

## RESPONSES TO COUNCIL QUESTIONS RE: 2/10/15 AGENDA

### CONSENT CALENDAR:

#### Item #1.D.

What was the anticipated life of the current AMH system when it was approved in 2009?

**Staff Response:** The anticipated life of the current AMH system when it was approved in 2009 was 10 years. Since 2010, Bibliotheca, based in Switzerland, merged with Integrated Technology Group, based in North America, and Intellident, based in the United Kingdom. In 2012, Bibliotheca also purchased Trion AG, the original manufacturer of Sunnyvale's AMH system. Due to changes in the industry, the parts for the original system have become increasingly difficult to source. Wanting to be proactive in preventing a partial or complete AMH system failure, Bibliotheca approached Library staff with a proposal to subsidize the cost of a replacement system for Sunnyvale.

There have been ongoing complaints about the existing AMH system's requirement that patrons feed items into the return one item at a time. Will the upgraded hardware require patrons to continue to feed items one at a time?

**Staff Response:** The upgraded AMH hardware will continue to require patrons to feed items one at a time due to the sorting of the items into unique bins that allows for expedited placement on carts and return to the shelf. The upgraded system will, however, accept items at a faster rate than the existing system (900 items per hour in the new system compared to 600 items per hour in the existing system).

### PUBLIC HEARING/GENERAL BUSINESS:

#### Item #2

When will the rezoning request come to Council, with the GPA or with the Special Development Permit?

**Staff Response:** While it is the prerogative of the Council, staff suggests that the Council act on the zone change at the same time it acts on the General Plan change. This was how the zone changes for residential projects on East Weddell were handled. The Planning Commission would then have a clearer direction for its subsequent review of the project.

When will Council determine the TDM level, will it be when considering the GPA or rezoning or SDP?

**Staff Response:** The required TDM standards are defined in the Moffett Park Specific Plan. If the discussion is on revising the TDM standards in the plan, which would apply to all projects in Moffett Park, then it should be included with the Specific Plan amendment study. For TDM levels/requirements that are specific to the proposed project, it would be best to define them as conditions of approval in the project SDP or possibly as part of a development agreement depending on the specifics.

How does an analysis of net zero increase in vehicle trips differ from an analysis of current trip counts? Does it simply identify what TDM level results in a net zero increase in vehicle trips?

**Staff Response:** A goal of net zero increase in vehicle trips would be based on the trips occurring at the project site based on recent employment information or actual vehicle counts. One analysis would be to determine the required TDM goal and program

measures for the proposed project to achieve a net zero increase in trips. Another analysis might be to calculate the maximum size of an office project that could be allowed with the goal of a net zero increase in vehicle trips. A blend of both analyses is possible also.

1. Could staff be prepared to discuss and answer questions on the information item (in the back of the binder) regarding the monster interchange project included at the back of the binder. I am concerned to understand elimination of Alternative 2 without Council and public involvement in the decision. Another public presentation on this updating everyone might be helpful. Meantime:

A) what is Innovation Way projected capacity

B) what is its expected traffic volume?

**Staff Response:** The full traffic analysis for the project has not been completed yet. Under current design conditions Innovation Way could carry approximately 10,000-12,000 cars a day. The traffic analysis will look at increasing capacity by signaling the current stop signs and other improvements, which could increase thru capacity to 16,000-20,000 cars a day.

C) how is Moffett Park drive doing in terms of traffic conditions today

**Staff Response:** Based on current peak hour volume data, Moffett Park Drive is carrying approximately 8,000 cars a day.

D) which alternative best meets the purpose and need of the original project - which i understood to be alleviating conditions in the monster intersection. That's not the same as optimizing conditions on Innovation Way...

**Staff Response:** The goal of the project is to provide the best design to alleviate the congestion at the 237/101/Mathilda Interchange. Optimizing Innovation Way is not a project goal, however as part of the design, staff reviews possible concerns within the project sphere of influence (or affected by the project) including streets such as Almanor, West Ahwanee, Moffett Park Drive, and Innovation way. This allows the project to move forward with a design that provides all the project benefits, meets the project goals, and is buildable. In addition, Innovation Way is affected by all project alternatives, so it is important to analyze the possible impacts and concerns.

As part of the initial design process Sunnyvale/VTA/Caltrans analyzed approximately 18 alternatives, ultimately narrowing it down to the three presented to Council. Alternative 2 is being dropped because it provides the same benefits to interchange operations as Alternative 1, but with more expected impacts or concerns. The only significant change to interchange operations between Alternatives 1 and 2 is that under Alternative 1 northbound vehicles on Mathilda will make a U-turn, instead of a left-turn, to access westbound 237. Staff has reviewed the 2040 volumes, and the U-turn movement will be approximately 100 peak hour vehicles. This U-turn volume can be accommodated without affecting interchange operations.

It is typical and expected as part of the Caltrans process to minimize the number of build-alternatives. For the 237/101/Mathilda project, we will carry two Alternatives (1 and 3) that meet the purpose and need of the project.

2. Staff are indicating a "development agreement is not currently anticipated". For a 1.6 million square foot project, I find this concerning. Could staff indicate under what conditions development agreements are typically employed and why they are not considering one here?

**Staff Response:** The staff report indicates that a development agreement is not

currently anticipated meaning that one is not currently proposed; the report adds that it "could be considered to address community benefits." At this point, a specific community benefit has not been identified, but a development agreement will be discussed with the applicant if the General Plan study is initiated. It would be processed concurrently with the project entitlements. Both the Central & Wolfe and Moffett Place projects included development agreements, and the Moffett Towers 2 project (recently changed from Moffett Towers 3) is similar in scale and warrants a similar discussion.

3. I am interested to propose including in the study:

- A) A bike connection from west Sunnyvale into Moffett Park, generally in the vicinity of Mary Avenue. Such a study might need to look at implications for revision to the General Plan to reflect change from "auto bridge" to "bike/pedestrian only bridge" at the end of Mary Avenue. This also has implications for the TIF eligible projects list and the VTP 2040 project lists. Staff comment welcome on that.

**Staff Response:** The Mary Avenue extension is part of the City's approved General Plan, the City's Traffic Impact Fee (recently updated December 2013), and the Valley Transportation Plan 2040. Consideration to remove the extension will require Council policy direction and funding for the appropriate studies, including traffic analysis and an Environmental Impact Report. In addition to the traffic implications, there will also be TIF implications including previous funds collected for the project as part of the TIF program.

- B) Burrowing owl study, habitat restoration options.

**Staff Response:** The study has been completed and will be presented to the Parks and Recreation Commission and Sustainability Commission in March and Council in April.

4. Could staff comment on and be prepared to discuss status of:

-understanding of and lessons learned from construction impacts of development work in Moffett Park

**Staff Response:** In terms of lessons learned from construction impacts, pile driving will not be allowed unless it can be demonstrated that due to geotechnical or structural reasons, it is the only feasible alternative. Staff has developed a standard condition that requires installing piles through an alternative vibration or drilling method, which is considerably quieter. For Moffett Place, the first two buildings involved pile driving which generated community complaints; in response, the developer has changed to a quieter method for its latter buildings. Assuming the soil conditions at the Moffett Towers 2 site are similar to the Moffett Place site, an alternative method will be required. A construction management plan is also required for such projects, which includes compliance with noise and air quality standards identified in the EIR.

-Bernardo Bike undercrossing - when is it going to be completed? How can we get it completed faster?

**Staff Response:** The Bernardo Undercrossing is a \$10 million project and currently unfunded. The City's traffic impact fee (TIF) will collect approximately \$2 million towards the project and the rest of the project will be funded through outside funding sources. The project is also included in VTP2040 which makes it eligible for outside funding, when funding becomes available. There is no current schedule. Current City TIF funds are prioritized towards completion of the 237/101/Mathilda interchange.

-Wolfe Road study (Wolfe-ECR + Wolfe lane reconfiguration) when is it going to start?

**Staff Response:** A scope of work has been completed and will be advertised for consultant selection in 2-3 weeks.

-Light Rail double-tracking and implications for Moffett Park service. It's not clear that express trains will be stopping in Sunnyvale. Does staff have any comment?

**Staff Response:** Staff does not have comments.

-Mountain View development near and affecting Moffett Park traffic conditions.

**Staff Response:** Staff will review any Mountain View development traffic analysis and provide comments as needed.

-what is the status of staff-staff discussions with Mountain View on possibilities for improving connections from Moffett Park to the west through Manila – Ellis

**Staff Response:** Staff is not currently having discussions with Mountain View staff regarding connection improvements in Mountain View.

-implications of Google development vicinity of Moffett Field

**Staff Response:** As part of the Specific Plan amendment study, staff will consider the implications of Mountain View's North Bayshore Precise Plan (e.g. as cumulative traffic) on this proposed plan change and project.

-status of habitat conservation plan work San Jose and vicinity and how it relates to our development if it does

**Staff Response:** The Santa Clara Valley Habitat Conservation Plan focuses on acquiring and restoring conservation areas in eastern and southern Santa Clara County. Sunnyvale is not subject to this plan nor is a member of the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Authority that oversees the plan. However, developers of both the Central & Wolfe and Moffett Place projects voluntarily paid a nitrogen deposition fee to the Authority based on net new vehicular trips from their projects.