

## **RESPONSE TO COUNCIL QUESTIONS RE: 7/11/17 CITY COUNCIL AGENDA**

### **Agenda Item #: 1.B.**

#### **Title: Approve the List(s) of Claims and Bills Approved for Payment by the City Manager**

Council Question: For the payment of \$1,060,750 to US BANK, please provide some clarification. Is this an "Annual Required Contribution (ARC)" as such term is used in Note 18 (OPEB) of the 6/30/16 CAFR? If not, please clarify. Please clarify if this amount is for a full-year ARC or some portion (e.g. quarterly) and whether this payment is toward the fiscal year ended 6/30/17 or beginning 7/1/17. Finally, please provide the total amount paid by the City in ARC payment(s) for the fiscal year ended 6/30/17.

Staff Response: The payment is a portion of the Annual Required Contribution (ARC). For FY 2016/17 the ARC was \$10,074,000. This is comprised of \$5,831,000 in current benefit payments for health benefits to retirees, and \$4,243,000 to the OPEB Trust to fund future benefits. This payment is one quarter of the budgeted OPEB Trust contribution for FY 2016/17. It is important to note that this payment is for FY 2016/17, and that Note 18 in the FY 2015/16 CAFR refers to payments made in FY 2015/16.

### **Agenda Item #: 2**

**Title: Proposed Project: Introduce an Ordinance to REZONE 49 contiguous single family home lots from R-1 (Low Density Residential) to R-1/S (Low Density Residential/Single-Story) Location: 801-825 Ticonderoga Drive (Assessor's Parcel Number 202-18-003 through 202-18-006 and 202-18-046), 849-891 Ticonderoga Drive (202-21-018 through 202-21-025), 850-886 Somerset Drive (202-21-007 through 202-21-013), 1150 Revere Drive (202-20-004), 1150-1166 Shenandoah Drive (202-20-033 through 202-20-036), 1151-1157 Shenandoah Drive (202-20-031 and 202-20-032), 861-879 Somerset Drive (202-20-001 through 202-20-003), 1130-1194 Pimento Avenue (202-18-007 through 202-18-018), 1149-1167 Pimento Avenue (202-20-045 through 202-20-048), 1181-1199 Pimento Avenue (202-21-014 through 202-21-017), 1149-1161 Plum Avenue (202-18-023 through 202-18-025)**

Council Question: I am trying to get a clarification on the boundaries for the project. In looking at the tract boundaries attachment, there are additional homes that weren't included. The neighbors take direction from staff on the boundaries of an SSCD (and did so in this case from what I read in the minutes). I am trying to understand why additional homes in the tract were not included, in that the application does not stop at tract, street or other physical boundaries.

Staff Response: The applicant initially submitted a more limited boundary area, and staff encouraged the applicant to expand it to include homes behind those in the original request and to expand the boundary to create a cohesive group. As noted in the zoning ordinance, the proposed boundary should, to the extent feasible, follow recognizable features such as a street, stream, or tract boundary. The requirement is not a mandate, but guidance due to the statement "to the extent feasible." The final requested area used a portion of the tract boundary in addition to streets. In staff's opinion, the result is a

logical boundary resulting in a cohesive grouping of properties. It is certainly possible to use the original tract boundary for the rezone area, but ultimately, the area included in the application is determined by the applicants, not the City.

#### **Agenda Item #: 4**

#### **Title: Approve a Conceptual Design for the Washington Community Swim Center Project**

Council Question: I understand that the programming has not been finalized, but don't some of the amenities/design directly relate to the intended programming?

Staff Response: As one of four pools within the City aquatics program, staff has already developed a preliminary programming concept for Washington Pool that fits within the overall program. At a minimum, the new pool would easily maintain the current programming, but it is expected to expand on it with a new pool that provides deep and shallow areas, a new play area, and a new community room that could be open throughout the year. These potential service enhancements to the community and related operating costs will be reviewed as part of future budget cycles.

Council Question: Have we evaluated the parking utilization of the park and the swim area specifically? As we attract additional residents to the new Swim Center are there possible new parking issues that might have to be handled?

Staff Response: The new pool is one of four within Sunnyvale and will provide very similar services to other pools within the City, so it is not expected to be a city-wide draw (beyond what it is today) and require additional parking. We would expect that initially, being a new facility, it will receive more visitors. Some questions were raised around parking, and staff completed a three-day survey of parking availability on Washington Park (along all frontages). The survey showed that on average there are approximately 100 open parking spaces for park and pool patrons.

Council Question: There are a lot of suggested improvements to the design in the submitted letters. Does staff consider these implementation details or items that would need to be part of Condition of Approvals? (Things like ramp verses steps are critical to the operation of the pool.)

Staff Response: The conceptual design was completed through a community process and took into consideration cost (both construction and operations) and programming. There are several design elements (such as tile types and colors) that will be completed as part of the design and will account both for aesthetics and operations/maintenance.

The ramp or step question was one of the key discussion items as part of the community process. The step-in pool received approximately 75% support (the ramp or zero-depth entrance received 25%.) This aligned with staff's perspective as the step-in pool maximizes the size of the shallow pool available for programming.