

## RESPONSE TO COUNCIL QUESTIONS RE: 10/17/17 CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

<b>Agenda Item #: 1.C.</b>
<b>Title: Approve the List(s) of Claims and Bills Approved for Payment by the City Manager</b>

Council Question: Please provide further information on the following payments:

-- 147,213.01 to City & County of San Francisco for Contracts/Service Agreements.

Staff Response: This is a payment by NOVA for job seeker services provided by the City and County of San Francisco related to a regional Ready to Work grant.

-- \$329,112.75 to Moffett Park Drive Owner LLC for Deposits Payable - Miscellaneous >\$10K.

Staff Response: The payment to Moffett Park Drive Owner LLC in the amount of \$329,112.75 is a 75 percent refund of the performance security deposit for Project 2015-9436 at 215 Moffett Park Drive. The remainder of the deposit is to be held for one year.

-- \$1,064,625.00 to US Bank Trust NA for Miscellaneous Payment.

Staff Response: This payment is for the debt service on the 1998 Certificates of Participation for the Downtown Parking Structure. Staff will more clearly code this payment going forward.

-- \$547,257.04 to JPMorgan Chase Bank N.A. for Bond Principal and Bond Interest.

Staff Response: This payment is for the debt service on the 2014 Solid Waste Revenue Bonds which were used to fund the installation of new recycling equipment at the SMaRT Station.

<b>Agenda Item #: 1.D.</b>
<b>Title: Authorize the Issuance of a Purchase Order for One Aggregate Chip Spreader (F18-005) in the amount of \$274,680 and Approve Budget Modification No. 16</b>

Council Question: As staff notes, this item is not included in the FY2017/18 adopted budget. Why is Council being asked to approve this purchase now? What would happen if Council decided to not approve this request? Is there a reason why this cannot wait to be incorporated into the upcoming budget?

Staff Response: The current Chip Seal Program has been suspended pending the replacement of old equipment with the new chip spreader. The old equipment was much more labor intensive and required replacement with an automatic chip spreader. Doing this immediately will enable the program to safely restart as soon as practical. Staff will build the replacement for the new equipment into the long-term Fleet Replacement Fund for the FY 2018/19 Recommended Budget.

<b>Agenda Item #: 1.F.</b>
----------------------------

<b>Title: Award of Contract for Consulting Engineering and Establishing Jurisdictional Partnerships at the Sunnyvale Materials Recovery and Transfer Station (F17-141), Find that the Action is Exempt from CEQA Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15262, and Approve Budget Modification No.13</b>
---

Council Question: Is there really no chance that the redesign process may change the nature of our compactor requirements?

Staff Response: Regarding the relationship to the Replace SMaRT Station Project, while the project may make significant changes to portions of the main building and correct deficiencies identified by the work authorized in Agenda Item 1.G., the basic facility and much of the process equipment at SMaRT are functioning well and are likely to be retained. The present schedule for Project 828260 shows construction through FY 2022/2023.

Regarding the potential for changes in the makeup of the SMaRT MOU partnership post-2021, with that uncertainty in mind, staff has been managing the nature and timing of larger equipment replacement and maintenance work items to minimize the amounts the current participating agencies (Palo Alto, Mountain View and Sunnyvale) invest in equipment between now and 2021. This is being done in ways that do not compromise the safety, efficiency or regulatory compliance of the operation (e.g. refurbishing rather than replacing the compactor).

<b>Agenda Item #: 1.G.</b>
----------------------------

<b>Title: Award of Contract to Recondition the Harris/AMFAB Transpack Compactor at the SMaRT Station (F18-004) and Finding of CEQA Categorical Exemption</b>
--

Council Question: I assume that the lifespan of the new compactor is greater than 4 years. If so, why are we approving the replacement of a major piece of SMaRT Station equipment before we plan out the complete replacement of the SMaRT Station?

Staff Response: This provides for routine, preventative maintenance of the SMaRT Station compactor at a cost of \$168,700. Replacement of the compactor would cost in excess of \$1 million.

<b>Agenda Item #: 1.I.</b>
----------------------------

<b>Title: Approve the 2018 Sustainability Speaker Series</b>
--

Council Question: Budgetary line items traditionally do not carry over from one year to the next. Why is this one carrying over?

Staff Response: The Sustainability Speaker Series is funded from the Projects Budget. While Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) carry an appropriation that does not lapse until the project is complete, non-CIP projects require additional review but are typically carried forward if incomplete. If the expenditures are encumbered (meaning the City has issued a contract or PO for services) then the appropriation carries forward automatically. Each year, staff conducts a

detailed review of all projects to determine what is carried forward and what can be closed out, which is currently underway. The action included in this report seeks approval of the series topics. There is sufficient current year budget to carry the program forward.

**Agenda Item #: 4**

**Title: Study of Accessory Dwelling Unit Development Standards: Introduce an Ordinance Amending Sunnyvale Municipal Code Section 19.68.040 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), Adopt a Resolution Amending the Master Fee Schedule to Impose Transportation Impact Fees for Accessory Dwelling Units, and Find that these Actions are Exempt from CEQA**

Council Question: I wanted to know the breakdown of the ADU requests, for 93 ADUs that have gone through or that are going through from 1996 to 2016.

Staff Response: Between 1996 and 2016, the City issued Planning permits for 111 ADUs. In the same time period, 83 ADUs received Building permits and have been finalized; 10 are still active (under construction), pending final inspection.

Council Question: What is the distribution for R0, R1, R2 and DSP residential?

Staff Response:

DSP	7 finalized
R0	16 finalized, 5 active
R1	32 finalized, 3 active
R2	28 finalized, 2 active

Council Question: How many before and after 2003 (when TIF requirements went into effect)?

Staff Response: 37 ADUs received a Building permit before 2003 and 74 after 2003.

Council Question: How many requests have been received so far in 2017, or since the changes went into effect? What is the breakdown of zoning areas for those requests?

Staff Response: 11 Planning applications have been received in 2017 (to date) with an ADU proposed.

R0	7
R1	2
R2	2

Council Question: The only other question unanswered by the materials was is the > 150 and < 700 sq ft dimensions limitations the exterior of the building or the interior living space?

Staff Response: The 150 and 700 square feet are gross floor area, which is the outside exterior wall and the middle on interior walls.