clearance necessary to preserve a mature Heritage tree (eucalyptus, No. 201) along the street frontage.

16. What's the safe route to school for kids from here? Does the MVWSD provide a bus for the elementary or intermediate school kids?

The project is within the Landels and Graham Middle School boundaries. The suggested route to school for Landels Elementary from the school district can be found here:

<https://www.mountainview.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=35207>

The MVWSD Transportation Department provides transportation for students who are residents of Moffett and who are special education students. In addition, the Community Shuttle serves Graham Middle School.

17. Will the new buildings have dual plumbing? If not, why not?

Residential developments are exempted from dual plumbing system requirements per the building code.

18. What are the views from the top stories? Is the Bay visible?

Views of Mountain View, Sunnyvale and limited views of the Bay are likely from the top stories.

19. Will the new buildings be mapped for condos?

No, the applicant is not proposing a subdivision map as part of the project.

20. How will the new State law that was just signed related to parking requirements impact this project?

The new State law (AB 2097) goes into effect on January 1, 2023. Since this project is before Council this week for a final decision, it is not subject to the provision of this law.

21. Page 47 the Initial Study says there will be a natural gas utilization. Isn't this construction required to be all electric?

The new buildings will be subject to current building codes that require all electric service, but portions of the existing site (existing buildings not proposed for redevelopment) have natural gas lines that will remain.

ITEM 7.1 Public Safety Building-Design, Project 20-49-Selection of Site Layout

1. What were the population and number of housing unit assumptions for the 2030 planning analysis? Did it include the most recent RHNA for 2023-2031? If the most recent RHNA was not included how many more people would need space in this new building, and how much more space would be needed?

The residential population projection used for the project was approximately 119,000 residents in Mountain View, which is a few thousand more than the 2031 Housing Element anticipates with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), plus buffer, for the City. Therefore, the personnel and space needs for the proposed project are not changed by the most recent RHNA for 2023-2031.

2. Do the utility services in the remnant area in Option 2 pose challenges for future uses of this remnant? If so, what are the challenges?

For Option 2, the existing utilities from Franklin Street that are servicing the current facility will be abandoned and will not affect the development of any future uses of the remnant parcel. There are some minor utility re-alignments planned along the Evelyn right-of-way to prepare for the future on-ramp to Shoreline Blvd. that will encroach about 10 feet onto the northerly portion of Option 2's remnant parcel. The minor encroachment by these public utilities will not impact the viability of the site for future development.

3. How large would the tax need to be to cover this gap? We have discussed the possibility of a tax for park acquisition and one for affordable housing if the regional one doesn't go forward. What are the other things being discussed?

A preliminary estimate of the property tax that would be needed to generate the \$6.1 million funding shortfall is \$18 per \$100,000 of assessed value or \$180 per annum for a \$1 million property. Staff will be engaging the services of a financial advisor to assist in providing additional analysis related to other revenue options that will address the funding gap that currently exists.

4. Can we use the space under the Evelyn/Shoreline on-ramp for parking? Can we put some of the parking garage under the Evelyn/Shoreline on-ramp or could we put surface parking there?

Some surface parking underneath the Evelyn ramp to Shoreline may be feasible. The total number of spaces, location and impact to the planned Evelyn Avenue multi-use path will be explored in the final design phase for the Castro Grade Separation Project that is currently underway. After Council approves a site layout for the Public Safety Building, staff will coordinate the detailed parking design between the two projects.

5. Can we get a small public park or wide tree-lined walking street along Villa out of this project?

In all options, the property along Villa is fully utilized by buildings. Introducing a small public park would require moving building footprints and reducing the size of the remnant parcel that may be available for future affordable housing. Staff can explore providing a wider sidewalk with trees along the property's Villa Street frontage within the existing street right-of-way as part of the project design.

6. Can we trade the “extra acreage for re-use site” for Tied House &/or Chez TJ to make those two properties city owned?

The property owners would need to agree to a land swap with the City, which they would likely only be willing to do if the proposed land swap location is suitable for their use. In addition, exchanging City property for another property is only exempt from the Surplus Land Act if the exchanged property the City would receive is necessary for the City’s use.

7. Roughly how much would a bond to cover the Public Safety Building cost taxpayers?

Please see the response above.