

## RESPONSE TO COUNCIL QUESTION REGARDING 8/25/15 AGENDA

### CONSENT CALENDAR:

#### Item 1.C.

SCVWD states the East Channel extends down to 280, but i believe the actual channel stops at Ortega, connecting to underground storm drains south past Homestead. (True?) I have been assuming that if one had a trail someday along the entire east channel, it would have to connect to streets south of Ortega. if there is in fact a trail opportunity (ie an existing fenced right of way for a service road) to connect to in Cupertino, I would be curious to hear about it, and would be happy to mention it to colleagues in Cupertino.

**Staff Response: That's correct, the current SCVWD East Channel project extends to Inverness Way where it connects to 72" Storm Drain.**

Also, is this agreement flexible enough to allow later expansion of lengths of trail? It seems to be. Paragraph C2 in Attachment 3 limits the length for the East Channel to Tasman-JCW. And it makes sense to do so for purposes of a specific set of city responsibilities that need to be budgeted.

**Staff Response: Typically these types of agreements can be amended to add additional sections if both parties are agreeable.**

Meanwhile, in the sense of plan north of Arques envisions trail implementation, also our Fair Oaks Park project will look at further lengthening of the trail, I believe. Do we and SCVWD see this agreement with SCVWD as one that can be expanded (in length of channel covered) in coming years to someday provide a trail connection from Tasman to Arques?

**Staff Response: Staff from the City and SCVWD are currently focused on this project and have not discussed future expansion. However, we would expect that if the opportunity for additional improvements were available in the future the Water District could be open to it.**

I would be curious to know at what date we might be able to complete such a trail. Maybe I should first ask: what is the new expected completion date for the East Channel project? The graphic in attachment 2 indicates vaguely 2018, but in fact over the years this project has just kept slipping. We were told that if voters passed the latest SCVWD tax, this would help. Yet, it seems the project is in the doldrums. What can the city do in the way of advocacy or IGR work to avoid further slippage?

**Staff Response: The SCWD continues to advance the project. The EIR has been adopted and the design is currently at 95%. The current SCVWD schedule calls for a construction start of 2016 with a completion date of 2018. Per discussion with SCVWD staff, the key item is the approval of permits by other agencies. These have been submitted or are in the process of being submitted, and is not expected that advocacy by the City would accelerate the review process.**

### **Item 1.E.**

How does the five-year nature of the current terms figure into what's normally a 4-year technology provision? Does it mean more money per councilmember or a longer lifespan of the budgeted amount? Also, can you please list the carry-over amounts for each councilmember?

**Staff Response:** The five-year nature means longer lifespan of the budgeted amount. There was no action to increase the technology allowance when the one-time, one-year extension of Councilmember terms was approved by the voters in 2013, nor when the unspent Council technology allowance funds were carried over from FY 2013/14 to FY 2014/15. If Council would like to increase the allowance for this term, expenditures for the additional year (\$325 per seat) can be absorbed within the Office of the City Manager operating budget.

#### **Carryover amounts by Councilmember:**

<b>Councilmember</b>	<b>Carryover</b>
<b>Seat #1 Larsson</b>	<b>\$1,300</b>
<b>Seat #2 Hendricks</b>	<b>\$1,300</b>
<b>Seat #3 Griffith</b>	<b>\$1,300</b>
<b>Seat #4 Whittum</b>	<b>\$51</b>
<b>Seat #5 Meyering</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Seat #6 Davis</b>	<b>\$1,300</b>
<b>Seat #7 Martin-Milius</b>	<b>\$1,300</b>
	<b>\$6,551</b>

### **Item 1.F.**

Safe routes to school - could staff share the pdf/url for the Paragon Planning Comprehensive School Traffic Study?

**Staff Response:** The study can be found at the URL below as part of the December 4, 2012 RTC.

<http://sunnyvale.ca.gov/Portals/0/Sunnyvale/CouncilReports/2012/12-279-1A.pdf>

### **Item 1.G.**

Food scraps - I regret that I did not realize - and I am responsible I am sure - that we were using the Newby Island Landfill. When did we first enter into a contract entailing the use Newby Island landfill for food scraps? Do we use Newby for anything else? What is another option that avoids using Newby? My concern about Newby comes after an experience I had not so long ago, when I spent some time one afternoon at Milpitas High School. Since then I have come to suspect that Newby is a public health hazard. Certainly it makes a joke of any talk about air quality requirements in the larger community. It has San Jose dumping pollutants on its lowest income demographic and spreading them in more diluted form throughout the region. Daily wind patterns at the base of SF Bay guarantee that. I believe Newby should be shut down and restored,

much as Fresh Kills was on Staten Island. Continuing to use it, even if cost effective presents an ethical conflict in my view.

**Staff Response:** To clarify, we do not use the Newby Island Landfill, and the City has never contracted for disposal of municipal solid waste at the Newby Island Landfill. The purchase order that is the subject of RTC 15-0744 is with regard to the compost operation to which we send the commercial food waste, not the landfill. The compost facility has its own state permit, separate from the Newby Island Landfill permit.

With regard to the odors experienced in the Milpitas area, the vicinity includes, besides Newby Island Landfill, a large number of other potentially significant odor sources. Those sources include the San Jose waste water treatment plant and its extensive outdoor biosolids drying beds, the Zanker Road Landfill, the new ZWED anaerobic digestion facility adjacent to the Zanker Road Landfill, various ponds at the edge of the Bay, the pond restoration project(s) and the San Francisco Bay itself. Any of those sources can produce odors detectable in the Milpitas area. As staff knows from our own experience dealing with unfounded odor complaints about City facilities, members of the public often have difficulty telling one type and source of odor from another type and source.

All of the sources noted above are likely contributors to the odor issues in the Milpitas area from time to time. However, Newby Island Landfill is the biggest "pile" visible to the public and that, plus opposition to Newby's current effort to change its permit to expand the landfill's size, may explain why members of the public are singling out this source and blaming it for the odors. Sunnyvale staff has visited the Newby Island compost facility a number of times and has arranged tours there for the Sunnyvale businesses that provide food waste to the City's composting program. Staff has always found the compost facility to be well-operated and not a significant source of odors.

The action recommended in RTC 15-0744 is a temporary extension of this compost agreement. As described in the RTC, the long-term plan, taking into account the growth of the commercial food waste program and anticipated startup of residential food waste, is to conduct an RFQ process that results in issuing multiple processing contracts for food waste/organics composting.

## **PUBLIC HEARING/GENERAL BUSINESS:**

### **Item #3**

Can staff please be prepared to discuss the history of public safety and neighborhood preservation incidents that occurred in the past related to the former Cold Weather Shelter at the Armory and its proximity to nearby residences?

**Staff Response:** Public Safety has conducted a review of activity previously associated with the Armory Cold Weather Shelter and is prepared to discuss the findings. In summary, the department averaged approximately 50 calls for service per month during the months of operation. The majority of the calls were medical related, followed by law enforcement calls for service (i.e. disturbance,

loitering, etc.). These calls were directly associated with the physical location. The department is unable to determine specific data on surrounding areas without doing detailed research on individual calls for service. Neighborhood Preservation observed an increase in calls during the operation of the Cold Weather Shelter at Fair Oaks Park mostly regarding the storage of property. They received very few calls for service related to storage of property on private property in the adjacent neighborhoods.

I see from the Mayor's letter last week, dated 8/20/15, that City staff provided a lengthy letter to the County regarding the E. California site dated 6/30/15. Could staff advise: When did City staff share this letter with Council?

**Staff Response:** On June 30, the City Manager forwarded Council a copy of the letter to the County via email. This was sent to Council the same day it was forwarded to the County and a copy is attached for your information. In addition, on June 23, the City Manager sent via email a summary of her first meeting with County representatives about the proposed E. California site.

City staff indicated: "we understood Onizuka as a potential site last year and toured it with County staff following Council's direction. The County staff rejected it for various reasons and focused on other properties." Please advise, when/where did City staff inform Council of County staff's rejection of Onizuka? Please share the document or email in which County indicated its rejection and the "various reasons" for rejecting it.

**Staff Response:** Last year, City staff presented various sites as options per Council's direction and in compliance with the County's potential site assessment process. County staff toured the sites, including Onizuka. The County's consideration of the Onizuka site was for a permanent Cold Weather Shelter (CWS). The County did not send a formal letter or email indicating rejection of the site. Rather, for various reasons which County staff can explain further, during the past year they chose to focus on other possible sites in the North County for a permanent CWS. While County staff did informally inquire about the Onizuka site, the City has received a mixed reaction from several County staff about the site, including that they were uncertain that it would be offered by the City, more recently as of Thursday, August 20, that the site was not suitable or preferred for a CWS. During all of these County inquiries, staff provided the requested information to the County about the site as well as responded to questions about other City property. The County will need to articulate for the Council why it has not pursued actively the Onizuka site or why it considers it as not suitable or preferred.

City staff in correspondence last week referred to: "City Council's position on Onizuka (based on their site plan and ability to implement it) presents a constraint." What did City staff mean by "City Council's position on Onizuka"? I am not aware of a City Council position on Onizuka that constrains its use as a CWS. I am only aware that City Council asked that Onizuka be considered, and I am not aware of any constructive effort by City staff to facilitate its consideration. What is the "constraint" referenced by City staff?

**Staff Response:** The Moffett Park Specific Plan and associated MP-I zoning district does not include a homeless shelter as a permitted or conditional use. To allow a shelter at this location would require a zoning amendment to allow homeless shelters within the MP-I district or to rezone the specific parcel in such

**a way that a shelter would be a permitted or conditional use. The added constraint for a temporary CWS is the short time frame to process the required Council and Planning Commission actions with environmental review. Staff was informed in June 2015 of the County's decision to focus on a temporary CWS after a site for a permanent facility did not materialize.**

It concerns me that in the public meeting last Monday evening, 8/17/15, apparently both County and City staff were in possession of information that Council did not have, that could have answered reasonable questions asked by members of the public. The public (75 residents seated, and 105 standing) had questions that went unanswered, and residents went away quite frustrated, and justifiably so. For example, County staff had no answer to the good question folks asked: what about Onizuka? County and City staff present said nothing in answer to that; but if I understand city staff's emails subsequently, City staff knew that County staff had rejected it months before. No one told the public that. And no one told Council that.

**Staff Response: City staff does not have any information that was not shared with the Council. The County has not provided specific reasons why the Onizuka site was not considered for a temporary or permanent CWS and why the County's property at Fair Oaks and California was chosen for a temporary CWS. As mentioned in an earlier response, the City has received a mixed reaction from several County staff about the site, including that they were uncertain that it would be offered by the City, or more recently, that the site was not suitable or preferred for a CWS. No formal action by the County has been taken to assess the site further. A possible contributing reason given the short time-frame is that the County's property does not require City land use approval. We have alerted County staff about questions relating to other sites that the County may have considered for a temporary CWS. The County can address this question at the Council meeting.**

Earlier this week I replayed the council meeting from a year ago, August 12, 2014, linked to here: <http://bit.ly/1UJmVo> The CWS item starts after 2:47. It's clear that a year ago County staff understood the interest in other sites, and specifically said Onizuka would be looked at. At 3:36 in the hearing he states that if he could get on site and look at sewer hookups they could consider modular buildings. At 3:37, County staff states that County is not recommending using the E. California site. County staff mentions County Roads need for the site, and the on-ramp as unfavorable to the site. Council comments start at around 5:09...it is clear that council wanted to know if Onizuka would work a year ago, and several state that if E. California was looked at, it would come back to them for a decision. It seems that since that date, August 12, 2014, City staff came to learn that these public conclusions were no longer accurate, and yet, did not, until last week, inform Council of that. Is that correct?

**Staff Response: The Council discussion and action in August 2014 pertained to a site for a permanent CWS. County staff took a look at the Onizuka site per the suggestion of the City Council as a possible alternative; while follow-up questions were asked, the County did not pursue with City staff establishing a permanent CWS at this location. Instead, as indicated above, they focused on other sites in the North County. At this time, the County's Fair Oaks property is only being proposed for a temporary CWS during the 2015/16 winter season, and staff is not aware that the County is considering it for a permanent facility.**

Meanwhile, I have received information that County staff did not reject Onizuka, but in fact asked City staff if they could assess feasibility of the site. This differs from City Staff's report, last week that County staff rejected Onizuka. Could City staff produce a document, email or letter in which County staff rejected Onizuka?

**Staff Response: As indicated above, the County did not reject the Onizuka site in writing. However, County staff was well aware that the Council had identified this site as a possible alternative as part of their action in August 2014. They did take a look at the site, but did not choose to pursue it with City staff.**

Can City staff produce any document that would provide evidence supporting a claim that City staff made any effort to assess feasibility of Onizuka. Do we know that there is an issue, or not an issue with sewer/electrical or other facilities?

**Staff Response: Given the lack of follow-up or serious interest expressed by the County, staff did not investigate the utilities needed for a CWS on this property. However, County staff was made aware that development of the site will require new utility connections.**

Has City staff had any correspondence or discussion regarding use or disposition of Onizuka, in which 3rd parties, such as real estate developers, corporations, Moffett Park property owners or lobbyists, opposed use of Onizuka for a CWS? Please summarize who advocated for what.

**Staff Response: While staff has received various inquiries about the property, the response has been that further Council direction is needed on the future use of the property. There has been no formal process with the community to assess whether there is opposition or not.**

Could staff confirm: is it correct that Onizuka is well-situated for transit, near the 54, 26, bus lines in Sunnyvale, two Light Rail stations and five express bus lines, that the site is between Moffett Park Light-Rail Station and Lockheed Martin station, about 400 yards from the former and 600 yards from the latter?

**Staff Response: It is correct that the site is accessible by bus transit and is within walking distance to two light rail stations.**

Could staff confirm, is it correct that temporary Onizuka CWS does not conflict with City plans for the site. Is it correct that the City has no adopted plan for use of the 4.6 acre Onizuka parcel?

**Staff Response: As indicated above, a CWS is not identified as an allowed use in the Moffett Park Specific Plan or MP-I zoning district.**

Could staff comment on the correctness of the other points raised on the attached, regarding use of Onizuka for the CWS.

**Staff Response: The observations are generally correct, except regarding conflict with existing City plans, which is discussed in answers to previous questions.**

Multiple members of the public expressed concerns regarding the present day public safety situation in the Victory Village neighborhood. Could staff indicate what if any steps have been taken in recent years to reduce traffic accidents in the neighborhood? Have any traffic measures been adopted? Has City staff had any correspondence with

County Roads concerning improvements to the ramp-street configuration? Has any public improvement of any kind been pursued in the Victory Village neighborhood in the last ten years?

**Staff Response:** DPS has conducted a high-level review of total calls for service (Police/Fire/EMS) in the area of Victory Village and the adjoining reporting districts. The Victory Village reporting district averages approximately 165 total calls for service per month. In comparison, the adjoining reporting district which includes Fair Oaks Park averages approximately 455 total calls for service per month. It should be noted that this district is much larger in geographical size. DPS is currently researching the data further to determine the breakdown of calls by call type (Police/Fire/EMS). The DPS Traffic Unit conducted a query of traffic accident data in the area of the proposed Cold Weather Shelter. Data was reviewed for the past three years (August 2012 to August 2015) in the following areas:

- On Fair Oaks Avenue between Arques Avenue and Kifer Road – 35 total collisions of which five were injury accidents.
- On Central Expressway between Mathilda Avenue and Wolfe Road – 72 total collisions of which 21 were injury accidents.
- Central Expressway at Fair Oaks Avenue – 9 total collisions, none of which were injury accidents.

The DPS Traffic Unit has received one official traffic complaint in the area of Victory Village since 2012. The Traffic Unit conducts regular speed enforcement in the area.

Is County claiming exemption under CEQA for the CWS project at E. California, or are they performing an Initial Study?

**Staff Response:** County staff has not made a CEQA finding on the temporary CWS. However, County staff recently conveyed to the Housing Officer that they are preparing an Initial Study for the project. They also indicated that they will consider the CEQA document at the Board of Supervisors' meeting on September 29.

Is it consistent with CEQA for the County to allocate over \$1M for a project on 8/25/15 that does not have an environmental clearance?

**Staff Response:** County staff has not indicated that CEQA review or clearance is required for their action on August 25 to authorize funding for a temporary CWS. The recommended budget allocation includes the cost to perform the CEQA review for the project.

In addition to the 8/25/15 9AM Supervisors meeting at 70 W. Hedding St, at what hearings would members of the public or City need to attend to exhaust remedies under CEQA?

**Staff Response:** As mentioned above, County staff has indicated that they will consider the CEQA document on September 29.

Please point to the letter, email or other document by which the City is raising concerns about this process pursuant to exhausting remedies under CEQA. Can staff estimate the resources required if the City pursues a challenge to an Initial Study under CEQA,

and the timeline for process.

**Staff Response:** Staff asked questions regarding the potential environmental issues and the required CEQA review and for the project in the City Manager's letter to the County's Chief Executive Officer on June 30, 2015 (see attachment). It is difficult to estimate the resources required to challenge the CEQA finding as it depends on the County's action and the Council's direction.

Could City staff clarify the following. County staff was heard by some to have said at the public meeting last Monday 8/17/15 that the E. California site was approved by Council unanimously. If that is what was said --- and public members comments reflected that belief--- could the City staff clarify --- It's my understanding that neither E. California nor any specific site was approved by Council. To confirm this, I watched again the meeting video, linked-to above. There was a 5-2 motion to support the County's looking at a range of options, with the understanding that if it was in Sunnyvale it would come back to Council. Did City staff represent to County staff that Council "approved" the E. California site?

**Staff Response:** County staff was forwarded the verbatim City Council action on August 12, 2014. This action does not indicate that the Council approved any specific site for a CWS, nor did City staff indicate this.

Also, at the 8/17/15 meeting, in reading the County FAQ handout, I realized for the first time that "temporary" means, to County staff, "temporary each year", i.e., only some months, each year. I am not aware of any Councilmember ever expressing in our meetings support for an annually recurring CWS use at E. California. Could City staff indicate on what date City staff learned that "temporary" actually mean "recurring annually"? Could City staff indicate where/when they informed Council of this?

**Staff Response:** Supervisor Simitian informed the City Council and City staff in June 2015 that the County was proposing a temporary CWS for the 2015/16 winter season (December 1, 2015 to March 31, 2016) on the County's Fair Oaks property. They are hoping to secure a location to establish a permanent CWS for the 2016/17 winter season, but County staff has also indicated as a contingency that they may have to consider a temporary facility for another year if a permanent facility is not ready yet.

#### **Item #4**

If council were interested to see further reduction in visual impact/mass of the project, are there any modifications to: aesthetics, finish, materials, sizing of decorative features or walkway, driveway (bottlenecking eg), garage entrance setback, that staff could see helping to diminish scale, short of further 2nd story modifications? this is kind of an open ended question, so perhaps i can ask it at the hearing if that is easier to handle.

**Staff Response:** If the Council finds that the house, as currently designed, requires further modifications then a number of options are possible, none of them particularly simple, including: rearrangement of the second floor to move it further toward the rear of the property, move the entire house to the rear (which increases the concern of those neighbors), sliding only portions of the entire house toward the rear, etc.



In the staff recommendation, does the hvac go in the rear?

**Staff Response:** The applicant has relocated the HVAC to the rear yard. Staff is recommending denying the appeal and upholding the Planning Commission action which allows the applicant to explore locating the HVAC in the side yard (provided it meets all setback and noise performance standards). Council can accept or remove this provision if they otherwise approve the project.

In our discussion of new parking schemes (tandem, mechanical etc), would this zoning allow new parking schemes, or would it still require a double-wide garage

**Staff Response:** Tandem parking can be permitted if the lot is less than 57 feet in width (it is 60 feet, so this provision does not apply) or if it can be found that "significant structural modifications are required to expand the existing covered parking area into the living area to meet the minimum size and dimensions for two covered spaces." This standard does not apply to a new house, but to an addition to an existing house.

Could we be provided a full sized color depiction of elevations at the dais or perhaps in the council conference room?

**Staff Response:** The applicant will be informed of the request for large-size color elevations.

Attachment

# CITY OF SUNNYVALE

*The Heart of Silicon Valley* <sup>SM</sup>

456 WEST OLIVE AVENUE

SUNNYVALE, CALIFORNIA 94086

(408) 730-7480

*Office of the City Manager*

June 30, 2015

Mr. Gary Graves, Chief Operating Officer  
Office of the County Executive  
County of Santa Clara  
70 West Hedding Street, 11th Floor  
San Jose, CA 95110

**Re: Request for Information Regarding New County Shelter Facility in Sunnyvale**

Dear Mr. Graves:

Following our very brief conversation last week on this topic, Supervisor Simitian contacted my office regarding the County's plans to develop a new cold weather shelter facility on excess County property located in Sunnyvale for operations beginning in late November or early December of this year. On June 23, I spoke with him regarding this proposal, and he indicated that no detailed plans or project description were currently available, and that the County staff was exploring several alternative structure types at this time, such as a large tent and/or modular structures. He indicated that County staff would have more specifics about the project available in late July, such as a project description and site plans. We understand from your staff that the facility will require the County to connect to several City utilities to provide services to the site such as water, sewer, solid waste disposal, and/or storm water drainage.

City staff is available to answer any questions your staff may have about obtaining such connections. To assist the County in its evaluation, attached find staff contact information, a list of the basic requirements for utility connections, and information about the required encroachment permit. In turn, we have also included a list of questions that we request that the County answer, to the extent information is available, and in order to enable City staff to answer any Council and/or public questions that will likely arise about the County's project. Alternatively, we seek the appropriate County contacts that would be able to handle those inquiries and responses to them.

If our staff can assist your staff in developing an appropriate public outreach plan or any other aspect of this project, please let me know.

Sincerely,



Deanna J. Santana  
City Manager

## **Sunnyvale Utility Connections / Encroachment Permit Requirements**

- City provides water, sewer, solid waste disposal, and storm water drainage facilities in the vicinity that can provide required services to the site.
- Utility connections require an encroachment permit from DPW.
- Applications, design guidelines and specifications are available online:  
<http://sunnyvale.ca.gov/Departments/PublicWorks/EncroachmentPermits.aspx>
- Water and sewer connection fees will apply. A surety bond or cash payment may also be required to guarantee completion or warranty the work performed.
- Sewer impact analysis may be required to determine impact on existing main.
- Solid waste disposal service fees are typically included on water/sewer bill.
- A storm water management plan will be required if the project will create or replace 5,000 SF of parking lot area or 10,000 SF of other impervious surfaces (walkways, roofs, etc.).
- Other utility providers in area include PG&E, AT&T, and Comcast.
- Site planner should also check with VTA to confirm location of existing bus stop at Fair Oaks Ave.
- New sidewalk and/or driveway approaches may be needed for emergency access.
- Solid waste collection vehicles may require driveways on both Fair Oaks and California to allow trucks to enter and exit property. Otherwise, an on-site turn-out or turn-around will be required, which may require larger portion of site to remain vacant.

### **City Contacts:**

Judy Chu, Senior Engineer, DPW  
(408) 730-7413  
[jchu@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:jchu@sunnyvale.ca.gov)

Manuel Pineda, Public Works Director, DPW  
(408) 730-7415  
[mpineda@sunnyvale.ca.gov](mailto:mpineda@sunnyvale.ca.gov)

## **Request for Information**

### **Public Outreach / Noticing**

- Please share draft public outreach plan with the City, including a list of impacted/interested stakeholders, and a timeline for implementation.
- A meeting between appropriate City and County staff is suggested to review the outreach plan before the County begins the outreach process.
- Please describe the type of public noticing planned (i.e., mailed notices, legal ads, website, email; proposed mailing radius; languages)
- Please provide the appropriate County contacts for media and public inquiries about this proposal.
- Please provide a FAQ with anticipated questions and appropriate responses for use by the City Communications Office.
- Please provide a list of compelling talking points on the need for the proposed project.

### **Design / Visual Impacts**

- Please describe the type of fencing/visual screening planned for the perimeter of the site.
- The County may consider offering to install new front yard fencing to adjacent homeowners to limit trespassing/loitering by clients of the new facility (overflow and/or after-hours) on nearby residential properties.
- The new facility should be designed to provide safe, secure sleeping areas for single females and parents with small children, apart from areas for single adult males, given the large number of female homeless adults counted during the 2015 homeless census.
- Please provide elevations or renderings of the proposed structure(s) as located on the site.
- When will the County determine whether to use modulars or the large tent?
- Is any type of on-site security lighting or street lighting proposed that may cause excessive light impacts to neighbors?

### **Operational Issues**

- Please describe how the facility will be secured during off-season months, when shelter is not in use, to prevent unauthorized camping/trespassing on the site.
- Will the structures be removed after the CWSP season ends?
- Given the investment required to establish a temporary facility at this site, and the difficulty in locating another site, is it likely that the facility may become permanent and/or operate year-round?
- Staff suggests assigning new street addresses to the site: 204 N. Fair Oaks for the R&A staging area and 212 N. Fair Oaks for the new shelter facility.
- Please describe how the County will control excessive loitering in the neighborhood (i.e., at night by those who could not be accommodated within the facility, and by clients and prospective clients during the daytime once the facility closes for the day, between 8am and 5pm).



- Staff suggests operating the facility by referral only, until capacity is reached (similar to CSI and some family shelter operations), rather than by an “everyone line up at the door, first-come, first-served” approach, so that overflow demand does not result in unauthorized camping, loitering and/or trespassing in the neighborhood and the broader vicinity. This could be an effective measure to mitigate impacts to the adjacent neighborhood.
- Staff also suggests that the CWSP program at this site be operated to offer stays of longer than one night at a time (weekly, monthly, seasonal), similar to what was offered through the 2014-15 North County CWSP program. This would provide more stability/comfort for the clients and minimize the amount of daily pedestrian traffic and daytime loitering impacts to the neighborhood.

### **Environmental Issues**

- County staff has mentioned possible use of diesel generators to provide power to site. Generators often create noise and/or air quality impacts on neighbors in the vicinity (and potential shelter occupants). Please describe the mitigation measures planned to mitigate these impacts.
- A BAAQMD permit may be required for proposed use of generators.
- City noise ordinance prohibits generator noise in excess of 50 dBA at night and 60 dBA during daytime hours. Please clarify whether generators will exceed these noise levels.
- Please identify the level of CEQA review planned for this project and provide a timeline for the CEQA process.
- What potential environmental impacts has the County staff identified related to this project?
- What potential mitigation measures has the County identified to address those potential impacts, if any?

### **Solid Waste**

- What is County’s plan for solid waste/recycling disposal?
- How much waste/recyclables volume is anticipated to be generated by food delivery packaging and/or other on-site waste streams?
- The site plan should show the designated area on-site for solid waste bin staging and collection.
- Staff suggests providing through-road access (two driveways connected by roadway through site) for solid waste vehicle ingress/egress; otherwise an on-site turn-out/turnaround area will be required.

### **Fire Prevention / Public Safety**

- Please confirm that the proposed structure(s) will be sited at least 20 feet from all property lines, generators and vehicles parked on public streets.
- Please describe the type of heating and fuel sources proposed to provide heat and electricity to the structure.
- Please provide a fully dimensioned site plan to verify adequate Fire vehicle access to the site, including location of fire access roads and hydrants.

- The proposed structure should be made of fire-resistant material approved by the State Fire Marshal.
- Please describe the approved fire protection system, or if the structure is not sprinklered, will a Fire Watch be provided at all times of building occupancy?
- Since the facility will be on County property, will the Sheriff's Office be responsible for handling non-emergency calls at the site?
- Will the Sheriff's Office write the reports/handle the investigation of emergency calls that are mitigated before they arrive at the site?
- Public safety impacts may arise related to large volumes of pedestrian ingress and egress to the site during the opening and closing of the facility each day (crossing thoroughfares such as Fair Oaks and/or the onramp to Central Expressway. Please describe any planned mitigation for such pedestrian access concerns.
- Staff suggests that the County coordinate with Sunnyvale Public Safety to delineate jurisdictional responsibilities, plan for appropriate service levels, and possibly develop a coordinated response plan.
- Please describe any measures planned to minimize likely impacts to nearby parks (Murphy, Fair Oaks, and Victory Village), such as unauthorized camping by prospective clients and/or heavy daytime usage by shelter clients, which may exceed capacity of the facilities in these parks (restrooms, trash bins, seating areas, etc.).
- Please describe any measures planned to minimize likely impacts to residential and/or commercial/industrial properties in the vicinity, such as trespassing, littering, sleeping, camping, etc., on private property.