

## RESPONSE TO COUNCIL QUESTIONS RE: 9/25/18 CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

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

**Title: Authorize the Issuance of a Purchase Order for Five (5) 4-door Sedans for the Department of Public Safety (F18-311)**

Council Question: Can Staff please explain why the budget request isn't for the full estimated amount of \$119K (including \$10K in estimated sales tax) instead of the \$109K requested? Doesn't each budget item try to achieve an estimate of the total cost? (including any contingencies)

Staff Response: Sales tax is calculated and applied at the time of purchase and can vary by timing and region. As it is not optional, can be variable, and is not part of the vendor's product pricing, it is not included in the purchase order amount. It is accounted for when budgeting for goods and services. In this case, the replacement of vehicles and motorized equipment is funded from the fleet equipment replacement fund, which is built on a line item basis but budgeted at the total cost for all equipment replaced in a given year, allowing flexibility for varying pricing received during procurement.

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

**Title: Adopt a Resolution to Certify the Program Environmental Impact Report, Make the Findings Required by the California Environmental Quality Act, Adopt the Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; and Adopt the Civic Center Modernization Master Plan**

Council Question: From a timing standpoint, the DPS Headquarters Addition is completely separate from the City Hall Construction. Are there logistical improvements or cost improvements to manage these as separate projects/separate phases of Phase 1?

Staff Response: Staff believes there are likely cost advantages for having both projects built concurrently by one general contractor. This will also simplify the oversight role for the City with construction management and building inspection.

Council Question: Is the DPS Headquarters Addition seen as a standalone building or directly connected to the current DPS building? Is it possible to retain this "addition" building (as a standalone facility) in the future when the new DPS is constructed?

Staff Response: The DPS Building Addition is being planned as a separate stand-alone building with its own utility connections and backup power. The Addition could be retained as a separate building if the main DPS building were removed in the future.

Council Question: During the construction of the underground parking for the new City Hall, are there any issues as far as constructing underground parking that would affect the operations of the existing City Hall Building during construction? What is the setback difference between the two buildings?

Staff Response: The existing City Hall building has a wide roof overhang and the basement excavation shoring is planned to be approximately 5 feet from the overhang with a new basement wall approximately 10 feet from the overhang. This presents some challenges including the need for temporary utilities but these can be managed during design. Construction fencing will ensure there is no access from the existing City Hall building.

Council Question: What is the planned seating for the new Council Chambers? (How does it compare to our current Council chambers as far as number of seats/ADA reserved areas for Council Meetings/Lecture location?)

Staff Response: The new Council Chambers is planned to seat 250 audience members vs. 114 for the current Chambers. Our layout is not detailed enough at this point to have a specific allocation for reserved seating but will meet ADA standards.

Council Question: Looking at the Stop Bollard examples, I would have assumed something taller (seem like a tripping hazard). Or is Page 42 not representative of example bollards on Page 80 (in height and form)?

Staff Response: Page 42 is an architectural rendering and bollards may not be drawn to scale. The sample materials on Page 60 are recommendations that will be finalized during design.

Council Question: What is the ADA access to the second floor open space green roof? Does it have limited hours?

Staff Response: As currently shown, the Public Roof Terrace as shown on page 32 of the Master Plan would be restricted to hours that City Hall is open. For special events, City Hall elevators can be made available to access the second-floor terrace. More design work is needed to show how access control will be configured.

Council Question: Am I correct that the proposed layout has DPS vehicles exiting from underground parking via an exit on to Charles Street that would be shared by people visiting the Charles Street Gardens? Are there any concerns that normal usage of that ingress/egress by members of the public might interfere with public safety operations?

Staff Response: Yes, this would be a shared driveway. Staff is not concerned DPS usage will be impeded by others giving the number of parking spaces.

Council Question: In my experience, members of the public most commonly visit City Hall for two specific purposes - the one-stop permitting and visiting the Annex to deal with utility issues or other payments. It's clear from the diagrams where the one-stop permitting is located. Where will utility customers go? To the Finance Department on level three? That seems inconvenient.

Staff Response: The service plan is to have one cashier located at the One Stop Permit Center that could handle transactions for Finance and Community Development.

Council Question: The diagrams have a shared break room on every floor in the same location. However, the ground floor appears to have an additional very large shared break room. What's the logic behind that?

Staff Response: The intent is to have the larger area on first floor be open to the public. It could have vending machines for visitors, places to charge your phone/computer as a convenience for people visiting City Hall.

Council Question: Is this the time to say that we need four flagpoles instead of three (one for visiting guests or special causes, as San Jose has), or is that an implementation detail for later?

Staff Response: That seems like an implementation detail.

**Agenda Item #: 3**

**Title: File #: 2018-7190**

**Location: 1441 Norman Drive (APN: 313-14-041)**

**Zoning: R-1 (Low Density Residential) Proposed Project: Appeal of a decision of the Planning Commission denying a DESIGN REVIEW to allow a new two-story, single-family home**

Council Question: How many ADUs have been developed in the Raynor Neighborhood over the last 5 years?

Staff Response: In the R-1 portion of the Raynor neighborhood, there are approximately 5 ADUs added in the last 5 years.

Council Question: Does the table of Raynor FARs include any properties with ADUs?

Staff Response: Yes, of the approximately 260 properties on the list in Attachment 3, there are approximately 20 ADUs (R-1 portion of Raynor).

Council Question: In looking out the house next door 1447 Norman, is this considered main house with an ADU or two dwellings?

Staff Response: The property at 1447 Norman Drive includes a main house and a detached 524 sf accessory dwelling unit (which is attached to a 716 sf garage). The ADU was approved in 1992 and completed in 1994.