

## RESPONSE(S) TO COUNCIL QUESTION(S)

RE: 9/13/2016 AGENDA

---

### Agenda Item #: 1E

**Title:** Award of Contract for Design and Construction Support Services for the Washington Community Swim Center Project (RFP No. F16-100)

**Question(s):** The full packet pdf has two staff comments in the Scope of Work, Exhibit A, pages 9 and 10. Is the SOW in the pdf the final version?

**Staff Response(s):** The Scope of Work included in the packet is the final version. In the electronic version of the packet that was distributed, staff inadvertently left comments from the review process in place. This did not affect the printed version and the electronic version has been corrected and updated on the website.

---

### Agenda Item #: 1E

**Title:** Award of Contract for Design and Construction Support Services for the Washington Community Swim Center Project (RFP No. F16-100)

**Question(s):** The 2016/17 budget listed \$7.2M over next three years for Washington Community Swim Center. Exhibit A lists \$5.5M, and Agenda Item approves ~\$700K contract (including contingencies). What is the other \$1.1M from the budget? (If  $\$5.5M + \$0.7M = \$6.2M$ ) Or... is this ~\$700K part of the \$5.5M, and if so, what is the remaining 1.7M?

**Staff Response(s):** The Adopted FY 2016/17 states that over the next three years, \$7.2M is budgeted for this project; additionally, as part of the FY 2015/2016 year-end budget closing, staff anticipates carrying over \$670k bringing the total budget to \$7.9M. The \$5.5M referenced in the Scope of Work is specific to the construction phase of the project. The \$700,000 being considered by Council on 09/13/16 is for the design of the project which includes design support during construction. These are only two components of the project budget. Other components, which would make up the final \$1M of the budget include bidding contingencies, materials testing, inspection, and construction management. These amounts for the various construction related costs are estimates at this time. As stated in the RTC, depending on price competitiveness at the time of bidding for the construction project which is estimated to begin in FY 2017/18, additional funding may be needed to complete the project. Should the project come in under budget, any savings would revert back to the original funding source.

---

### Agenda Item #: 1H

**Title:** Award of Contract for Design and Construction Support Services for the Trash Capture Devices Project No. 2 (F16-136)

**Question(s):** 1) How much money is in the Waste Management Fund (from which this \$129K is removed)?

2) As per Page 2 of 3, "Staff will need to clean out the devices with a large vacuum truck several times a year, depending on amount of trash collected." How is this monitored

## RESPONSE(S) TO COUNCIL QUESTION(S)

RE: 9/13/2016 AGENDA

(that the collection points are almost/completely full)? Only visually? Not automated in any way? Does the City already have the vacuum truck required?

**Staff Response(s):** The total funding appropriated for Storm Trash Capture devices for FY 2016/17 is approximately \$564,000. The City has two vacuum trucks it uses to clean out the trash capture devices as well as perform other utility related maintenance work. The trash capture devices are cleaned after the first storm of the season and after each major storm thereafter. Additionally, although not automated, monitoring of the trash capture devices is done visually once every four months to determine if they are in need of cleaning.

---

### Agenda Item #: 3

**Title:** Introduce an Ordinance to Add a new Chapter 19.45 (Residential Transportation Demand Management) to the Sunnyvale Municipal Code, Adopt a Resolution Creating the Multi-family Residential Transportation Demand Management Program (Study Issue-Planning File 2015-7150), Rescind Council Policy 1.1.15 (Residential Transportation Demand Management), and Find that these Actions are Exempt from CEQA.

**Question(s):** The tool kit appears to be a roadmap for future policy changes, not a document that defines how to use existing policies and strategies on project.

**Staff Response(s):** The Council is not being requested to adopt the toolkit: it is simply a resource. It is an educational tool that responds to the Study Issue directed by the City Council: we have surfaced a range of potential possibilities for the Council to understand. ***However, staff does not recommend adoption of the toolkit, rather it has developed a Multi-Family Residential Transportation Demand Management Program that is based on seven techniques that are consistent with current policies/measures*** (Attachment 4 provides further detail). In the RTC, "***A multi-family residential TDM toolkit (Attachment 5) provides information to assist in the development and review of a Multi-family Residential TDM Program. The toolkit is intended as a long term resource document and includes a few strategies that are not currently enabled in the SMC or existing Council policies (e.g., unbundled parking, reduced parking, shared parking).***" This same disclaimer is also in the toolkit itself. The notion is to have a robust listing and description of TDM measures for future consideration and to provide guidance for any measures adopted by the City. Council can decide in the future whether or not to select any additional items from the toolkit. The actual TDM measures that are recommended for adoption are in Attachment 4.

## RESPONSE(S) TO COUNCIL QUESTION(S)

RE: 9/13/2016 AGENDA

---

### Agenda Item #: 3

**Title:** Introduce an Ordinance to Add a new Chapter 19.45 (Residential Transportation Demand Management) to the Sunnyvale Municipal Code, Adopt a Resolution Creating the Multi-family Residential Transportation Demand Management Program (Study Issue-Planning File 2015-7150), Rescind Council Policy 1.1.15 (Residential Transportation Demand Management), and Find that these Actions are Exempt from CEQA.

**Question(s):** Staff is suggesting not performing Driveway Counts as Planning Commission suggested. In considering the current TDM Program for Office Projects, does the \$2500 per Driveway currently cover the cost for Staff time? Once City Staff has collected the driveway counts, what is the value of the Report for submittal to the city (that we are requiring the developer to create based upon our Staff counts and then submit back to the City)? Could we not require the developer (instead of requiring the HomeOwner Associations) to pre-pay the estimated cost for evaluating the driveways for some number of years? Without measuring (driveway counts), how does Staff know if the new Residential TDM Program is actually being successful with its goals?

**Staff Response(s):** The TDM fees to be presented to Council will likely include the actual cost of the driveway counts plus an administrative fee; the total cost per year (which probably includes more than one driveway on a site) could be \$10,000-\$20,000. Pre-paying could be considered, however there are administrative complexities with collecting fees for use over a longer period of time and concerns that adequate funds might not be available as we do not know how much costs for these services may change over time. Once the data is collected it would need to be organized and indexed against the types of TDM measures to better understand how well a site performed. Cumulatively, including additional projects for review would require more resources that are beyond current staffing levels. Staff expects that more transportation agencies and “think tanks” will collect residential trip information over time which will inform the potential for trip reduction goals and any additional policy for the City Council to consider.

---