

## RESPONSE TO COUNCIL QUESTIONS RE: 8/22/17 CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

### Agenda Item #: 1.F

#### Title: Amend Council Policy 7.3.19 (Council Meetings)

Council Question: Under Sturgis, the Council can move to adjourn a meeting at any time it desires (Sturgis, p. 77). In such a scenario, what happens to General Business items that have yet to be heard? Are they automatically continued to another date? Do they have to be re-agendized by the Mayor? Said another way, last week, the Council had to vote to being hearing a General Business item after 12:30am for the sole purpose of continuing that item to a date certain. This is counter-intuitive to me. Is there any language that can be added to the policy that would cause un-heard General Business items to be automatically continued (either to a date certain or date uncertain) in a case where there are insufficient votes on a motion to begin hearing the item?

OCA Response: Council Policy 7.3.19 (Council Meetings) addresses adjournment in the context of hearing agenda items after 11:30 p.m. Consequently, the Council relies on Sturgis for adjournments for reasons other than the lateness of the hour. If the Council were to adjourn prior to 11:30 p.m., then the “[b]usiness that was interrupted by adjournment of a meeting comes up as the first item under unfinished business at the next meeting.” (See, Sturgis p. 80.) As the Council does not follow a new business/old business agenda format, unfinished business (can also be referred to as old business) is not a standing item on the Council’s agenda. In harmonizing Sturgis and the Council agenda format, a continued item from an adjourned meeting would be considered as the first agenda item under “public hearings/general business.”

Regarding your question about whether unheard general business items can be automatically continued (either to a date certain or date uncertain), if the Council wished these items to automatically be heard at the next Council meeting, then it could strike the following language from Council Policy 7.3.19:

Any item on an agenda for a regular meeting which must be continued due to the late hour, shall be continued to a date certain.

Striking the above language would default to the Sturgis rule regarding agenda items interrupted by an adjournment.

As an alternative, this language could be amended to explicitly add the Sturgis language into the Policy and could read as follows (new text is in red font):

Any item on an agenda for a regular meeting which must be continued due to the late hour, shall **without motion be automatically continued to the first item under public hearings/general business at the next Council meeting.**

If the Council wished to have flexibility regarding when the interrupted items would be heard, then the language could be amended to read as follows (new text is in red font):

Any item on an agenda for a regular meeting which must be continued due to the late hour, shall **without motion be automatically continued to the first item under public hearings/general business at the next Council meeting, unless by motion, which shall not be subject the vote requirements stated above, the Council continues an item(s) to a date certain.**

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

#### **Title: Approve an Update of the Transportation Strategic Program and Adopt a Resolution Amending the City's Master Fee Schedule for Traffic Impact Fees**

#### **(Attachment 2 – Traffic Impact Study questions)**

Council Question: What time of year was the study (AM/PM Peak) done? (Was this before or after school let out?)

Staff Response: The traffic analysis that was used for the update to the fee study was the traffic analysis that was completed as part of the recently approved Peery Park Specific Plan, Lawrence Station Area Plan, and Land Use Transportation Element. Traffic counts for all Traffic Impact Analysis (including this one) are not taken on holidays or during the summer months when school is out. Most of the counts for this study were taken in 2015.

Council Question: Any reason why Lawrence and Homestead wasn't studied, or is that considered a Cupertino intersection? This is a main corridor into the city (especially when the Apple spaceship opens).

Staff Response: This is a City of Santa Clara intersection. Santa Clara is working with the County to improve it.

Council Question: Page 26 – I don't understand why the 101/237/Mathilda interchange was not part of the STFM. I thought this was considered a funded project (as far as the City was concerned). If the Monster Interchange is improved, does it still lead to a LOS F in that area?

Staff Response: The project was not fully funded at the time of the analysis; however, a funding strategy has been agreed upon (although not yet funded). When the interchange is improved, the LOS is expected to be D.

Council Question: Page 48 – There is a basic assumption that an additional 18 intersections will be signalized by 2035 for \$500K each. We have several roundabouts in the city, and I assume that these are dramatically cheaper (especially from a long-term cost standpoint). Is this an option instead of just adding more signalized intersections?

Staff Response: The City currently has several traffic circles that are used for traffic calming and to reduce speeds. Roundabouts designed to replace a traffic signal are much larger than a traffic circle because they are designed to process vehicles as or more efficiently than a signal. In some cases, a roundabout could be considered in place of a traffic signal (staff recently analyzed one for Duane/Stewart). However, installing roundabouts in an existing intersection can require the acquisition of right-of-way from the adjacent properties, which can dramatically increase costs and schedule. Using a roundabout instead of a signal could be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Council Question: Page 51 – I'm trying to understand why the Mary and Central Intersection is focused on Moffett Park growth with no mention of Peery Park growth (which is far closer to the intersection). Can staff clarify why the fee isn't targeted partially to Peery Park?

Staff Response: The update to the fee maintains the existing fee structure with a fee for Moffett Park and a separate fee for the rest of Sunnyvale including Peery Park. The

reason for separating Moffett Park is because it has such a limited number of roads that serve the area. Per the table on Page 51, only 2% of the traffic at Mary/Central is related to Moffett Park and the other 98% is related to the rest of Sunnyvale, including Peery Park.

Council Question: With the Bike Master Plan not complete, when would be the time to re-evaluate the fees, if there are further larger bike/ped infrastructure projects that come out of the Master Plan update?

Staff Response: The fee should be reevaluated when there are significant changes (to improvements or land use) that could change the fee structure. As it relates to the Bike Master Plan, staff acknowledges in the staff report that “as part of completing the new bicycle master plan staff intends to review the impact on the traffic impact fees.”