

RESPONSE TO COUNCIL QUESTIONS RE: 9/14/2021 CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

Agenda Item #: 1.D

Title: Award of Contract to Ray's Electric Inc. for Mary Avenue at Evelyn Avenue Caltrain Crossing and Traffic Signal Improvements and Finding of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Categorical Exemption (PW21-39)

Council Question: I am trying to get a better idea of the extent of TR-19-03.

Traffic Signal Improvements, TR-19-03" consisting of modifying the traffic signal at the intersection of Mary Avenue and Evelyn Avenue, construct ADA ramps, curb, gutter, sidewalk, concrete median, bulbouts, and signing and striping improvements

From a timing standpoint, we are planning to implement the Caltrain Grade Separation at Mary/Evelyn. How much of these signal improvements are critical, and what will need to be redone once we do grade separation? I know there are several decision points left, but does Staff have a timeline when they think the Mary/Evelyn Grade Separation will be implemented?

Staff Response: The improvements that are included in TR-19-03 are safety and accessibility changes identified by Caltrain, City and California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) staff and completely funded by a CPUC Section 130 State grant. Separately, Caltrain will be implementing improvements within their right of way also. These improvements were identified as part of a collaboration of the three agencies' review of past collision data and a site visit. We are anticipating that the Mary/Evelyn Grade Separation project will be moving forward into design in 2024 and if full funding is secured construction as early 2027. Resultingly, we will be able to realize at least 5 years of benefit from the safety improvements before construction would begin.

Agenda Item #: 2

Title: Proposed Project: For the Lawrence Station Area Plan (LSAP) Update...

Council Question: I'm trying to get a better understanding of the request from Santa Clara to help fund their road improvements (by increasing our LSAP TIF by \$1).

Has Santa Clara been collecting Transportation Impact Fees for all of the housing that they have been adding at Lawrence Station Area to pay for their portion of possible roadway improvements? I don't remember a previous request for our city to pay towards mitigation in another city's roadways; can you clarify?

Staff Response: The \$1/residential dwelling unit increase in Transportation Impact Fees for the LSAP area is due to a Consumer Price Index adjustment requested by the City of Santa Clara for the two projects identified to address congestion effects caused by the increase in residential traffic in Santa Clara. The transportation improvements have been previously identified by Santa Clara as part of their Related Company development and other development projects' transportation studies within their jurisdiction. As part of past development projects, Sunnyvale has been paying fair share to other adjoining agencies (Caltrans, County of Santa Clara, Cupertino, Santa Clara and Mountain View) for transportation effects caused in their jurisdictions. Similarly, other agencies have been coordinating with Sunnyvale on improvements necessary as a result of their development effects in Sunnyvale (i.e. Related Company development and Patrick Henry Specific Plan in Santa Clara, LinkedIn in Mountain View, and Apple in Cupertino).

Council Question: Looks like multiple problems in Attachment 23 (REDLINE Adopted LSAP) on the PDF file downloaded from the link, there are multiple letters/words missing.

*This residential area has a more **ne-grained** pattern of streets and blocks that, with a few exceptions, are well-scaled to pedestrians and bicycles and provide good access for motor vehicles.*

Looks like there are characters missing throughout the document.

Staff Response: That is correct, some of the words are cut off in the 2016 redline plan version (which was created to assist in understanding changes to the LSAP text between the public draft and final draft). It happened because we copied text in the public draft pdf (as we did not have access to the application used to create the draft plan) then transferred it to a word version that shows redlines. For some reason, when we copied the pdf to Word, a lot of words that include "fi" do not transfer over fully. For example, "fine-grained" will show up as "ne-grained." This all stems from the previous LSAP consultant not being involved with the project by the time of 2016 adoption and staff had to update the public draft document through this method. The new (2021) version of the plan has cleaned all of this up with the update, and the final draft amended plan does not include these cut-off words. With the LSAP Update project, a new consultant has made clean-up edits throughout the document along with the other revisions proposed for the LSAP Update that will supersede the 2016 redline LSAP version with some incomplete words.

Council Question: During the PC Meeting, a landowner complained about the location of the Loop Road which was clarified (flexible location). Has Staff met further with the owner to clarify the location and the intention of the Loop Road?

("Allow flexibility in the final locations of the loop road, shared- used paths, and pathways based on specific site conditions. ")

Staff Response: Staff met with the owner (PS Business Parks, 1310-1380 Kifer Road) several times to discuss this topic, with the latest meeting in June 2021. The intent of the eastern portion of the Loop Road, where it is located through the PC Business Parks property, is to align with the intersection of Corvin Drive and Kifer Road, then travel southward through the PS Business Parks property to the rear and positioned to align with the property to the west or south so the Loop Road can continue through other private properties toward Lawrence Station. The location of the eastern portion of the Loop Road in the proposed 2021 amended LSAP is the same as what was shown in the original 2016 adopted LSAP. The location of the Loop Road on the interior of PS Business Parks property is flexible and does not have to follow the straight line shown in amended LSAP and Sense of Place Plan circulation diagrams.

With the LSAP Update, additional density points are available for construction of the Loop Road (15 density points instead of 10 in the existing incentive program). There are also an additional 10 density points available for construction of secondary pathways, one of which is shown on a portion of PS Business Parks property. If the proposed LSAP amendments are adopted, PS Business Parks and other property owners would be able to achieve higher densities above current allowances by constructing circulation improvements identified in the Sense of Place Plan.

Agenda Item #: 3

Title: Proposed Project: Related applications on multiple sites totaling 32.4-acres: SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT: To demolish two existing industrial/office/R&D buildings and three accessory structures and construct two new three-story office/R&D/manufacturing buildings totaling 1,211,000 sq. ft. (including 148,000 sq. ft. of basement space) connected by a pedestrian bridge across Kifer Road; and construct an 11,000 sq. ft. freestanding amenity building for a total combined FAR of 77%. The project also includes a five-level, above ground parking structure with an attached 12,000 sq. ft. central utility plant. VESTING TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP: To merge four existing lots into two. DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT: Introduction of an Ordinance Approving and Adopting a Development Agreement Between the City of Sunnyvale and Intuitive Surgical, Inc. Location: 932 Kifer Road (APN 205-49-005), 950 Kifer Road (APN 205-49-012), 945 Kifer Road (APN 205-40-002), 955 Kifer Road (APN 205-40-001) File #: 2019-7557 Zoning: M-S (945/955 Kifer Road) and M-3 (932/950 Kifer Road) Applicant / Owner: Foster + Partners

Council Question: Saw that BP-13 was deleted from the COA. What are the standard requirements for Exhaust as far as this project is concerned (and deleting them)?

Staff Response: BP-13 was deleted as it specifically referenced exhaust adjacent to residential development. The site has industrial uses on the three sides and the railroad on the fourth side, therefore this condition is not needed. The project needs to meet all standard building code requirements (specifically mechanical and fire codes).