City of Sunnyvale

Notice and Agenda

City Council

Friday, February 17, 2017 **8:30 AM** **Council Chambers, City Hall, 456 W. Olive Ave., Sunnyvale, CA 94086**

Special Meeting: Study/Budget Issues Workshop

CALL TO ORDER

Call to Order in the Council Chambers (Open to the Public)

SALUTE TO THE FLAG

ROLL CALL

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

This category is limited to 15 minutes with a maximum of up to three minutes per speaker. If you wish to address the Council, please complete a speaker card and give it to the City Clerk. Individuals are limited to one appearance during this section. NOTE: The Public Hearing for the proposed 2017 Study and Budget Issues was held on January 10, 2017.

INTRODUCTION BY THE CITY MANAGER

FISCAL OUTLOOK PRESENTATION

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY ISSUES/BUDGET ISSUES PROCESS

REVIEW, DISCUSSION AND PRIORITY SETTING: STUDY/BUDGET ISSUES

17-0075 City Manager's Memorandum to Council
Study Issues Full Packet

CLOSING REMARKS

AVAILABILITY OF RANKING/NEXT STEPS

ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

Any agenda related writings or documents distributed to members of the City of Sunnyvale City Council regarding any open session item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection in the Office of the City Clerk located at 603 All America Way, Sunnyvale, California during normal business hours and in the Council Chamber on the evening of the Council Meeting, pursuant to Government Code §54957.5. Please contact the Office of the City Clerk at (408) 730-7483 for specific questions regarding the agenda.

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance in this meeting, please contact the Office of the City Clerk at (408) 730-7483. Notification of 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. (28 CFR 35.106 ADA Title II).

CITY OF SUNNYVALE
OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER

February 17, 2017

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

FROM: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

SUBJECT: Council Study/Budget Issues Workshop

Overview

The purpose of the workshop is to identify study issue priorities for the 2017 calendar year and budget issues priorities for the coming fiscal year.

Fiscal Overview Presentation

This workshop will begin with an overview of the City's fiscal outlook and current conditions. This is specifically designed so that the City Council can consider Study Issues in the context of the City's fiscal, operational, and policy priorities. Over the next months, the City will be developing a proposed budget for the City Council to consider. This review must consider the many competing priorities, and related costs, to ensure a balanced budget. Budget Issues recommended for inclusion in the City Manager's Recommended Budget – or any prioritized study issues that require funds to initiate a study - will be presented for Council's consideration within the FY 2017-2018 Recommended Projects and the Update to Operating Budgets.

Context for Decision Making

As Council heard at the most recent Strategic Planning Workshop (January 26-27, 2017), the City of Sunnyvale is widely recognized for its high performing public services and strong fiscal management. As shared during the Workshop, our ability to maintain this service standard must be constantly balanced against the realities of existing staffing levels and fiscal resources to sustain them. While we are mostly resourced for the efficient delivery of operational services, through teaming and collaboration, we have been able to assign limited capacity to critical initiatives that strategically position the City. We must always be reminded of the impacts of the Great Recession where the City eliminated approximately 200 Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs) through attrition and, while our fiscal conditions have improved, our staff resources have not kept pace with service demands. In fact, these reductions significantly impacted the City's quantity of resources available to provide public services, however affected less the quality of those services delivered. While the monetary value of these position reductions helped to balance budgets, the result is that staff has maintained the high quality of service desired by our community with very little service reductions, if any--with less resources or, in other words, 'doing more with less'.

Additionally, during this time, the City has undertaken significant strategic and mission critical projects with the most minimal level of new staffing. For example, the Water Pollution Control Plant Rebuild has only added one FTE and the Town Center development was carried out by temporarily repurposing existing resources. The Civic Center Modernization Plan, significant transportation projects, modernizing our information technology systems, implementation of the Climate Action Plan, and unprecedented demand for development services by our business and residential community have also stretched our staffing resources to their limit and, with most of them, are on mission-critical or accelerated terms to advance implementation.

To help guide your decision making today, the following is the list of policy priorities established by Council and still underway:

1. Civic Center Campus and Main Library
2. Ability of Infrastructure to Support Development and Traffic
3. Open Space Acquisition Planning (modified in 2017)
4. Downtown Sunnyvale
5. Improved City Processes and Services through the use of Technology
6. Implementing the Climate Action Plan (*added in 2017*)

I respectfully request that the City Council practice discipline in directing new work efforts, consider their fiscal impact against other service tradeoffs, and evaluate their strong alignment with operational and policy priorities. I also request that we remind ourselves that requests for analyses are not a cost neutral action: our resources are already extremely stretched and adding new assignments must tradeoff against existing direction that will be delayed, eliminated, or re-scoped. This doesn't mean that there is no capacity to absorb new workload, but rather a disclosure of the conditions for which we will make every effort to successfully serve the City Council. Indeed, it is my strong desire to work with the City Council on managing our resources while achieving our goals, and the opportunity to surface the context of our work is much appreciated. Given our existing record, I feel confident that we can work to maximize our resources and goals.

Study Issues

The study issues process lays the foundation upon which Council examines and establishes areas of potential policy consideration each year. The process allows the City Council to consider and compare at one time all policy topics of interest or concern, as identified throughout the calendar year by members of the public, boards and commissions, City Council members or City staff. In this manner, the process provides a structured approach for addressing the large number of issues that are raised each year, allowing Council to rank the issues and set priorities within the limits of time and resources. Council may also drop a study issue from any further consideration, or defer the examination of a study issue to a future calendar year.

There are 28 proposed study issues for 2017 as noted in the table below. Of the 28 proposed study issues, staff supports studying 14. It is important to note that "support" indicates that the study issue is a valid policy area, timely, and aligned to City interests. However, staff is still working on five study issues from prior years. Given the current workload and resource

constraints, while staff may “support” a Study Issues, it does not imply that there are sufficient resources to take on 14 new study issues.

Citywide Study Issues	
Underway/Continuing	**5**
New	**28**
Support	14
Defer	6
Drop	8
Subtotal	28
Total	**33**

Underway/Continuing	5
Supported Issues	14
Proposed Active for 2017	**19**

Staff Recommendation and Priority Ranking
Please note that the Staff Recommendation section of each study issue paper is drafted at the point in time when the issue was sponsored. The section indicates whether staff thinks the policy issue should be considered by Council as a priority, deferred to the next year, dropped from further consideration at this time, or whether staff has no recommendation on this particular matter. As issues can be sponsored throughout the year, some of the narrative in the recommendation can be several months old by the time the Council Workshop arrives in January/February. That delay can sometimes lead to a shift if priority recommendation by staff on proposed study issues or a new set of data that may raise new considerations for staff and/or Council. For example, changes can stem from various unanticipated events – new work efforts/projects, legislation, new state laws, policy trends, changes in workforce, changes in resources, etc. Staff will be able to provide verbal updates to the Study Issue where the narrative is no longer current. One example of this scenario is identified in more detail below:

> **Updated Study Issue Paper:** DPS 17-01 *Regulation of Marijuana Cultivation in the City of Sunnyvale for Research and Development and Medical Marijuana Cultivation for Personal Use*. Originally sponsored in April, the study issue paper was finalized and published in June 2016. The longstanding marijuana policy in Sunnyvale has been to prohibit medical marijuana dispensaries and other medical marijuana-related commercial activities such as cultivation, sales and delivery. However, the passage of Proposition 64 in November, which legalized recreational marijuana, necessitates immediate updates to the City’s existing marijuana ordinance to ensure that the City retains its desired level of local control over marijuana. Staff plans to bring a clean-up ordinance in 2017 to align existing regulations and clarify the City’s position on the existing prohibition on commercial marijuana. Therefore, the Staff Recommendation on this study has changed from support to defer. To the extent the Council desires more detailed discussion, 2018 may be more appropriate, as the state is currently drafting regulations for permitting marijuana activities that are not anticipated to be effective until early 2018. Deferring consideration will allow the City time to review the

state program and processes and provide Council with more definitive information regarding the state process for regulating marijuana activities. For reference, the revised paper is attached to this memo (Attachment 1) and included separately in the supplemental packet of materials.

For a comprehensive staff recommended priority rank of proposed study issues, Council should refer to the Department Rank. The full list of department rank is attached to this memo (Attachment 2); the rank is also reflected on the Council's ranking sheets and on each department's Summary Worksheet.

Study Issues Ranking Process
At this workshop, Council will be asked to review potential study issues one department at a time following the steps suggested below:

- By Department, Council questions or clarification on any study issue submitted. Departments will be clear in the scope of the issue and identify "partner departments" that will need to contribute time and resources to complete the analysis.
- Before ranking, issues may be combined, dropped or deferred from ranking consideration by a majority vote of Council.
- Council discussion and deliberation.

Council is encouraged to drop rather than defer proposed study issues when a strong interest does not exist; secondary consideration should also be given when considering if a proposed study issue will contribute to the successful implementation/completion of the established Council goals. During the City Council's deliberations of study issues, I respectfully request that the City Council consider its priorities within the context of approved Strategic Policy Priorities, capacity needed to advance operational priorities, and strategic areas of study (via study issues) that best meet the needs of the City.

When drafting study issue papers throughout the year, the scope of the study is based on the details provided during the formal action to sponsor the study. Sometimes the scope as presented may not fully capture the intention of the sponsoring body. Any proposed changes to the scope of any issue paper should be made during a publicly noticed meeting, such as the Study/Budget Issues Workshop and will need to be approved by the Council. If a significant departure from the original scope is made, City staff may request the opportunity to amend its response and/or fiscal impacts.

Study Issues with a Fiscal Impact
One of the roles of the City administration is to evaluate and present the potential fiscal impacts of a study – including costs to study the item and costs to implement study results. When developing study issue papers, staff evaluates the level of complexity that will be required in order to complete a thorough, professional examination of the study issue and any effect this examination may have on existing workload and service level responsibilities.

The Fiscal Impact section of each paper also identifies if additional dollars (above current budgeting) will be necessary and how they are proposed to be used. Any non-budgeted costs to complete a study will require appropriation and consideration within our limited funds. As previously noted, any prioritized study issue that requires funds to initiate a study will be

presented for Council's consideration within the FY 2017-2018 Recommended Projects and the Update to Operating Budgets.

Study Issues Proposed for Initiation in 2017
On March 7, staff will present a Report to Council identifying the study issues that can be initiated in 2017, consistent with Council's priority order and within departmental resource constraints. Once approved by Council, the study issue presentation dates will be added to the Tentative Council Meeting Agenda Calendar.

Budget Issues
Budget issues are proposals to add a new service, eliminate a service or change the level of an existing City service. Budget issues can be proposed by the City Council or Boards and Commissions; any item proposed by a member of the public must be sponsored by one of these groups. New budget issues are due to the City Manager no later than three weeks in advance of the annual Study/Budget Issues Workshop. Council votes on each budget issue, deciding to either drop, defer, or refer each to the FY 2017/18 Recommended Budget. Budget issues that are referred to the Recommended Budget are considered as budget supplements. Service level changes proposed by staff will be identified and highlighted in the City Manager's Recommended Budget presented in May.

Newly Proposed Budget Issues
At the recent Strategic Workshop, the Council initiated two new work efforts which require funding to move forward. These items will be presented to Council at the Budget Workshop in May as Budget Supplements. In the meantime, below is a quick description of funding needs and a preliminary cost-estimate.

- **Parkland/Open Space Policy/Initiative**: This project would include a service contract from a consultant firm, or the hiring of a limited duration staff member, to assist with the analysis, scoping, planning, and community engagement necessary to support the effort to set new policy on the topic of parkland/open space. The scoping of this effort is undetermined and requires further refinement; however, given staff changes and workload, the organization is not well positioned to absorb an effort that requires significant coordination, examination of land use implications, and community outreach. Preliminarily, based on City Council discussion, the purpose of this effort would be to capture the public's interest in establishing policy relative to preserving and/or land use of the City's parkland. Community engagement efforts would include community meetings, online and in-person forums/surveys, keeping the public informed of key milestones of this effort, social media channel outreach, focus groups, and outreach with stakeholders, including appropriate boards/commissions.
    - Preliminary Cost Estimate: $200,000 to $250,000

- **Implementing the CAP**: At the Strategic Workshop, staff presented options to enhance Climate Action, including the opportunity for Sunnyvale to begin planning for longer term climate action goals. The State Legislature and the Governor have established greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets of 40% by 2030 and 80% by 2050, respectively. Particularly the latter target will require significant shifts in the areas of transportation, energy use, and energy sourcing. Staff proposes to secure consultant services to assist with the analysis, planning, and community engagement

necessary to support policy setting and resource allocation in order to advance and accelerate climate action toward the 80% reduction target. Staff proposes a project budget of $250,000 and an 18-month project timeframe from when funding is available. This project is also expected to require staff time from several departments to contribute to the design and evaluation of implementation strategies and to develop the framework for how the organization will manage a long-term numeric target with actionable approaches.

- Preliminary Cost Estimate: $250,000

ATTACHMENTS

1. Revised Study Issue Paper DPS 17-01 *Regulation of Marijuana Cultivation in the City of Sunnyvale for Research and Development and Medical Marijuana Cultivation for Personal Use*
2. 2017 Department Rankings

City of Sunnyvale

REVISED
2/10/17

Agenda Item

16-0435 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPS 17-01

TITLE Regulation of Marijuana Cultivation in the City of Sunnyvale for Research and Development and Medical Marijuana Cultivation for Personal Use

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Public Safety
Support Department(s): Community Development, Office of the City Attorney

Sponsor(s):
Councilmembers: Griffith, Tara Martin-Milius

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
The study will examine possible revisions to the current Municipal Code regulations in Title 9 (Public Peace, Safety or Welfare**)** and Title 19 (Zoning) governing Medical Marijuana Cultivation for Personal Use and the cultivation of Marijuana for Research and Development purposes.

What precipitated this study?
The study issue arose out of discussion during the April 12, 2016 Council Meeting regarding the proposed prohibition of all medical marijuana activities within the City. Members of the public requested consideration for exceptions to a complete prohibition for personal cultivation and research and development.

Planned Completion Year: 2018

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study
Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $0

Funding Source: N/A

Explanation of Cost: Staff costs related to research and preparation of the study issue will be

absorbed by the individual departments.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

Explanation of Cost: Potential costs may include operating costs related to staff response for permitting and enforcement.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Planning Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Defer

Explanation: As mentioned in the City Manager's memo, at times, study issue papers require a revisit prior to the study/budget issues workshop. Originally sponsored in April, this study issue paper was finalized and published in June 2016.

The longstanding marijuana policy in Sunnyvale has been to prohibit medical marijuana dispensaries and other medical marijuana-related commercial activities such as cultivation, sales and delivery. However, the passage of Proposition 64 in November, which legalized recreational marijuana, necessitates immediate updates to the City's existing marijuana ordinance to ensure that the City retains its desired level of local control over marijuana. Staff plans to bring forward a clean-up ordinance in 2017 to:

- Align existing regulations, which prohibit personal cultivation of medical marijuana, with state law, which allows personal cultivation of up to six marijuana plants; and
- Clarify, before the state begins issuing licenses to marijuana businesses in 2018, that the existing prohibition on commercial marijuana activities applies to recreational as well as medical marijuana.

To the extent the Council desires more detailed discussion, 2018 may be more appropriate, as the state is currently drafting regulations for permitting marijuana activities that are not anticipated to be effective until early 2018. Deferring consideration will allow the City time to review the state program and processes and provide Council with more definitive information regarding the state process for regulating marijuana activities.

Prepared By: Frank J. Grgurina, Director, Public Safety
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development
Reviewed By: Melissa Tronquet, Assistant City Attorney
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

Dept Rank	Number	Title	Required Staff Effort	Cost of Study	Cost to Implement?
1	OCM 17-02	Evaluate Proposing a Charter Amendment to Revise Section 604 regarding Filling Vacant Council Seats by Special Election	Minor	$0	Unknown
2	OCM 16-02	Consider Adoption of a Wage Theft Ordinance	Moderate	$20,000	Unknown
3	OCM 17-01	Storing Outdoor Dining Furniture Overnight on Sidewalks on Murphy Avenue	Moderate	$0	$0
1	CDD 17-09	2017 Housing Strategy	Major	$200,000	Unknown
2	CDD 11-02	Downtown Development Policies for Parking	Moderate	$60,000	Unknown
3	CDD 13-02	Consideration of Usable Open Space in Required Front Yards	Moderate	$0	$0
4	CDD 17-08	Evaluation of the Residential Single-Story Combining District Process	Moderate	$30,000	Unknown
5	CDD 16-14	Exploring Options for Establishment of a Plaque Program for Heritage Resources	Minor	$0	Unknown
1	ESD 17-01	Eliminate the Use of Chemical Pesticides on City Owned or Leased Property	Major	$100,000	Unknown
2	ESD 13-05C	Eco-district Feasibility and Incentives	Major	$50,000	Unknown
1	FIN 17-01	Evaluation of New Revenue Strategies to Fund New and Increasing Service Demands and/or Unfunded Capital Investments	Moderate	$20,000	Unknown
1	LCS 17-02	Potential Membership in the Global Network of Age-Friendly Cities and Communities (GNAFCC)	Moderate to High	$0	Unknown
1	DPW 17-07	Develop Mobile Version of Sunnyvale Bicycle Map	Moderate	$25,000	Unknown
2	DPW 17-12	Evaluate the Development of a Class I Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail along Evelyn Avenue adjacent to the Caltrain Railroad Tracks, Between Sunnyvale and Mountain View	Major	$100,000	Unknown

City of Sunnyvale

2017 Proposed Study Issues

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY

NO STUDY ISSUES PROPOSED

City of Sunnyvale

Study Issues Status Report
Office of the City Attorney

Continuing Study Issues

Number	Name ***Continuing Status***
	N/A

Completed Study Issues

Number	Name	Status
OCA 14-03C (b)	(*a*) ~~Clarify Inclusion of Electronic Cigarettes in Smoking Regulations~~; (b) Expand Smoking Regulations to Prohibit Smoking near Doorways and Outdoor Areas of Retail and Commercial Businesses (Transferred to DPS and included as part of DPS 15-01) *(OCA 14-03 (a) Clarify Inclusion of Electronic Cigarettes in Smoking Regulations was completed on March 18, 2014.)*	Completed 2/9/2016

Study Issue Summary Worksheet
2017 Proposed Study Issues

#	Title	Required Staff Effort	Cost of Study	Cost to Implement?*	Dept Rank	B/C Rank
OCM 16-02	Consider Adoption of a Wage Theft Ordinance	Moderate	$20,000	Unknown	2	N/A
OCM 17-01	Storing Outdoor Dining Furniture Overnight on Sidewalks on Murphy Avenue	Moderate	$0	0	3	N/A
OCM 17-02	Evaluate Proposing a Charter Amendment to Revise Section 604 regarding Filling Vacant Council Seats by Special Election	Minor	$0	Unknown	1	N/A

*Indicates whether there will be a one-time capital cost and/or ongoing annual costs upon implementation. See Study Issue Paper for detail.

City of Sunnyvale

Study Issues Status Report
Office of the City Manager

Continuing Study Issues

Number	Name ***Continuing Status***
OCM 10-04C	Civic Center Buildings: Renovate, Replace, or Relocate? *The Civic Center Modernization Project is now being tracked as one of City Council's strategic priorities.*

Completed Study Issues

Number	Name	Status
OCM 16-01	Explore Expanding Friendship City Relationship with Iizuka, Japan to a Sister City Relationship	6/21/2016

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

17-0100 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
OCM 16-02

TITLE Consider Adoption of a Wage Theft Ordinance

BACKGROUND
Lead Department : Office of the City Manager
Support Department(s): Office of the City Attorney

Sponsor(s) :
Councilmembers: Klein, Smith, Melton, Goldman

History :
1 year ago: Dropped
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
The California Labor Commissioner, also known as the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement (DLSE), and a division of the State of California Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) enforces laws against wage theft violators; but, under State law, local jurisdictions can establish their own standards and enforcement procedures in addition to what the State provides. Workers can file individual claims on their own behalf for nonpayment of wages or benefits with the DLSE. The DLSE does not enforce local city or county laws regarding wage theft claims.

This study would examine existing wage theft laws, ordinances and policies at the State level as well as in other local jurisdictions. This study would also review and examine existing methods for employees to recover unpaid wages. The study would ascertain what monitoring and enforcement efforts have been implemented by other jurisdictions, including the required resources to sustain such a program, and the outcome of SB 588 at the State level. The study would consider whether additional local remedies to this statewide issue would be viable and/or effective.

The City of Sunnyvale has a municipal code provision (Section 2.09.220) specifically designed to protect employees from wage theft by requiring City contractors to pay the prevailing wages. These wage requirements are contained in the City's construction contracts, and staff monitors the certified payrolls of construction contractors to help ensure that prevailing wages are being paid. Additionally, Council Policy 5.1.5, Utilization of Local Workforce in Construction Projects, encourages developers and contractors to pay workers a fair wage consistent with the prevailing wages set forth by DIR.

Specifically, the City would review the City of San Jose's "Wage Theft Prevention Policy", the City and County of San Francisco's wage theft program and enforcement, and the Santa Clara County's contracting policy regarding wage theft as models. The focus of the study will be on the actions that are under the City's control such as the City's contract award and competitive bidding policies to protect the City from contracting for services from businesses that have unpaid wage theft judgments that have not been satisfied. The study will also review all City policies to determine if the City has the authority to suspend or revoke permits for businesses that have unpaid wage theft judgments.

What precipitated this study?

During the Public Comments section of the January 10, 2017 Council meeting, a member of the public spoke in support of the City adopting a wage theft ordinance in Sunnyvale. The speaker stated that employees are being deprived of earned wages and that the City needs to adopt an ordinance to ensure these employees are property compensated for wages earned. Previously, in 2016, the Council had dropped this proposed study issue. In order to revive it for consideration in 2017, the study required at least four sponsors; Councilmembers Klein, Smith, Melton, and Goldman sponsored the issue to be presented at the February 17, 2017 Study/Budget Issues workshop.

Planned Completion Year: 2017

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $20,000

Funding Source: N/A

Explanation of Cost: The study would require a minimum 120 hours of staff time from the Offices of the City Manager, City Attorney and Departments of Finance and Public Works. Staff assigned to work on this study may not be able to accomplish other tasks and the requested funds are for consultant and/or legal services that may be needed to put a comprehensive program in place. At this time, given the complexity of the topic and that this would require establishing a new program, without the addition of new permanent resources; staff would need to request some consultant funds.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs based on similar programs in other local jurisdictions.

Explanation of Cost: Potential costs of implementing study results may include additional personnel and resources needed for enforcement activities.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: N/A

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Support

Explanation: Staff supports this study issue to evaluate the options for providing standards and enforcement procedures for wage theft in public contracts. Support for this study is based on the limited review and analysis as described in the *Key Elements of the Study* section of this paper. Efforts to ensure that public funds are used for intended purpose and to protect wages are important to the City's procurement processes.

Prepared By: Connie Verceles, Economic Development Manager
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Reviewed By: John Nagel, City Attorney
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-1101 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
OCM 17-01

TITLE Storing Outdoor Dining Furniture Overnight on Sidewalks on Murphy Avenue

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Office of the City Manager
Support Department(s): Community Development, Public Works, Public Safety

Sponsor(s):
Councilmembers: Larsson, Griffith, Martin-Milius

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
City Council adopted updated South Murphy Avenue Sidewalk Use Regulations in 2010 to preserve and enhance the 100 block of South Murphy Avenue. The regulations include furnishings on the public right-of-way/sidewalks to offer the businesses the opportunity to utilize the sidewalks for outdoor dining. The merchants are required to apply for an Outdoor Dining Permit through the Planning Division. Per regulations, these permits require the nightly removal of outdoor furniture.

The City's Public Works staff maintains the sidewalks by deep cleaning portions of the sidewalk each week. In order to complete these tasks, all furniture must be removed and stored indoors in order for the power washer to thoroughly clean sidewalks.

This study would examine three options for the entire street, not for specific merchants. The first option would review the current program to evaluate how the program is functioning for both the merchants and City staff. The second option would examine potential impacts or implementation needs of allowing merchants to leave outdoor dining furniture on the sidewalk on a permanent basis with the merchants responsible for sidewalk cleaning. The third option would explore a compromise option - requiring indoor storage on the evening before the scheduled cleaning and a penalty for non-compliance. Additionally, the safety concerns associated with non-fixed furniture left outdoors overnight would be assessed in all options.

Council action to adopt revisions would result in updated regulations, which would be applicable to portion of the Murphy Avenue extension into the Town Center project area.

What precipitated this study?
This study was proposed by Vice Mayor Larsson, supported by Councilmembers Griffith and Martin-Milius, on behalf of the Sunnyvale Downtown Association (SDA). The request is to allow outdoor dining furniture to be left outdoors and potentially assigning the cleaning responsibilities to the merchants utilizing the sidewalk for outdoor dining. The concern from the merchants is the late hour that the furniture needs to be removed and stored indoors. Many merchants have limited staff at closing and feel that the task is difficult for the last staff person onsite. Also, some merchants have limited indoor space and find it difficult to store furniture on a nightly basis.

Planned Completion Year: 2017

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $0

Cost to Implement Study Results

No cost to implement

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: No

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Support

Explanation: Staff supports this study as several merchants have asked for this item to be reviewed by the City. Merchants have expressed a willingness to work with staff on finding an adequate solution.

Prepared By: Connie Verceles, Economic Development Manager
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development
Reviewed By: Manuel Pineda, Director, Public Works
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

17-0104 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
OCM 17-02

TITLE Evaluate Proposing a Charter Amendment to Revise Section 604 regarding Filling Vacant Council Seats by Special Election

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Office of the City Manager
Support Department(s): Office of the City Attorney, Finance

Sponsor(s):
Councilmembers: Klein, Griffith, Melton, Larsson, Goldman, Smith, Hendricks

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
Sunnyvale City Charter Section 604 provides requirements for filling a vacancy in the City Council. When an unscheduled vacancy occurs on Council, the vacancy must be filled by holding a special election. When the special election cannot be consolidated with a general municipal election, the City must conduct a “stand-alone” or special election at significant cost. Under only very limited circumstances, the Council may fill an unexpired term by a City Council appointment.

During the Council discussion regarding sponsorship of the Study Issue, Council discussed whether the Charter amendment process would include the formation of Charter Review Committee made up of Sunnyvale residents as is the traditional practice in the City.

This study will provide details about the three methods by which a charter amendment may be proposed (by the Council on its own motion, by initiative petition, and by elected or appointed charter commission) and whether the Council wishes to form a charter review committee to advise the Council on amendments to the Charter. The study would provide an evaluation of the current requirements of the charter regarding the filling of a Council vacancy and the shortcomings of the limited options as written that can result in costly special elections. The study will explore several possible solutions for revising language in Charter Section 604, to provide less costly options for filling vacancies. The study will present information that will inform Council to provide direction on how to proceed with proposing a charter amendment and will include an assessment of the cost of implementation of the results.

Though not discussed by Council, staff wishes to advise Council to consider expanding the scope of this Study Issue to include a technical amendment to Charter Section 606 regarding the designation of a Vice Mayor to bring this Charter section into conformity with the change in general municipal elections from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years. Presently, Charter Section 606 reads:

> At the first regular meeting in January, at which the City Council shall certify the election results, following each General Municipal Election, and the first regular meeting in January in odd-numbered years, the City Council shall also designate one of its members as Vice Mayor. The Vice Mayor shall perform the duties of the Mayor during his/her absence or disability. (Amended effective December 31, 1975, December 21, 1976, December 23, 1982, November 30, 1995 and November 28, 2007: previously Section 705)

The Charter section would be redrafted to change "in January in odd-numbered years" to read "in January in even-numbered years." This would retain the original intent of the Charter to provide for a one-year term for Vice Mayor rather than the unintended change of the meaning of this text to provide that the designation of a Vice Mayor occurs only in odd-numbered years.

What precipitated this study?
On April 4, 2016, a member of the City Council resigned his seat prior to the end of his term. Due to the provisions of Charter Section 604, and the particular timing of this resignation, there was no other option for the Council than to call a special election to fill the vacancy for the remaining partial term of three-and-a-half months. The special election had to take place as a "stand-alone" election on August 16, 2016 when no other elections were to be held; therefore, the City of Sunnyvale was responsible for the full cost of the election. Aside from internal administrative costs, the special election cost the City approximately $800,000. A regular, general municipal election would typically cost in the range of $300,000 to $400,000.

Planned Completion Year: June 2018

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Minor

Amount of funding above current budget required: $0

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

Explanation of Cost: Potential costs of implementing study may include costs of forming a Charter Review Committee, conducting public meetings, advertising, outreach, and election costs for a ballot measure.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: No

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Support

Explanation: Staff recommends pursuing a proposal for a charter amendment to Charter Section 604 to clarify language and/or provide alternatives for filling a vacant City Council Seat and expand the scope of the Study Issue to include an amendment to Charter Section 606 regarding the designation of a Vice Mayor to bring this Charter section into conformity with the change in general municipal elections from odd-numbered years to even-numbered years.

Prepared By: Kathleen Franco Simmons, City Clerk
Reviewed By: John A. Nagel, City Attorney
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

Study Issue Summary Worksheet
2017 Proposed Study Issues

#	Title	Required Staff Effort	Cost of Study	Cost to Implement?*	Dept Rank	B/C Rank
CDD 11-02	Downtown Development Policies for Parking	Moderate	$60,000	Unknown	2	Planning 2 of 6
CDD 13-02	Consideration of Usable Open Space in Required Front Yards	Moderate	$0	0	3	Planning 5 of 6
CDD 15-04	Height Regulations to Accommodate Architectural Style	Moderate	$0	0	Drop	Planning 3 of 6
CDD 16-14	Exploring Options for Establishment of a Plaque Program for Heritage Resources	Minor	$0	Unknown	5	Heritage Pres. 1 of 1
CDD 17-02	Increase Availability of Electric Vehicle Charging Stations in Private and Public Parking Facilities	Moderate	$0	Unknown	Drop	Planning 4 of 6 Sustainability Drop
CDD 17-03	Rent Stabilization for Mobile Home Parks	Major	$80,000	Unknown	Defer	Housing 1 of 4
CDD 17-05	Consider Revising Certain Requirements of Sunnyvale Municipal Code Chapter 19.72: Mobile Home Park Conversions	Moderate	$40,000	Unknown	Drop	Planning Drop Housing 4 of 4
CDD 17-06	Explore Introduction of a Rent Stabilization Ordinance	Major	$50,000	Unknown	Defer	Planning Drop Housing 2 of 4
CDD 17-08	Evaluation of the Residential Single-Story Combining District Process	Moderate	$30,000	Unknown	4	Planning 1 of 6
CDD 17-09	2017 Housing Strategy	Major	$200,000	Unknown	1	Too late to rank

*Indicates whether there will be a one-time capital cost and/or ongoing annual costs upon implementation. See Study Issue Paper for detail.

City of Sunnyvale

Study Issues Status Report
Community Development

Continuing Study Issues

Number	Name ***Continuing Status***
CDD 14-09C	Comprehensive Update of the Precise Plan for El Camino Real *Anticipating February 2017 for City Council review of vision statement and land use alternatives. Plan and EIR anticipated to be completed in late 2017.*
CDD 14-10C	Update to the Murphy Avenue Design Guidelines *Currently seeking consultant proposals. Anticipated to be completed in June 2017.*
CDD 14-04C	Individual Lockable Storage Requirements for Multi-Family Housing *To be completed in 2017. Scheduled for City Council on February 28, 2017.*

Completed Study Issues

Number	Name	Status
CDD 08-11C	Preparation of Peery Park Specific Plan.	Completed 8/9/16
CDD 15-02C	Consider Multi-family Residential Transportation Demand Management Programs	Completed 9/13/16
CDD 15-14C	Evaluate Timing of Park Dedication In-lieu Fee Calculation and Payment	Completed 4/12/16
CDD 16-13	Solar Access Requirements	Completed 8/9/16

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0792 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
CDD 11-02

TITLE Downtown Development Policies for Parking

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Community Development
Support Department(s): N/A

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Planning Commission

History:
1 year ago: Deferred
2 years ago: Ranked Below the Line

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
Redevelopment of sites within the downtown is governed by both the Downtown Specific Plan (DSP) and the development standards contained within the Zoning Code. For individual projects there may be difficulty in accomplishing the vision of the DSP and meeting the standards in the Zoning Code. This study would examine those potential tensions with respect to parking requirements.

The Downtown Specific Plan requires that non-residential developments provide all net new required parking on site (i.e., minus any credit for spaces in the Parking District). Downtown parking is a potential barrier to the redevelopment of smaller individual sites in the downtown, which may be more constrained in their options for locating the required on-site parking facilities. One such property owner has contacted staff on numerous occasions to request staff support for a deviation to the parking requirements or payment of an in-lieu fee. In one example, a 12,900 s.f. property (approximately 100x130 feet) has an auto repair facility with no credit in the parking district as the auto repair meets the minimum parking on-site. Due to the size and dimensions of the property, it would be difficult to redevelop the site with a retail use along the sidewalk, of a desirable depth, and have room for minimum parking and maneuvering dimensions. If it was possible to provide parking off-site, elsewhere in the parking district, a retail use could be provided, thereby activating the streetscape. There are other sites in the downtown with similar challenges.

This study would examine the City's downtown development policies to identify and explore alternative solutions for meeting future downtown parking needs, including alternative ways to achieve effective off-site parking downtown, including shared and joint-use parking and use of smart technology to manage public parking. It could also examine the potential for providing additional

parking supply in the Parking Maintenance Assessment District, including a current needs assessment, exploration of financing options, and consideration of legal issues. The effect of recent downtown development on parking demand and parking patterns would also be considered in this study.

With the Town Center project resuming construction, the new developer team will likely propose modifications to the land use mix for the project that will require an updated parking analysis. It would be appropriate to combine or coordinate this study issue with the project-level parking analysis while the project modifications are being evaluated. A combined study could explore possible options and solutions to meet the parking needs for the Town Center project as well as the overall downtown area.

What precipitated this study?
Recent proposals for redevelopment projects in the downtown have highlighted tensions between the DSP and the Zoning Code. Parking is a particular challenge, as the City's Parking Maintenance Assessment District has limited capacity and there are no plans for expansion under current policies. As a result, redevelopment projects are required to use on-site parking to satisfy all additional parking requirements resulting from intensification of the site. This requirement has the potential to encourage development patterns that are not consistent with the City's overall vision for downtown, such as increased land area devoted to surface parking.

Planned Completion Year: 2017

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $60,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement; could also be partially funded by STC Venture, LLC (Town Center project Developer) for a combined project and downtown area parking study.

Explanation of Cost:
Consultant cost estimated at $60,000 for parking studies and an updated parking needs study for build-out of the uses in the Downtown Parking Maintenance District.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

Explanation of Cost: Costs can vary widely depending on the outcome of the study. Possible costs include installing new parking signs, implementing an on-going parking management plan, or financing capital improvements to add downtown parking.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Planning Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Support

Explanation: This study issue has been deferred several years in a row and more recently ranked below the line. The Council has continued to defer rather than drop this study issue with the reasoning that it is important to assess the amount of parking needed to serve the downtown area and to identify possible parking solutions, However, the Council also felt that the study should reflect the future parking demand that will be generated by the Town Center project. It would also be beneficial for the study to consider the effects of recent developments on downtown parking. With the Town Center developer likely proposing some project changes in 2017 that will require reassessing the project's parking needs, it is appropriate to move forward with this study issue before or concurrently with consideration of these project modifications. Staff supports this study issue, with the final timing being dependent on the progress on the Town Center project.

Prepared By: Andrew Miner, Planning Officer
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development
Reviewed By: Hanson Hom, Assistant City Manager, Chief of Downtown Planning
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0793 **Agenda Date:** 2/3/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
CDD 13-02

TITLE Consideration of Usable Open Space in Required Front Yards

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Community Development
Support Department: N/A

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Planning Commission

History:
1 year ago: Deferred
2 years ago: Deferred

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
Usable open space is required for multi-family residential projects in the city. Pursuant to Sunnyvale Municipal Code Section 19.37.100, landscaped areas in the required front yard cannot be counted towards usable open space. This study would review open space regulations and evaluate whether there are instances or criteria that would permit required front yard areas to be counted towards required usable open space and not be deemed a deviation from the code.

What precipitated this study?
Developers of small townhouse developments have requested and the Planning Commission has approved, through a Special Development Permit, the ability to count a portion of the required front yard area towards the minimum usable open space requirement. The portions that have been credited toward required open space are the privately fenced yards in front of the townhouse units.

Planned Completion Year: 2017

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study
Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $0

Cost to Implement Study Results
No cost to implement.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Planning Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Support

Explanation: The study issue would develop clear criteria for allowing exceptions for front yards to partially meet the open space requirements for residential projects (primarily townhouse projects). By providing specific zoning standards or guidelines that define the conditions and situations where the front yard can be counted toward required open space, it would streamline the review process. Staff had anticipated being able to complete this policy change as part of the zoning code retooling; however, the schedule for the retooling effort fell behind due to other workload items. The retooling effort will recommence in early 2017.

Reviewed By: Andrew Miner, Planning Officer
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0794 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
CDD 15-04

TITLE Height Regulations to Accommodate Architectural Style

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Community Development
Support Department(s): N/A

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Planning Commission

History:
1 year ago: Deferred
2 years ago: Ranked Below the Line

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
Projects with unique design and architecture that exceed the height requirements typically require a variance or exception for approval. Variance findings require something unique about the project site or use to approve the request. The issue can be present in any area of the City, but this study issue request was precipitated by applications in the single-family and R-2 zoning districts.

Options to study include:
A. Amend the Variance findings in the Chapter 19.84 of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code to address the concern;
B. Amend the code to allow a wider set of architectural features that may exceed the allowable height (now limited to towers, spires, chimneys, cupolas, etc.);
C. Increase the allowable height for a portion of a building;
D. Create a height exception process and update the Single-Family Design Techniques to provide guidance on when the exceptions should be considered.

What precipitated this study?
Planning Commission review of specific projects resulted in denial because of the strict nature of the required findings. The Commission felt it would be useful to have additional options, such as unique architectural design, available to them when they considered the application request.

Planned Completion Year: 2017

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: 0

Funding Source: N/A

Explanation of Cost: N/A

Cost to Implement Study Results

No cost to implement

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Planning Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Drop

Explanation: Staff does not consider this a priority study, however the study has potential merit if the Council finds the existing regulations may be too prescriptive, resulting in fewer design options. Most new multi-family residential developments are approved through the Special Development Permit process, which allows consideration of deviations from zoning code requirements (including height), in exchange for superior design. Most single-family home redevelopment applications do not approach the 30 foot height limit unless there is a grade change on the property. This physical feature of the property could qualify as a hardship for variance findings, provided that the other two findings can be made (that it will not be detrimental to other properties and that it is not a grant of special privileges). Staff is not aware of non-residential developments where height is a concern due to architectural style; variances for height have been approved for unique uses in industrial areas (e.g., high-bays).

Prepared By: Andrew Miner, Planning Officer
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development
Reviewed By: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0914 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
CDD 16-14

TITLE Exploring Options for Establishment of a Plaque Program for Heritage Resources

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Community Development
Support Department(s): N/A

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Heritage Preservation Commission

History:
1 year ago: Ranked Below the Line
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
The City has approximately 62 structures listed on the Heritage Resources Inventory as well as a few neighborhoods and several trees; however, many community members may not know of most of those resources or their historical impact on the City of Sunnyvale. Creation of a plaque program could educate the community on specific heritage resources in the City as well as events and people famous to Sunnyvale.

Exploration of establishing a plaque program may include:

- Survey of cities with plaque programs and the specifics of each program;
- Discussions with other City staff members on the effectiveness and receptiveness of such a program;
- Evaluation of costs associated with buying plaques and how those costs would be covered;
- Details and criteria for what resources would be eligible to receive a plaque and details on how the program would be established and maintained; and
- Standards for the plaque program with the objective to improve community education and awareness of Sunnyvale's historic resources.

Between the mid-1980s and mid-1990s the City budget included funds for plaques for the 11 Heritage Landmark properties. The amount budgeted for a bronze plaque was approximately $600; however, the final cost depended on size and the amount of information on the plaque. The plaques were installed on all 11 heritage landmark properties and vary in size at each location.

What precipitated this study?
While the Heritage Preservation Commission is primarily interested in preserving historic resources, they also feel it is important to educate the community on existing resources all over the City. Creation of a plaque program would draw attention to existing resources and may also help to foster a sense of pride for owners of resources.

The Community Character Chapter of the General Plan includes goals and policies on Heritage Preservation.

> **GOAL CC-6 KNOWLEDGE OF SUNNYVALE'S HERITAGE -** To promote knowledge of, and appreciation for, Sunnyvale's heritage and to encourage broad community participation in heritage programs and projects.

Planned Completion Year: 2017

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Minor

Amount of funding above current budget required: $0

Funding Source: N/A

Explanation of Cost: N/A

Cost to Implement Study Results

Study would include assessment of potential costs.

Explanation of Cost: The study would update the costs for preparing and installing plaques on Heritage Resources and estimate the amount of staff time required to administer a program.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Heritage Preservation Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Support

Explanation: Staff considers the issue worthy of a study issue, and it would be beneficial to increase community awareness of the City's historic resources. However, the cost for a plaque program would need to be balanced with other funding priorities. Staff is aware of cities that require the owners of historic resources to cover the costs of the plaques; therefore a plaque program could potentially be created with minimal cost to the City.

Prepared By: Amber Blizinski, Principal Planner
Reviewed by: Andrew Miner, Planning Officer
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development

Reviewed by: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0391 **Agenda Date:** 2/3/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
CDD 17-02

TITLE Increase Availability of Electric Vehicle Charging Stations in Private and Public Parking Facilities

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Community Development
Support Department(s): Environmental Services

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Planning Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
The Sunnyvale Municipal Code currently requires pre-wiring for Level 2 electric vehicle (EV) chargers in new residential and industrial/R&D/office construction. Hotels, shopping centers and other nonresidential new construction projects are currently not required to provide any pre-wiring. There is no current specific requirement to install charging stations; however, projects subject to the City's Green Building Requirements can attain points in the LEED point rating system by installing chargers.

This study would explore ways to increase the availability of electric vehicle charging stations throughout the City and would examine the following:

- Expanding current requirements to require installation of charging stations, beyond pre-wiring;
- Expanding the requirement to other nonresidential uses such as hotels and shopping centers;
- Increasing the number of chargers required in residential and nonresidential projects or lowering the threshold for when chargers are required for nonresidential projects;
- Incentives for existing older private properties to provide charging stations; and
- Examining the feasibility to install charging stations at City Hall and other public parking lots/structures.

What precipitated this study?
The Planning Commission reviewed projects that were not required to provide electric vehicle (EV) charging stations and suggested the standards be modified to expand the types of development

required to provide charging stations.

Planned Completion Year: 2017

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required: Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $0

Funding Source: N/A

Explanation of Cost: N/A

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Planning Commission, Sustainability Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Drop

Explanation: Although the study could provide further direction in the type and number of EV charging facilities required in new developments, there are two other efforts scheduled or underway.

Currently, the Building Code requires pre-wiring for electric vehicle chargers in new residential construction (12.5% of required parking and in attached garages) and the Zoning Code requires pre-wiring for 3% of parking spaces in industrial/office new construction that have 100 spaces or more.

These two efforts will evaluate the approaches for increasing EV charging station deployment identified in this proposed Study Issue. Staff will be updating the green building program in 2017, after the new building codes are adopted. The update will include Climate Action Plan items. Staff recommends incorporating some of the electric vehicle charging requirements as part of the green building program update.

Per the strategies identified in the City's Climate Action Plan, staff (Environmental Services Department) has successfully secured funding through the California Energy Commission to purchase and install four charging stations at the Civic Center and close to Downtown Sunnyvale. Grant participation agreements were approved by the City Council in February 2016 and installations should be completed by fall 2016. Finding desirable locations sufficiently close to electrical infrastructure has been found to be a critical component to installing changing stations in existing facilities. In an effort to have a more efficient and strategic process for future charger installations, staff is also participating in a County of Santa Clara-administered grant project - *Driving to Net Zero*. This is a multi-year project, funded by the Strategic Growth Council, which kicked-off in February 2016 and is scheduled for completion in mid-2017. Among other objectives, the project will support participating agencies, such as Sunnyvale, with the development of a charging station siting plan. This plan would help identify strategic locations for deploying future charging stations and aid in pursuing additional future grants for additional EV charging infrastructure. Additionally, the project will

also evaluate existing codes implemented by local jurisdictions and develop a set of best practices for EV charging code requirements that can facilitate and incentivize optimal deployment of charging infrastructure. This review will include but is not limited to pre-wiring requirements in new single-family and multi-family residential development, charging station requirements for new and renovated multi-family and commercial development, and preferential parking requirements for new commercial development. The deliverables from this grant project will inform the green building program update and consideration of other possible code requirements that can be implemented and increase availability of EV charging infrastructure.

Prepared By: Amber Blizinski, Principal Planner
Reviewed By: Andrew Miner, Planning Officer
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development Department
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0737 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
CDD 17-03

TITLE Rent Stabilization for Mobile Home Parks

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Community Development
Supporting Department(s): Office of the City Attorney, Office of the City Manager

Sponsor(s):
Councilmembers: Davis, Griffith, Martin-Milius

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
Key elements include:

Phase I. Conduct initial research on the types of mobile home park rent stabilization programs that exist and identify alternative approaches being used. Also assess the benefits, costs, and possible unanticipated effects of implementing rent stabilization, such as possible impacts on mobile home sale prices, impacts on the mobile home parks and/or possible pricing impacts on other types of housing in the City.

Hold community outreach meetings and study sessions with the Housing and Human Services Commission and with the City Council to collect feedback on approaches. Council direction will be sought on whether or not to proceed with rent stabilization for mobile home park residents. Staff presentations will include a discussion of various approaches, such as a Council adopted ordinance, or a voter adopted ordinance or Charter Amendment (through a ballot measure) in order to establish rent stabilization for mobile home park residents. The Council could also consider initially adopting an ordinance and then placing a ballot measure for voter approval on the ballot. If directed to proceed, the remaining scope of the study could be as outlined below, or as otherwise directed by Council at the conclusion of Phase I.

Phase II. If Council decides to proceed with further evaluating rent stabilization for mobile home residents, prepare preliminary budget for administration of rent stabilization program; also identify costs that other communities have experienced due to litigation. Council could decide to adopt an ordinance (see Phase II A below) or place an ordinance or amend the charter on the ballot for voter

approval (see Phase II B below).

Phase II A. If Council is interested in adopting an ordinance, preliminary language would be developed. After outreach with stakeholders (i.e., park residents, park owners, Sunnyvale voters, and other interested parties) regarding draft language and implementation plan staff will prepare a draft ordinance and schedule public hearings for formal consideration of a rent stabilization ordinance.

Phase II B. If Council is interested in placing an ordinance or charter amendment on the ballot, staff recommends developing a draft ballot measure and hiring a public opinion research firm to conduct initial polling of likely Sunnyvale registered voters to determine level of support for a proposed mobile home park rent stabilization measure. If polling results indicate enough support for possible passage, staff would bring forward for Council consideration a draft administrative plan, including cost and proposed funding structure, to implement the program if measure passes.

Continue public outreach among stakeholders regarding draft language and implementation plan. Conduct follow-up polling with likely Sunnyvale voters on ballot measure with updated language (as modified through public input) as well as any fees that would be imposed on mobile home park residents and/or park owners to fund program.

Return to Council with findings from second iteration of polling as well as a summary of the community engagement results to determine whether the measure should be placed on a ballot for voter consideration

Note: A similar study issue (CDD 17-06) has been proposed to analyze rent stabilization options for other types of rental housing in the City.

What precipitated this study?
Several residents of Plaza del Rey Mobile Home Park requested that the City impose rent stabilization on their Park due to the 7.5% rent increase imposed by the new park owners in early 2016 and concerns about future rent increases. Mobile home parks are unique in that typically the home is owned by the resident and rent is paid to a park owner for the use of the space. The rent varies due to a number of factors, including: the amenities available at the park (pools, spas, parks, recreation rooms, etc.); whether utilities are included in the rent; the level of maintenance and management services; and property taxes on the land.

Planned Completion Year: 2017 for Phase I, if the study is ranked as a top policy action. Future phases would depend on interim actions of the City Council.

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Major
An effort of this scale and likely level of public interest would require that other CDD / Housing initiatives be placed on hold to allow time for this study.

Amount of funding above current budget required: Phase I - $80,000; Phase II -depends on Council direction, but likely in excess of $100,000.

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost:
Phase I will require funding for outreach, postage and other noticing expenses, contract staff and/or consultants, etc. A significant public outreach process is anticipated to include outreach to about 4,000 households residing in mobile home parks and to the mobile home park owners, managers, and industry associations. Contract staff or consultants would assist with the outreach process, preparing meeting materials and facilitating meetings, or have specialized skills in rent stabilization programs, and/or market analysis. Staff assistance may also be needed for Communications, City Attorney, City Clerk, and City Manager staff due to high volume of inquiries, media contacts, multiple stakeholder contacts, need for specialized legal counsel, etc.

Phase II A would require additional consultant assistance for preparation of an ordinance and administrative programs.

Phase II B would include a public opinion research firm to conduct two-phase polling study. Consultant assistance would also be needed with the preparation of regulations and administrative programs.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

Explanation of Cost: There are certain costs to administer a rent stabilization program. There are also costs to place a measure on the ballot. A portion of the administrative costs could potentially be passed through to park residents and/or park owners. The study would estimate potential costs and describe potential funding mechanisms. In addition, if a program is implemented, there may be significant litigation costs as well, either initially or over time.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: Yes
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Housing and Human Services Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Defer

Explanation:
There are a number of activities at the state and local levels that will affect the programs and staff efforts related to affordable housing. There is recent state legislation on accessory living units, by-right residential development and modifications to the State Density bonus regulations. The Council has adopted the Housing Element that has several actions requiring further study and there are several proposed study issues that relate to affordable housing. Staff recommends that City Council consider an overall strategy that addresses and prioritizes affordable housing efforts (this concept will be included in the strategic planning sessions in January 2017).

Staff further notes that this study issue would likely generate a very high level of interest among its

proponents and opponents, as well as advocacy groups, the media, and other entities. For that reason it is difficult to estimate precisely in advance the costs of this study or the ultimate impacts of this study on other City initiatives, workload, operations, or impacts on the community at large. It is important to weigh these matters carefully in light of other Council priorities and level of service expectations.

Prepared By: Suzanne Isé, Housing Officer
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development Department
Reviewed By: Jennifer Garnett, Communications Officer
Reviewed By: Tim Kirby, Finance Director
Reviewed By: John Nagel, City Attorney
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

REVISED
11/11/16

Agenda Item

15-1118 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
CDD 17-05

TITLE
Consider Revising Certain Requirements of Sunnyvale Municipal Code Chapter 19.72: Mobile Home Park Conversions

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Community Development
Support Department(s): Office of the City Attorney

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Housing and Human Services Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
The study would assess whether several revisions to Chapter 19.72 should be made:

a) Require the relocation plan to use a measurement other than appraised value of the homes, such as replacement cost, when determining the payments to be made to mobile home owners for their homes; and
b) Revise the definition of comparable housing to take into account the occupancy of the unit (i.e., to address overcrowding concerns); and
c) Require the appraisals and rent subsidy calculations to be updated prior to the park closure date, to maximize benefit and minimize negative impact on the residents.

The study would not include consideration of revisions to Chapter 19.72 other than those noted above.

What precipitated this study?
This study issue was proposed following the Housing and Human Services Commission's hearing on the conversion impact report for a local mobile home park closure in late 2015, and reflects some of the concerns discussed during that hearing. Several years earlier, the Commission had participated in the implementation of a somewhat similar Study Issue (09-07), which resulted in significant amendments to Chapter 19.72 being adopted in 2012.

Planned Completion Year: 2018

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $40,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost:
Completing this Study would take a considerable amount of staff hours in CDD, OCA, and OCM due to the amount of time required to complete the necessary research and conduct public outreach on the topic. CDD funding sources (enterprise fund, special housing revenues) are not the appropriate funding sources to fund discretionary policy studies of this nature. Funding would be used for additional staff resources and any outside legal counsel or consultants that may be required. Given the current workload, this study may require specialized consultants and additional staff to identify possible technical approaches and/or the legality of implementing the proposed revisions.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown, study would assess costs to implement results.

Explanation of Cost: One or more of the proposed revisions are likely to increase costs to the park owner; however they could also impact staff workload in monitoring the conversion and relocation process, due to the complexity added to the relocation planning process by the proposed revisions.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Housing and Human Services Commission and Planning Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Drop

Explanation: While staff understands the concerns that prompted this Study Issue, these concerns have been considered and/or addressed recently, as follows:

The first of the three issues, item a), to consider replacement cost rather than, or in addition to, appraised value, was considered during the City Council hearing on the closure of Nick's Trailer Park (RTC No. 15-0890) and was determined to be infeasible because it was "too vague and complex to be fairly implemented by the applicant or monitored consistently for compliance by staff. In particular, the 'anticipated cost to buy another mobile home' would be virtually impossible to determine consistently for all the home owners in the park, given the wide variety of mobile homes available, price variations by park, city, mobile home size, type, age, and space rents or utilities."

Items b) and c) were addressed in the 2015 park conversion process which motivated this Study Issue, and will be addressed in a second park conversion process which is currently underway. These types of concerns (e.g., overcrowding, appraisal acceptability) are typically addressed as part of the standard practice for developing tenant relocation plans, which are implemented by the relocation specialist and overseen by staff under the current regulations. The relocation plan is structured so that any replacement dwelling considered for a displaced household would not put the household in an overcrowded situation, and that appraisals used to calculate relocation benefits are reasonably current.

It is important to keep in mind that an update of the appraisals and/or rent comparables just prior to the closure date would not necessarily benefit the tenants if the conversion was occurring during a period of declining rents and/or mobile home prices, such as occurred during the recent recession of 2008-2010. For this reason it is not necessarily advisable to include such detailed, prescriptive requirements in the municipal code, which is intended to be in effect for many years. However, such factors and the adequacy of a particular conversion impact report can be evaluated by park residents, members of the public, the Housing and Human Services Commission, and City Council, based on current market dynamics at the time that a draft conversion impact report for a particular park is published for public review.

Alternatively, if the City Council is interested in pursuing additional modifications to the mobile home conversion regulations, staff recommends the Council consider a defer action. There are a number of activities at the state and local levels that will affect the programs and staff efforts related to affordable housing. There is recent state legislation on accessory living units, by-right residential development and modifications to the State Density bonus regulations. The Council has adopted the Housing Element that has several actions requiring further study and there are several proposed study issues that relate to affordable housing. Staff recommends that City Council consider an overall strategy that addresses and prioritizes affordable housing efforts (this concept will be included in the strategic planning sessions in January 2017).

Prepared By: Suzanne Isé, Housing Officer
Reviewed By: Robert Boco, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development Department
Reviewed By: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0951 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
CDD 17-06

TITLE Explore Introduction of a Rent Stabilization Ordinance

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Community Development
Support Department(s): Office of City Attorney, Office of City Manager

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Housing and Human Services

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: Dropped (CDD 15-10)

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
The key elements of the study would be to answer the following questions:
1. Would it be appropriate to develop a rent stabilization program for Sunnyvale; i.e., what are the pros and cons, unintended consequences, etc.?
2. If yes, how should such a measure be structured (i.e., proposed rate of increase, mechanisms for implementing and enforcing measure, appeal procedures)?
3. Should rent stabilization be enacted through a local ordinance, charter amendment, or ballot measure? If by ballot measure or charter amendment, what is the likelihood of successful passage by the voters?
4. How much would it cost the City to implement and maintain a rent stabilization program, if enacted?
5. How many rental units in the City would be covered by the program, given that state law (Costa-Hawkins) exempts all dwelling units built after February 1, 1995, as well as most single-family homes and condominiums, from rent stabilization programs?

This potential study issue is distinct from CDD 17-03: Rent Stabilization for Mobile Home Parks. The studies would be conducted similarly; however this study issue would focus on rental units that are not mobile homes.

What precipitated this study?
Commissioners are concerned with reports that many community members have been affected by significant rent increases of well over ten percent, in some cases even a near-doubling of the rent; depending on the lease, these increases may occur more than once a year. Tenants have expressed

concerns as they are not able to afford large increases and have had to move, or may need to move in the event of a subsequent increase. Many tenants have reported several years in a row of significant rent increases, although some forecasts indicate area rents may be leveling off. Rent increases are reducing the inventory of *de facto* (unregulated) affordable housing units. Staff has also received many complaints from tenants about such rent increases in recent years. While the Council has been providing funding to Project Sentinel to provide tenant/landlord dispute resolution services, these mediation services are voluntary and do not prevent rent increases from occurring, nor are any city regulations in place that address rent stabilization.

Planned Completion Year: 2018

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Major

Amount of funding above current budget required: $50,000 or more

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost: Cost for consultant and/or special legal counsel to evaluate alternatives for rent stabilization and better understand legal limitations based on current State laws.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

Explanation of Cost: If the study resulted in a city effort to place a rent stabilization measure on the ballot, significant costs would be required for developing the ballot measure, paying for the county costs for placing local measures on the ballot, significant costs for special legal counsel and public opinion researcher. The estimated cost of a ballot measure for November 2018 is $43,000; ballot measures not combined with a general election can be as much as $800,000. In addition, it is possible the measure would be challenged upon implementation by groups representing rental property owners, which would create additional legal expenses for the City. If another approach were pursued, costs to implement would likely be around the same for special legal counsel and additional specialized research that may be needed.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: Yes
Council Study Session: Yes
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Housing and Human Services, Planning Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Defer

Explanation:

There are a number of activities at the state and local levels that will affect the programs and staff efforts related to affordable housing. There is recent state legislation on accessory living units, by-right residential development and modifications to the State Density bonus regulations. The Council

has adopted the Housing Element that has several actions requiring further study and there are several proposed study issues that relate to affordable housing. Staff recommends that City Council consider an overall strategy that addresses and prioritizes affordable housing efforts (this concept will be included in the strategic planning sessions in January 2017).

Prepared By: Suzanne Isé, Housing Officer
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development Department
Reviewed By: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0958 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
CDD 17-08

TITLE Evaluation of the Residential Single-Story Combining District Process

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Community Development
Support Department(s): N/A

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Planning Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
The Residential Single-story (S) combining district was created in 2000 to allow for the preservation and maintenance of single-family neighborhoods that are predominately single-story. In 2005, the City Council reviewed the standards for creating an S combining district, and reduced the required 67% participation of affected property owners to 55%, and removed the 7-year sunset provision.

Recently staff has received several applications for re-zoning in single-family neighborhoods to incorporate the S combining district into the zoning designation. Some of the more recent applications have included affected residents and neighbors opposed to the re-zoning request. There are numerous community members supportive of the second story limitations of the S combining district and numerous community members opposed to the creation of S combining districts (whether or not they own property in proposed areas).

This study would look at the application requirements and the process for considering the S combining district as well as the overall effect of the rezoning (beyond excluding second stories). Of particular interest are the completeness and accuracy of information owners receive prior to considering participating in an application, and the effects of rezoning on property values.

To address some of the operational concerns staff will implement changes that do not require a study to complete. This includes an independent verification by the City of interest in the S combing district. Other issues raised through the applications considered to date include the following:

- Summary and information on the existing S combining district neighborhoods;

- Defining acceptable neighborhood boundaries);
- Consider limitations on neighborhoods based on lot size or subject to certain development standards;
- Determining the appropriate fees;
- Impacts on property values from S combining districts;
- Review of other cities' practices; and
- If a sunset date would be appropriate for S combining districts and/or the requirement of renewal of the district over time.

What precipitated this study?
Prior to 2015, three single-family neighborhoods had been re-zoned to the S combining district; however, in 2015 and 2016, 11 applications have been filed requesting re-zoning to the S combining district. Additionally, the latest applications presented to the Planning Commission have included opposition from a few neighbors within the neighborhood subject to the re-zoning. Due to the number of single-story applications this year and after hearing comments made by the public at a study session, the Planning Commission has forwarded this study to relook at the process and to determine what factors should be considered as part of determining "in the public interest." The Planning Commission is also interested in the application submittals and general process for these applications. There have also been requests to analyze the effect of single-story rezonings on the citywide housing stock and property values.

Planned Completion Year: 2018

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $30,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost:
Prepare a market or financial analysis to determine the effect to property values by limiting a neighborhood to single-story homes. The funds would also be for expenses related to community outreach.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

Explanation of Cost: Depending on what modified processes are adopted there may be slight cost increases in staff costs.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Planning Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Support

Explanation: Due to the influx of applications, and the potential impact that limiting neighborhoods to one-story of development may have on property values, staff believes that this study may be appropriate to undertake at this time. The single-story overlay combining district was rarely used prior to 2016 and the practices and processes developed when it was created may need to be re-evaluated under these new circumstances. Regarding the property value study, it may be helpful to note that zoning regulations can affect the value of property; during the 2000 process there was literature suggesting that single story zoning could either increase or decrease the value of property, and that there were many and complex other factors that affected value as well. If the study is prioritized and completed, any assessment of the effect of the single-story zoning on property values is likely to be limited to the time-frame in which the property value study is prepared.

To address recent concerns, it is important to note that staff will be making adjustments to administrative process and outreach materials (e.g., request that property owners confirm their interest or opposition to the rezoning request after the outreach meeting and prior to scheduling the Planning Commission and City Council public hearings).

Prepared By: Amber Blizinski, Principal Planner
Reviewed By: Andy Miner, Planning Officer
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development
Reviewed By: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

17-0219 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
CDD 17-09

TITLE 2017 Housing Strategy

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Community Development
Support Department(s): Office of the City Attorney, Office of the City Manager

Sponsor(s):
City Manager

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
This study issue is offered as an alternative to the housing related studies that have been proposed:

- CDD 17-03 Rent Stabilization for Mobile Home Parks
- CDD 17-05 Consider Revising Certain Requirements of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code Chapter 19.72: Mobile Home Park Conversions
- CDD 17-06 Explore Introduction of a Rent Stabilization Ordinance

As discussed during the Strategic Policy Priority setting process, City staff relayed that the larger message taken from the collection of submitted housing study issues is that there is a desire to make sure that the City's housing policies, particularly for affordable housing, were appropriately meeting the needs of the community and goals of the City Council. Rather than absorbing a collection of issues to examine, it may be that these individual study issues combined will not fully address the housing needs of the community and staff would like the opportunity for the City Council to consider a more comprehensive approach that exceeds the topics submitted (and, in some cases, may integrate them fully) as it manages limited staff resources.

Plus, there is the following potential study issue, as previously sponsored by the Planning Commission and later voted to drop:

- CDD 17-07 Review and Consider Increasing the Below Market Rate (BMR) Ownership Housing Requirements (Chapter 19.67 of the Municipal Code)

As an alternative, staff feels that the City's sponsored Study Issue would complement several other

planned activities for the Housing Division in 2017.

- Legislative Advocacy: Monitoring (and advocating on the City's behalf, as needed) federal and state housing policy changes, including matters related to funding, key federal program regulations, and new legislation (mainly at the state level). State legislation already in process or expected to appear includes a variety of topics important to the City, such as: clean-up bills related to 2016 accessory dwelling unit bills; bills proposing to significantly change local permit processes ("by-right" bills) and/or the CEQA process related to housing development, and bills related to local jurisdictions' performance under current housing laws, such as the housing element law and various related laws. By the end of January 2017 there were at least seven new housing-related bills in various stages of preparation, at the state legislature. Various changes in federal housing policy, federal rule-making, and funding availability have either begun to occur or are expected to occur within the fiscal year, particularly during the federal appropriations process for the next federal fiscal year. Some federal policy makers have already suggested significant cuts to federal programs, even complete elimination of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) under which the City receives approximately $1 million in grant funds annually
- Major Capital Projects: (new or rehabilitated housing developments completed with City financing and oversight). Staff is currently managing several major affordable housing development projects at various stages in the pipeline, including two new construction projects (Benner Plaza and the Block 15 affordable housing site in Downtown) and several rehabilitation projects (Eight Trees, Crescent Terrace, Orchard Gardens). In addition, many older properties previously assisted by the City have reached a phase where time-consuming compliance and asset management activities are required, such as updating and modifying existing agreements to allow for the exit of limited investor partners, revisiting loan terms, etc.
- Housing Element Policy Objectives: The adopted 2015-2023 Housing Element includes several actions requiring further study that are supposed to be completed within the next year or two. These include: a study of options to expand areas where accessory dwelling units (ADUs) can be developed, primarily by lowering the minimum lot size requirement; a study of options for requiring landlords to provide relocation assistance for tenants of standard rental units (apartments, etc.) when those units are removed from the market through redevelopment or substantial rehabilitation requiring temporary or permanent relocation; a study of possible incentive programs or policies for Priority Development Areas to encourage development of more affordable units; and a study of funding policies and priorities for the City's current housing mitigation fee revenues
- Development Review (Housing Related): There are several major developments already entitled or in the application phase that will require significant amount of time from the Housing and legal staff this year; completing the project's Below Market Rate, Density Bonus, and/or fee-related agreements, due to the variety of options developers can pursue in complying with the City's BMR and/or fee requirements. These projects include the AMD site redevelopment, Butcher's Corner, Town Center, and several density bonus rental projects (Sobrato on Karlstad and Greystar on Kifer, among others). In addition, the large number of affordable units currently in the pipeline (~500) will require significant work by Housing staff in assisting developers to market and lease or sell these units, as applicable, such as through lotteries, waiting lists, or general marketing efforts. Development review efforts also include oversight of proposed and/or approved mobile home park conversions and/or subdivisions of various kinds, and any tenant relocation efforts in process. In addition, properties with expiring affordable units, such as the recent Grove Garden project and upcoming expirations in BMR

rental projects, require significant staff effort to assist tenants in finding other housing.

Staff has proposed this study to undertake a more comprehensive look at the City's current market conditions, current policies, programs, planned studies, proposed studies, and existing pipeline of affordable units, in the context of external forces that impact the City's housing stock, including federal, state, and private sector actions. The intended outcome of this study would be a comprehensive strategy that would offer the City guidance in using its limited funding and staffing resources in the most effective way to positively impact current local housing conditions for local residents and workers, focusing on issues such as affordability, accessibility, quality, and sustainability (both in the financial and environmental sense). The study could also propose changes in the City's existing practices that promote the Council's desired goals.

Additional ideas that may be analyzed as part of this study could include any of those on the list below, which were presented at the City Council strategic planning sessions in 2017.

Supply-side (producer) approaches

- Relax development standards to reduce development costs
- Further streamline development review process / Expand by-right zoning (state may impose on cities anyway)
- More generous project funding/underwriting standards*
- Develop Land Acquisition Assistance Program*
- Condo conversion ordinance update*

Demand-side (consumer) approaches

- Expand down payment & renter assistance programs
- Expand current programs to new income levels (e.g., above 120% AMI)
- Increase Education Programs (financial literacy, homebuyer education, tenant education)*
- BMR expansion (related to proposed Study Issue: CDD-17-07)
- Rent stabilization (related to other proposed Study Issues: CDD 17-03 and CDD 17-06)
- Other mobile home related items (related to proposed Study Issue: CDD 17-05)

*Staff has preliminarily identified these strategies as being the most impactful for Sunnyvale.

What precipitated this study?

There is growing concern about the affordability and availability of housing in Sunnyvale and the region. There are several other proposed study issues focused on specific concerns or solutions; this study is proposed as a more holistic examination of the overall local housing context, to analyze which strategies could be implemented by the City most effectively and to assist the largest number of local residents and/or housing seekers. These strategies could consist of modifications/enhancements to existing housing programs, integration of proposed study issues, introduction of new programs, changes to City policies or regulations, or other strategies.

Planned Completion Year: 2017/2018

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Major

Amount of funding above current budget required: $ 200,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost:
There is minimal capacity in the Community Development Department for housing-related studies this year due to the large number of affordable housing development projects, policy projects, development review-related workload, legislative advocacy and general operational workload currently impacting staff, as described above. The funding would be used to hire one or more specialized consultants with expertise in these areas, such as an economic/financial firm and housing policy/programs firm, as well as short-term provisional or contract staff to manage the consultant contracts, plan and manage public outreach efforts, and respond to public inquiries related to the study. The work of the staff and consultants would be overseen by the Housing Officer.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

Explanation of Cost: The study will include an assessment of existing revenue sources for housing programs and projects, and whether changes in how the various housing activities are administered and/or current City codes or policies could be modified to reduce project or program costs.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: Yes
Council Study Session: Yes
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Housing and Human Services; possibly Planning Commission if changes to zoning regulations are proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Support

Explanation: The study is recommended as an alternative to the other housing-related study issues proposed for 2017 to provide a more comprehensive review of options for improving the production and availability of affordable housing and addressing other areas of public concern related to housing.

Prepared By: Suzanne Ise, Housing Officer
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development
Reviewed By: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

Study Issue Summary Worksheet
2017 Proposed Study Issues

#	Title	Required Staff Effort	Cost of Study	Cost to Implement?*	Dept Rank	B/C Rank
ESD 13-05C	Eco-district Feasibility and Incentives	Major	$50,000	Unknown	2 (Phase 1)	Planning Drop Sustainability 3 of 3
ESD 17-01	Eliminate the Use of Chemical Pesticides on City Owned or Leased Property	Major	$100,000	Unknown	1	Parks + Rec. 2 of 3 Sustainability 1 of 3

*Indicates whether there will be a one-time capital cost and/or ongoing annual costs upon implementation. See Study Issue Paper for detail.

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0797 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
ESD 13-05C

TITLE Eco-district Feasibility and Incentives

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Environmental Services Department
Support Department(s): Community Development

Sponsor(s):
Councilmembers: Griffith, Martin-Milius

History*:
1 year ago: Deferred
2 years ago: Deferred

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
An Eco-district is a neighborhood or district with a broad commitment to accelerate neighborhood-scale sustainability. Eco-districts commit to achieving ambitious sustainability performance goals, guiding district investments and community action, and tracking the results over time. The aim of an Eco-district is to integrate objectives of sustainable development and planning and reduce the ecological footprint of a project.

This study issue would determine the feasibility of the Eco-district concept in Sunnyvale. The study would also identify and make recommendations for incentives the City can offer developers to implement strategies for enhancing neighborhood sustainability, such as energy and water management systems, green streets, and resource conservation; similar to how the City provides FAR incentives for LEED.

What precipitated this study?
Eco-District concepts support many of the policies identified in the City's General Plan and the City's sustainability goals included in the Climate Action Plan. The creation of eco-districts in Sunnyvale could enhance the City's efforts to emphasize unique features of special districts and highlight the City's sustainability and neighborhood values while reducing community greenhouse gas emissions.

Planned Completion Year: 2017

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Major

Amount of funding above current budget required: $50,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost:
As proposed, this study would require significant staff time to complete. The Eco-district concept is a fairly new and emerging concept with limited examples of implementation. Due to staff expertise and workload, it is anticipated that a consultant would be necessary to complete this study. It is anticipated that the cost for a consultant to identify the feasibility and level of incentives necessary to implement an Eco-district in Sunnyvale would be in the ballpark of $50,000. Funding would likely be from the General Fund.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Study would include assessment of potential costs.

Explanation of Cost:
Capital and operating costs could vary considerably depending on the level of City involvement in establishing and administering an Eco-district. Options identified as a result of this study may require additional, substantial funding, as well as operating costs in future years to implement the Eco-district concept. The implementation costs would be incurred through staff time to develop guidelines for the Eco-district strategy and unknown capital and operating costs associated with ongoing implementation and support if the City is an active participant in the strategy. The impact of the study would be realized in potential greenhouse gas reductions as a result of the sustainability measures implemented. This study would support measures identified in the Climate Action Plan, General Plan and Land Use and Transportation Element. Costs associated with the implementation of this study issue would also be based on the incentives identified. Costs may be monetary or in the form of deviations from current development requirements, depending on the outcome of the study.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Planning Commission, Sustainability Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Support Phase 1 of the study

Explanation: Staff recommends a two phased approach for this Study Issue. Phase 1 would consist of an assessment of the alignment of the City's current practices and policies with Eco-District principles and objectives. The City utilizes many strategies to promote sustainable development within Sunnyvale such as specific area planning efforts, implementing and updating the City's Green Building Policy, and updating of the Land Use and Transportation Element. Many of the sustainability goals or objectives included in these plans are similar to common strategies employed by Eco-

Districts. Phase 1 of the study would be an assessment conducted by staff (no more than 100 staff hours). Conducting the Phase 1 assessment would help determine whether or not the City should invest in securing consultant support to conduct Phase 2 and further define the scope of the consultant services needed. The Phase 2 study would include determining feasibility of Eco-District implementation in Sunnyvale and what financial incentives the City could offer to developers. Staff will present the results of the Phase 1 of the study to the City Council and key Boards and Commissions and seek direction for Phase 2 of the study at that time.

Prepared By: Elaine Marshall, Environmental Programs Manager
Reviewed By: John Stufflebean, Director, Environmental Services Department
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development
Reviewed By: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

*Above the Line Three Years Ago: Although ranked and scheduled for study in 2013, City funds were not allocated to conduct the study and instead Council directed staff in 2013 and again in 2014 to seek grant funding to pay for the study. Staff was unable to identify available grant opportunities that aligned with the study objectives. After two years of seeking grant funds, Council directed staff (via RTC No. 15-0012, March 17, 2015) to defer the study issue and present it again for Council consideration at the January 2016 Workshop.

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0938 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
ESD 17-01

TITLE
Eliminate the Use of Chemical Pesticides on City Owned or Leased Property

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Environmental Services
Support Department(s): Public Works, Library and Community Services

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Sustainability Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
The purpose of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the City's current Integrated Pest Management Policy, levels of pesticide use on City property, assess community support for eliminating pesticide use on City property, and identify the potential impact on City operations. Additionally, the study will also consider opportunities for educating residents about chemical pesticide alternatives.

What are the key elements of the study?
- Identify current costs to the City for purchasing and applying pesticides (insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, & rodenticides) that are covered in the Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPM). Separately identify costs of "Pesticides of Concern" and other chemical pesticides (for example glyphosate) used that are not on the 'concern' list. Identify expected net costs of further reducing and eliminating all pesticide use on City property (increased cost of mechanical weed removal, physical barriers, etc. as prescribed in the IPM plan minus savings from not purchasing pesticides).
- Identify benefits to community and environment. These will not be monetized since it is beyond the scope of this study to assess the value of environmental benefits.
- Identify cost of a pilot study in selected parks or City properties to measure costs/savings in a real application.
- Study cost of implementing a public outreach program to encourage pesticide elimination at homes, schools and businesses and provide information on alternative control means.
- Through a survey of residents and businesses, identify level of awareness and concern by the public on this topic and the desire for the City to devote attention to further pesticide reduction and

eventual elimination.
- Benchmark and monitor progress of other cities in the region who have undertaken similar actions.
- Review the City's IPM Plan (effective June 1, 2010) and consider cost/benefit to add:
  1. Public notification prior to the application of pesticides in public areas;
  2. Reporting measures to allow the public to be informed on the quantities of each chemical pesticide used by the City (or associated contractors) on an annual basis; and
  3. Annual targets for reduction of pesticide use down to zero.

What precipitated this study?
Concern that using chemicals to control weeds and pests will contaminate water and soil leading to negative long-term impacts to human health, and non-targeted species (bees, aquatic life, birds, pets, and beneficial insects). Other cities in the region are investigating elimination of pesticides in city parks (Reference Menlo Park action in fall 2015 <http://www.menlopark.org/documentcenter/view/7894>).

Planned Completion Year: 2018

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study
Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Major

Amount of funding above current budget required: $100,000

Funding Source: General Fund

Explanation of Cost:
The Study will be completed with existing staff time and consultant services. While DPW is charged with IPM management and organizational lead, ESD staff will take the lead in evaluating the public outreach aspects of the study and complete a survey of residents and businesses. The consultant, with support and management from ESD and DPW staff, will survey and monitor what other cities in the area have undertaken for similar projects, complete a cost analysis for current practices and possible changes, identify options for a pilot project and costs associated with it. The cost does not anticipate a time-in-motion study to estimate potential cost impacts of chemical alternatives such as mechanical weed removal. The determination of net cost impact of chemical alternatives, as identified in the study scope, would be estimated based on research of cost impacts experienced by the benchmarked communities. Additional funding beyond the $100,000 would be needed to conduct time-in-motion studies and such costs will be included in the development of the potential pilot project to measure costs/savings in a real application as identified in this Study Issue.

Cost to Implement Study Results
Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

Explanation of Cost: Potential costs of implementing study results could include (1) increased operational costs associated with parks and City facilities maintenance associated with manual control of weeds or pests, and/or (2) increased operational costs to fund a pilot project or public education campaign or other public noticing requirements identified.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Sustainability, Parks and Recreation

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Support

Explanation:
The City's current IPM policy has been in place since 2010. City maintenance staff receives annual training on the IPM policy and contractors are required to also comply with the policy when working on City property. In accordance with the IPM policy, pesticides are used only after other controls have been considered and applied. Additionally, the City provides education on IPM at environmental outreach events and participates in regional educational campaigns and hosts sustainable landscaping classes in partnership with the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Associate in spring and fall. While staff believes that the City's IPM Policy has been effective and overall use of pesticides of concern is minimal, staff supports the study and an evaluation of program.

Prepared By: Elaine Marshall, Environmental Programs Manager
Reviewed By: John Stufflebean, Director, Environmental Services
Reviewed By: James Stark, Superintendent of Parks and Golf
Reviewed By: Manual Pineda, Director, Public Works
Reviewed By: Cynthia Bojorquez, Director, Community Services
Reviewed By: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

Study Issue Summary Worksheet
2017 Proposed Study Issues

#	Title	Required Staff Effort	Cost of Study	Cost to Implement?*	Dept Rank	B/C Rank
FIN 17-01	Evaluation of New Revenue Strategies to Fund New and Increasing Service Demands and/or Unfunded Capital Investments	Moderate	$20,000	Unknown	1	N/A

*Indicates whether there will be a one-time capital cost and/or ongoing annual costs upon implementation. See Study Issue Paper for detail.

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-1012 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
FIN 17-01

TITLE
Evaluation of New Revenue Strategies to Fund New and Increasing Service Demands and/or Unfunded Capital Investments

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Finance

Sponsor(s):
City Manager

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
The objective of this study is to develop a revenue strategy that the City can implement in the near future, including a greater diversification of the City's revenues based on locally controlled revenue sources to address unfunded or underfunded programs and projects. As the City continues to grow and evolve the demand for services has also increased and changed. As has been stated over various public presentations, the growth of traditional sources of revenue have not kept pace with the resources necessary to meet the service expectations of our community and to address the delayed/deferred capital projects. Identification of new revenue sources, particularly those which can be under the sole control of the City, is paramount in potentially funding changing and future service and capital investment needs.

As noted in the City Manager's FY2016/17 Recommended Budget, the City is in the process of developing and implementing a number of budgetary strategies to ensure the long-term health of the City including setting aside funding to cover projected personnel cost increases, such as pensions and other post-employment benefits, identifying unfunded or underfunded programs and projects, potentially establishing a pension trust, establishing community benefit programs, utilizing third-party expert investors to manage a portion of the City's investment portfolio, and making investments in key areas (e.g. technology). Some examples of near-term unfunded services/projects that need to be addressed, as well as needed operating expenditures and infrastructure improvements over the next 20 years, include:

- Branch Library Operating and Maintenance Costs

- Transportation Strategic Plan Projects
- Downtown Specific Plan Projects
- Sidewalk Repair
- Water, Wastewater, Stormwater Infrastructure
- Civic Center Modernization
- Fire Station Replacements/Rehabilitation
- Emergency Operations Center

One component of the budgetary strategy to ensure long-term fiscal sustainability is securing stable revenue sources and to further diversity the City's revenue portfolio to fund the items noted above. This study would look at a wide variety of potential revenue sources and evaluate the potential income, future sustainability of the funding source, impact on residents, and potential for success; ultimately resulting in recommendations to Council for consideration.

Some of the strategies, among others that may be examined, include reviewing current taxes such as Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) and Business License Tax for modernization and increase; a Phase 2 of the Utility Users Tax (UUT); parking and franchise fees increases; and a Real Property Transfer Tax. Staff plans to examine these and other potential revenue generating opportunities and bring the most viable options back to Council for consideration prior to the development of the FY 2018/2019 bi-annual operating budget.

Staff also recommends to juxtapose the potential revenue source with the unfunded needs and expenditure increases. For example, a real property transfer tax is an economically sensitive tax where, generally, cities establish a low threshold of deemed ongoing revenue and, for revenue about the low threshold, designate it as one-time revenue. Cities often align this revenue source partially with ongoing operating expenditures and use the designated one-time revenue to cover capital expenditures. This is a prudent strategy for administering sensitive revenue sources.

What precipitated this study?
Like many cities across the country, the City of Sunnyvale faces increasing costs to deliver projects as well as increased demands for service from a growing community. The need to invest in and replace the City's aging infrastructure for projects that have been deferred or unfunded is our problem to solve and setting capacity aside is key to our collective success. However, this work exists in the context of projected increases in cost relative to ongoing personnel and operating costs which further compounds the problem. As these costs are projected to outpace revenue growth, and in order to find capacity to invest in projects and expand the services expected from our community, new revenue sources should be evaluated.

Planned Completion Year: 2017 (potentially 2018 depending on Council input)

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $20,000

Explanation of Cost:

The cost associated with this study is a for consultant services that may be needed to guide a revenue strategy and provide expertise in areas that the City has not explored. Staff time required to research and evaluate the options and fiscal impacts will be absorbed.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: Yes
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: No

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Support

Explanation: As the City continues to face challenges associated increased costs, demands for service, and aging infrastructure, strategic and creative approaches to ensuring long term fiscal sustainability are required. This study will take a detailed look at potential new, ongoing revenue sources that could help fund these under- or unfunded needs.

Prepared By: Brice McQueen, Senior Management Analyst
Reviewed By: Timothy J. Kirby, Director, Finance
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

2017 Proposed Study Issues

HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

NO STUDY ISSUES PROPOSED

City of Sunnyvale

2017 Proposed Study Issues

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT

NO STUDY ISSUES PROPOSED

Study Issue Summary Worksheet
2017 Proposed Study Issues

#	Title	Required Staff Effort	Cost of Study	Cost to Implement?*	Dept Rank	B/C Rank
LCS 17-02	Potential Membership in the Global Network of Age-Friendly Cities and Communities (GNAFCC)	Moderate to High	$0	Unknown	1	Parks + Rec. 1 of 3

*Indicates whether there will be a one-time capital cost and/or ongoing annual costs upon implementation. See Study Issue Paper for detail.

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0912 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
LCS 17-02

TITLE Potential Membership in the Global Network of Age-Friendly Cities and Communities (GNAFCC)

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Library and Community Services
Support Department(s): Public Works; Community Development

Sponsor(s):
City Manager

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
In order to assist cities to become more age-friendly and to facilitate mutual learning and support, the World Health Organization (WHO) established the Global Network of Age-friendly Cities and Communities (GNAFCC) in 2010. Cities in the network commit to continuously assess and improve their age-friendliness and to adapt their structures, policies, settings and services to be accessible to, and inclusive of, older people with different needs and capacities. An “age-friendly city” is defined as an inclusive and accessible community environment that optimizes opportunities for health, participation and security for all people, so that quality of life and dignity are ensured as people age.

Locally, Santa Clara County has launched an initiative, “Age Friendly Silicon Valley” with a goal of all 15 cities in the County becoming active members of the GNAFCC. To join the network, cities must:

1. Complete an online application form;
2. Attach a letter from the Mayor and municipal administration indicating their commitment to a cycle of continuous improvement in implementing best practices of age-friendly cities; and
3. Commence the network cycle of four steps as follows:
    a. Establishment of mechanisms to involve older people throughout the Age-friendly Cities and Communities cycle.
    b. Development of a baseline assessment of the age-friendliness of the city/community in 8 domains:
        i. Outdoor spaces and buildings;
        ii. Transportation;

iii. Housing;
iv. Social participation;
v. Respect and social inclusion;
vi. Civic participation and employment;
vii. Communication and information; and
viii. Community support and health services.

c. Development of a 3-year city-wide action plan based on the findings of this assessment. A minimum submission of one age-friendly practice per year is expected in order to maintain on-going membership in the network; and
d. Identification of indicators to monitor progress against this plan.

The County of Santa Clara has asked that the City of Sunnyvale join the Age Friendly Silicon Valley initiative and seek membership in the network by July, 2017. As of early October 2016, of the 15 cities in Santa Clara County, four cities (Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Morgan Hill and Saratoga) have already become members with an additional five cities (Cupertino, Los Gatos, Mountain View, San Jose and Santa Clara) currently studying the issue.

It is estimated that approximately 11% of the total population in Sunnyvale is 65 years and older. Over the next 20 years, that number is estimated to grow to approximately 34% according to the 2015 American Community Survey. As such, access to best practices and a shared information network would be of significant value to the City.

The proposed study issue would evaluate:

1. Benefits and considerations related to becoming a GNAFCC member;
2. Costs and strategies for conducting the baseline assessment of age-friendliness in the eight identified domains;
3. Identification of potential age-friendly practices that could be implemented in Sunnyvale over the following three years as required for membership; and
4. Status of County-wide participation in meeting the July 2017 timeline for membership and the City of Sunnyvale's ability to meet that deadline.

What precipitated this study?
A request to join the Age Friendly Silicon Valley Initiative led by the Santa Clara County Department of Aging and Adult Services.

Planned Completion Year: 2017

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate to High

Amount of funding above current budget required: $0

Explanation of Cost:
Staff time in conducting and preparing the study issue. Study issue will require literature review, a self-assessment and review of "Age Friendly City" models established nationwide

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs. The potential workload and impact associated with becoming an active member of the GNAFCC may be significant.

Explanation of Cost: The WHO has created a checklist of essential features of Age-Friendly cities. This checklist provides indicators in each of the 8 domains and is intended to be used by cities with the involvement of older persons as full partners in the completion of the self-assessment. The complete checklist can be found at: (http://www.who.int/ageing/publications/Age_friendly_cities_checklist.pdf?ua=1)

The potential cost for improvements would depend on the self-assessment and the City's interests in each of the 8 domains.

Based on review of different "Age Friendly City" models established nationwide, costs could include infrastructure improvements to enhance accessibility; new programs and/or services to enhance health and wellness of older adults; training resources to enhance staff awareness of age related issues and concerns; coordination of services with community partners; and implementation and enforcement of policies in support of an "Age Friendly City" designation.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Parks and Recreation Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Support

Explanation: Study issue process will provide staff with details to make an informed recommendation as to whether the City should pursue the "Age Friendly" designation. "Age Friendly City" is a nationwide initiative and over 40 cities throughout the US have received the designation. The County of Santa Clara is seeking to become the first county in the country with active membership from each city in its jurisdiction. However, the potential workload associated with becoming an active member of the GNAFCC may be significant. Consequently, it is recommended that a study issue of the impact of membership be conducted in order to appropriately respond to the County's request within the context of existing policy and operational priorities underway.

Prepared By: Gerard Manuel, Community Services Manager
Prepared By: Daniel Wax, Community Services Superintendent
Reviewed By: Cynthia E. Bojorquez, Director, Library and Community Services
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

2017 Proposed Study Issues

NOVA WORKFORCE SERVICES

NO STUDY ISSUES PROPOSED

Study Issue Summary Worksheet
2017 Proposed Study Issues

#	Title	Required Staff Effort	Cost of Study	Cost to Implement?*	Dept Rank	B/C Rank
DPS 17-01	Regulation of Marijuana Cultivation in the City of Sunnyvale for Research and Development and Medical Marijuana Cultivation for Personal Use	Moderate	$0	Unknown	Defer	Planning Drop
DPS 17-02	Bicycle and Pedestrian Collision Analysis	Moderate	$25,000	Unknown	Drop	BPAC 3 of 4

*Indicates whether there will be a one-time capital cost and/or ongoing annual costs upon implementation. See Study Issue Paper for detail.

City of Sunnyvale

Study Issues Status Report
Public Safety

Continuing Study Issues

Number	Name ***Continuing Status***
	N/A

Completed Study Issues

Number	Name	Status
DPS 15-01C	Prohibit Smoking Inside All Units and in Common Areas of Multi-Family Residences (Included in this study was OCA 14-03C (*b*))	Completed 2/9/2016
DPS 15-02C	Car/Ride Share Impacts on Taxicab Franchises and Review of Taxicab Franchise Regulations	Completed 2/9/2016

City of Sunnyvale

REVISED
2/10/17

Agenda Item

16-0435 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPS 17-01

TITLE Regulation of Marijuana Cultivation in the City of Sunnyvale for Research and Development and Medical Marijuana Cultivation for Personal Use

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Public Safety
Support Department(s): Community Development, Office of the City Attorney

Sponsor(s):
Councilmembers: Griffith, Tara Martin-Milius

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
The study will examine possible revisions to the current Municipal Code regulations in Title 9 (Public Peace, Safety or Welfare**)** and Title 19 (Zoning) governing Medical Marijuana Cultivation for Personal Use and the cultivation of Marijuana for Research and Development purposes.

What precipitated this study?
The study issue arose out of discussion during the April 12, 2016 Council Meeting regarding the proposed prohibition of all medical marijuana activities within the City. Members of the public requested consideration for exceptions to a complete prohibition for personal cultivation and research and development.

Planned Completion Year: 2018

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study
Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $0

Funding Source: N/A

Explanation of Cost: Staff costs related to research and preparation of the study issue will be

absorbed by the individual departments.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

Explanation of Cost: Potential costs may include operating costs related to staff response for permitting and enforcement.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Planning Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Defer

Explanation: As mentioned in the City Manager's memo, at times, study issue papers require a revisit prior to the study/budget issues workshop. Originally sponsored in April, this study issue paper was finalized and published in June 2016.

The longstanding marijuana policy in Sunnyvale has been to prohibit medical marijuana dispensaries and other medical marijuana-related commercial activities such as cultivation, sales and delivery. However, the passage of Proposition 64 in November, which legalized recreational marijuana, necessitates immediate updates to the City's existing marijuana ordinance to ensure that the City retains its desired level of local control over marijuana. Staff plans to bring forward a clean-up ordinance in 2017 to:

- Align existing regulations, which prohibit personal cultivation of medical marijuana, with state law, which allows personal cultivation of up to six marijuana plants; and
- Clarify, before the state begins issuing licenses to marijuana businesses in 2018, that the existing prohibition on commercial marijuana activities applies to recreational as well as medical marijuana.

To the extent the Council desires more detailed discussion, 2018 may be more appropriate, as the state is currently drafting regulations for permitting marijuana activities that are not anticipated to be effective until early 2018. Deferring consideration will allow the City time to review the state program and processes and provide Council with more definitive information regarding the state process for regulating marijuana activities.

Prepared By: Frank J. Grgurina, Director, Public Safety
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development
Reviewed By: Melissa Tronquet, Assistant City Attorney
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

REVISED
12/14/16

Agenda Item

16-0927 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPS 17-02

TITLE Bicycle and Pedestrian Collision Analysis

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Public Safety
Support Department(s): Public Works

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
The study would evaluate the options available to the City Council in adopting a policy for investigating all collisions involving bicyclists or pedestrians. The Department of Public Safety (DPS), with assistance from the Department of Public Works (DPW), would analyze each bicycle or pedestrian collision and determine the leading factor of the collision. The collisions would be summarized and provided periodically to the BPAC.

The assessment of the collision would include identification of any potential counter-measure that could have prevented the collision. Examples of potential counter-measures include engineering design modifications, education, and enforcement. The study would also include specific provisions for periodical reports to the BPAC on the findings and the required format of the reports. The BPAC specifically referred to the City of Mountain View collision reports (both in format and frequency) as an example that should be explored for Sunnyvale as part the Study Issue.

What precipitated this study?
The City is in the process of hiring a consultant to develop a Vision Zero Plan. The BPAC believes that a policy for investigating all collisions involving bicyclists or pedestrians, and the subsequent reporting provision could aid in achieving the Vision Zero Plan goals.

Planned Completion Year: 2018

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $25,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost:
The funding will be used to hire a consultant to review the existing process and draft the policy.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs

Explanation of Cost: Unsure if any additional cost would be identified beyond the costs for future projects that are already identified as part of the current process.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Drop

Explanation: Under City Charter Section 802 “City Manager Powers and Duties”, the City Manager is the head of the administrative branch of the City government and is responsible for the proper administration of all affairs of the City, therefore a new policy is not necessary. DPS already has current policies and practices in place directing the investigation of all reported collisions including bicycle and pedestrian related collisions. The information gained from the reports is utilized to direct specific enforcement activity with the Traffic Unit and those assigned to the Bureau of Police Services. The information is also shared with DPW (Traffic and Transportation Division) for review of any possible roadway improvements. Moreover, under Sunnyvale Municipal Code Chapter 10.08 the City’s traffic engineer has the power and duty to place and maintain official traffic control devices when required. If possible improvements are identified, DPW immediately implements lower cost improvements (such as minor striping modifications) or pursues grant funding or a capital project if it is higher cost (such as a major signal modification). All reported and investigated injury and non-injury accidents are reported to the California Highway Patrol.

DPS will continue to review reporting data methods and make any needed changes to improve accuracy of data. In comparison to the referenced report from the City of Mountain View, the reporting information provided by the City of Sunnyvale contains much of the same information, but in a different viewing format. The viewing format style cannot be changed given the parameters of the City’s software system. Currently the reports are provided to the BPAC once a year, however DPS staff is willing to provide the reports quarterly and attend future quarterly BPAC meetings to explain the information and answer any questions about the data that might help the BPAC on future Bicycle and Pedestrian Policy discussions. DPS and DPW will continue to analyze the data at the staff level and determine if modifications or improvements are required per the City Charter and Municipal Code.

Prepared By: Frank Grgurina, Director, Department of Public Safety
Prepared By: Manuel Pineda, Director, Department of Public Works
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

Study Issue Summary Worksheet
2017 Proposed Study Issues

#	Title	Required Staff Effort	Cost of Study	Cost to Implement?*	Dept Rank	B/C Rank
DPW 13-10C	Pilot Bicycle Boulevard Project on East-West and North-South Routes	Major	$100,000	Some cost	Drop	BPAC Drop
DPW 16-10	Consider Sunnyvale Municipal Code Amendments to Clarify, Strengthen and Enforce Tree Preservation and Tree Planting Requirements within Right of Way and Public and Private Property	Major	$100,000	Unknown	Defer	Planning 6 of 6 Sustainability 2 of 3
DPW 17-01	Develop Implementation Standards for Cycle Tracks / Separated Bikeways	Major	$75,000	Unknown	Drop	BPAC 4 of 4
DPW 17-02	Develop Implementation Standards for "Bicycles May Use Full Lane" Regulatory Sign	Moderate	$25,000	Unknown	Drop	BPAC 2 of 4
DPW 17-05	Orchard Heritage Park and Heritage Park Museum - Analysis and Options for the Long-Term Operations and Maintenance of Orchard Heritage Park and Review of the Sunnyvale Historical Society and Museum Association Proposed Expansion of the Sunnyvale Heritage Park Museum Site	Moderate	$350,000	Unknown	Defer	Parks + Rec. 3 of 3
DPW 17-07	Develop Mobile Version of Sunnyvale Bicycle Map	Moderate	$25,000	Unknown	1	BPAC 1 of 4
DPW 17-11	Exploration of Creating Usable Open Space over Portions of Central Expressway	Major	$750,000	Unknown	Drop	Parks + Rec. Drop BPAC Drop
DPW 17-12	Evaluate the Development of a Class I Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail along Evelyn Avenue adjacent to the Caltrain Railroad Tracks, Between Sunnyvale and Mountain View	Major	$100,000	Unknown	2	Too late to rank
DPW 17-13	Investigate the Purchase of the Court House Property Located at 605 W. El Camino Real	Moderate	$25,000	Unknown	Defer	Too late to rank

*Indicates whether there will be a one-time capital cost and/or ongoing annual costs upon implementation. See Study Issue Paper for detail.

City of Sunnyvale

Study Issues Status Report
Public Works

Continuing Study Issues

Number	Name ***Continuing Status***
DPW 14-13C	Scoping of Grade Separations for Caltrain Crossings at Mary Avenue and Sunnyvale Avenue *Completed RFP process, negotiations with the lowest and responsive bidder currently underway. Upon Council approval of an award of contract, it is anticipated the study would begin early 2017.*
DPW 16-01C	Develop a Vision Zero Plan-Total Elimination of Traffic Fatalities *RFPs are due November 16, 2016. Upon Council approval of an award of contract, it is anticipated the study would begin spring 2017.*

Completed Study Issues

Number	Name	Status
DPW 14-14C	Optimization of Wolfe Road for Neighborhood and Commuters via Reconfiguration and Signalization	Completed 6/21/2016
DPW 15-03C	Determine Steps to Move Forward to Becoming a Silver Level in the League of American Bicyclists - Bicycle Friendly Communities	Completed 4/19/2016
DPW 15-09C	Feasibility of Establishing a Park Mitigation Fee for Non-residential Development	Completed 6/28/2016
DPW 15-10C	Relocation of the Butcher House to Heritage Garden Park and Review of the Need for a Retaining Wall	Completed 7/26/2016

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0795 **Agenda Date:** 2/3/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPW 13-10C

TITLE Pilot Bicycle Boulevard Project on East-West and North-South Routes

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Public Works
Support Department(s): N/A

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

***History**:
1 year ago: Deferred
2 years ago: Deferred

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
This study would develop a plan for construction of north-south and east-west bicycle boulevards in two Sunnyvale corridors as a pilot project for evaluation of the impact of bicycle boulevard treatments. Roadway operations, maintenance, emergency vehicle access, community acceptance, and effectiveness for encouraging bicycling and improving bicycle safety could be potential evaluation measures. The outcome of the study would be consideration by the City Council of a pilot project to construct and evaluate additional bicycle boulevards.

What precipitated this study?
BPAC would like to add additional treatments for bicycle facilities which will help increase bicycle infrastructure and ridership.

Planned Completion Year: 2018

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study
Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Major

Amount of funding above current budget required: $100,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement.

Explanation of Cost:

Work with BPAC to identify study corridors and design concepts and conduct neighborhood public outreach. Consultant services are required to design the bike boulevard concepts and conduct community outreach efforts. Staff will be required to work with the consultant on developing and reviewing concepts and conducting community outreach

Cost to Implement Study Results

Some cost to implement.

Explanation of Cost: This study could result in the approval of new capital projects. Depending upon the length of the bicycle boulevard corridors and the number of features incorporated into the project concepts, costs of a capital project could reach hundreds of thousands of dollars.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Drop

Explanation: Staff is currently pursuing Grant Opportunities to consolidate the following comprehensive safety plans/studies; 1) Bicycle Plan, 2) Pedestrian Safety and Opportunities Study, 3) Safe Routes to School Study. Staff expects to complete a comprehensive review of the bicycle masterplan in the next two years. Further, staff is currently working on a number of significant road-diets and bicycle projects on Mary, Maude, Fair Oaks and the East-West Channels; and is currently seeking an Active Transportation Program (ATP) grant funds for the study and implementation of Bike Boulevards within the SNAIL Neighborhood. Completing these projects and actions will provide more opportunity and guidance regarding the possible implementation of Bicycle Boulevards in the City.

Prepared By: Manuel Pineda, Director, Public Works
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

*Above the Line Three Years Ago: Although ranked and scheduled for study in 2013, City funds were not allocated to conduct the study and instead Council directed staff in 2013 and again in 2014 to seek grant funding to pay for the study. Staff was unable to identify available grant opportunities that aligned with the study objectives. After two years of seeking grant funds, Council directed staff (via RTC 15-0012, March 17, 2015) to defer the study issue and present it again for Council consideration at the January 2016 Workshop. This item was deferred to 2017 as part of the 2016 Workshop.

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0796 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPW 16-10

TITLE Consider Sunnyvale Municipal Code Amendments to Clarify, Strengthen and Enforce Tree Preservation and Tree Planting Requirements within Right of Way and Public and Private Property

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Public Works
Support Department(s): Community Development, Office of the City Attorney

Sponsor(s):
Councilmembers: Meyering, Whittum

History:
1 year ago: Deferred
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
The intent of the study is to identify Sunnyvale Municipal Code (SMC) changes to clarify, strengthen and enforce tree preservation and planting requirements within public and private property. The study issue is intended to implement and support actions from the Sunnyvale Urban Forest Management Plan (UFMP), which was adopted by the City Council on September 16, 2014. The urban forest is comprised of three main groups of trees:

1. Trees located on City-owned property, including parks;
2. Trees located adjacent to private property in the public right-of-way (ROW); and
3. Trees located on private property (outside of the ROW).

The study would involve review of existing ordinances and policies related to trees, and may include revisions to strengthen the following Chapters of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code:

13.16 *City Trees*
19.37 *Landscaping, Irrigation and Useable Open Space*
19.94 *Tree Preservation*

What precipitated this study?
The Sunnyvale Urban Forest Advocates (SUFA) submitted a request for a Study Issue to further strengthen and support the need to maintain trees in Sunnyvale. As SUFA stated in their submittal to Council, they “would like to have the health, social, economic and energy of trees better understood

and more greatly appreciated" and the Study Issue would "be initiated to review, update, revise and expand (so as to strengthen) the ordinances pertaining to trees."

Planned Completion Year: 2018

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Major

Amount of funding above current budget required: $100,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement.

Explanation of Cost: Major modifications to the municipal code usually require a significant effort to identify sections that need to be modified, draft appropriate language, coordinate with appropriate City Departments and the City Attorney's Office, and community outreach to ensure that affected or interested parties participate in the process. Staff does not have the capacity to absorb this work within existing resources.

Staff would need to manage the consultant contract and work closely with the consultant in identifying proposed changes, developing new language, and conducting community outreach.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

Explanation of Cost: Depending on the outcome of the study, additional staff resources may be needed to administer SMC amendments and to enforce and monitor new requirements.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Planning Commission, Sustainability Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Defer

Explanation: The UFMP's major goals as stated on page 5, of the plan include:

- Increase tree canopy cover to maximize ecosystem benefits provided by the urban forest.
- Choose and locate new trees in all vacant planting spaces to maximize tree-related benefits and minimize maintenance costs.
- Develop an urban forest canopy that is stable over the long term.
- Maintain street trees appropriately to maximize benefits and minimize hazard.
- Facilitate collaboration among City departments related to issues and projects involving trees.
- Foster community support for maintaining and improving Sunnyvale's urban forest.
- Encourage proper tree management on private property.

As part of the Report to Council for approval of the UFMP, staff stated that they would develop an operational implementation and monitoring plan to ensure that the goals are achieved. This included consideration of revisions to existing ordinances and policies that address trees in Sunnyvale, including SMC chapters 13.16-*City Trees*, 19.94-*Tree Preservation*, and 19.38.70d-*Landscaping, Irrigation and Useable Open Space*, to ensure they are current and reflective of City policies, practices and the rest of the municipal code. The tree replacement requirements, enabled in the Tree Preservation chapter of the zoning code, were updated in 2015 to require significantly larger replacement trees as a condition of approval for most tree removal permits. Staff is in process of developing an implementation priority plan, and it is expected that modification of the SMC will be included as part of the plan.

In addition to the UFMP, the Climate Action Plan also recognizes the important role trees play in mitigating climate change. Reduction Measure OS-3 focuses on increasing the number of shade trees planted in the community and protecting the existing tree stock and includes the following actions that can be supported by this Study Issue:

- OS-3.1 Continue to implement the City's Tree Preservation requirements.
- OS-3.2 Develop and implement canopy coverage requirements for City-owned parking lots, with exceptions for solar installations.
- OS-3.3 Promote tree planting on private property through incentive and support programs.
- OS-3.4 Expand existing park, open space, and boulevard tree inventory through the replacement of trees with a greater number of trees when trees are removed due to disease, park development, or other reasons.
- OS-3.5 Clarify codes and policies to maximize the preservation of the largest longest-living trees, and ensure the expansion of the urban forest over time as appropriate for the site.

This is an opportunity to make sure there is alignment between the UFMP and the CAP while making sure that there is an appropriate operational and monitoring plan to ensure that the goals are achieved. However, this process will be a significant work effort that will include staff from multiple departments and consultant services, and there are already a number of other priorities and projects that will use similar resources (such as CAP implementation). However, both CDD and DPW are in the process of hiring additional staff funded by the development enterprise fund and approved as part of the operating budget. Deferring will allow for some existing priorities to be completed, allow new staff to integrate into the City and "catch up" on existing needs, and provide enough future capacity to complete proactive policy work as proposed in the Study Issue.

Prepared By: Manuel Pineda, Director, Public Works
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0524 **Agenda Date:** 2/3/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPW 17-01

TITLE Develop Implementation Standards for Cycle Tracks / Separated Bikeways

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Public Works
Support Department(s): N/A

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
This study would evaluate the pros and cons of Class IV bikeways known as cycle tracks or separated bikeways. In addition, the study would develop standards or guidelines which would aid in the determination of the best locations to implement cycle tracks within the City of Sunnyvale.

What precipitated this study?
Interest in cycle tracks is a growing trend and is used as a way to accommodate novice bicyclists by providing complete separation from motor vehicle traffic. The Protected Bikeways Act of 2014 established Class IV bikeways for California and required Caltrans to establish design criteria for them. However, these facilities have to be balanced with possible safety hazards and other adverse traffic issues. BPAC would like the City to develop procedures and guidelines for the design and placement of cycle tracks in order to ensure any decision to implement them will be made with the full understanding of its benefits and drawbacks.

Planned Completion Year: 2018

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study
Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Major

Amount of funding above current budget required: $75, 000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost:
The cost associated with the study is for consultant services. The study would examine the potential benefits and drawbacks, design guideline and standards, and expected costs for various types of separated bike lanes/cycle tracks like one way protected cycle tracks, raised cycle tracks, two way cycle tracks, and contra flow cycle tracks. Staff would be responsible in guiding the consultant in the development and ultimately approving the standards. It is unlikely that this process would develop or replace standards and guidelines that already exist. Instead this would be expected to be a repackaging of existing information into Sunnyvale specific standards. However, we would anticipate that it will require a community engagement process to include all interested parties including property owners, schools, and advocacy groups.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown; study would include assessment of potential costs.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Drop

Explanation: Comprehensive design and placement guidelines for various types of cycle tracks or separated bikeways are given in Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) "Separated Bike Lane Planning and Design Guide", and also in National Association of City Transportation officials' (NACTO) "Urban Bikeway Design Guide".
Should there be an opportunity; staff would use the above guide manuals to implement separated bikeways or cycle tracks in the City. It would not be a best use of funding and staff time to develop additional standards beyond already those established and already in use by many jurisdictions. Staff's priority is identifying a location and pursuing grants for a pilot project as discussed with Council during the bicycle Study Session on March 15, 2016. In addition as part of the Capital Budget Cycle staff will propose to update the City Bicycle Masterplan. This will be a great opportunity to discuss the benefits and concerns of separated bikeways and identify corridors that might be appropriate.

Prepared By: Carol Shariat, Principal Transportation Engineer/Planner
Reviewed By: Shahid Abbas, Transportation and Traffic Manager
Reviewed By: Manuel Pineda, Director, Public Works
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0525 **Agenda Date:** 2/3/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPW 17-02

TITLE Develop Implementation Standards for “Bicycles May Use Full Lane” Regulatory Sign

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Public Works
Support Department(s): N/A

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
The study would develop standards for when to use and where to place California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD) Regulatory 4-11 (R 4-11) “Bicycles May Use Full Lane” signs within the City of Sunnyvale. For this study, the placement of the signs would only be considered along arterials and collectors at locations most often where the travel lanes are too narrow for bicyclists and motor vehicles operate side by side with bicyclists or on roadways with no bicycle lanes or usable adjacent shoulders for the bicyclists.

What precipitated this study?
BPAC would like to provide a safer riding experience for bicyclists within Sunnyvale where there are no Class II bike lanes. Often time’s motorists do not understand that bicyclists can ride in the travel lane and they can become hostile towards the bicyclist riding in the travel lane. BPAC would like these signs installed at the appropriate locations on arterials and collectors within Sunnyvale to remind motorists they need to share the road.

Planned Completion Year: 2018

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study
Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $25,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost:
The cost associated with this will be for consultant services. The consultant will review the existing regulations and guidelines as given in California Vehicle Code (CACVC), and California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CAMUTCD), and develop guidelines for placement of these signs on City streets.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown; implementation costs will be site and project specific.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Drop

Explanation: Design and placement guidelines of these signs are already established per the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD). Per the Municipal Code staff uses CA MUTCD for evaluation and placement of these signs on City streets. The City follows MUTCD and already uses the signs when they meet the guidelines.

Prepared By: Carol Shariat, Principal Transportation Engineer/Planner
Reviewed By: Shahid Abbas, Transportation and Traffic Manager
Reviewed By: Manuel Pineda, Director, Public Works
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0566 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPW 17-05

TITLE Orchard Heritage Park and Heritage Park Museum - Analysis and Options for the Long-Term Operations and Maintenance of Orchard Heritage Park and Review of the Sunnyvale Historical Society and Museum Association Proposed Expansion of the Sunnyvale Heritage Park Museum Site

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Public Works
Support Department(s): N/A

Sponsor(s):
City Manager, Deanna J. Santana

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
Orchard Operations and Maintenance
The Council has expressed interest in analyzing options for the future operations and maintenance of the Orchard. The Orchard is currently maintained by volunteer work and no long-term operational plan has been developed, yet.

Expansion of the Sunnyvale Heritage Park Museum Site
The Sunnyvale Historical Society and Museum Association (SHSMA) expressed interest in exploring the possibility of expanding the museum grounds at Orchard Heritage Park further east to Michelangelo Drive. The purpose of the expansion would be to accommodate additional items such as exhibits, historical structures, a windmill and ultimately creating one cohesive location including the orchard. The expansion will require the removal of trees in the orchard.

Study
If approved, this study would engage the community, stakeholders, and current operators and volunteers to:

1. Identify long-term options for operating and maintaining the orchard.
2. Review concepts to expand the current Museum facility, including the identification of boundary limits.

Staff would hire a consultant to develop concepts for site plans, identify utility needs, review CEQA, assess potential costs, and complete a community engagement process.

What precipitated this study?
In 2015, Council approved Study Issue DPW 15-10 which analyzed the potential of relocating the Butcher House to Orchard Heritage Park. On April 5, 2016, staff presented Council with three alternatives which included locating the Butcher House within the orchard, locating the Butcher House to the lawn area across from the museum, or not relocating the Butcher House (RTC 16-0182). Council discussed the alternatives and members of the public spoke regarding the various options. Representatives of the museum also spoke and clarified that they would only proceed with moving the Butcher House if it was relocated to their preferred location in the orchard. A motion for Alternative 1, to relocate the Butcher House within the orchard (the location preferred by the Historical Society), failed on a 3-3 vote.

Since SHSMA indicated they would not support moving the Butcher House to the lawn area across from the museum, Council requested staff to meet with them and see if any other options were available to relocate the Butcher House to Orchard Heritage Park without removing any apricot trees. Staff held a meeting with the SHSMA on May 3, 2016, and the SHSMA reiterated they did not support moving the Butcher House anywhere else except for in the orchard because it does not align with their vision of expanding the museum grounds to Michelangelo Drive. On July 26, 2016, the City Council rescinded its previous Council action and took action to not relocate the Butcher House.

On multiple occasions Council has also expressed concern and interest regarding the long-term viability of the orchard, and the development of a plan for future operations and maintenance. It would be most appropriate to combine both these items into one study, as each decision would affect the other.

Planned Completion Year: FY 2018/2019

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $350,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost:
The cost identified above is for consultant services that are necessary to complete the work effort. The consultant team will require many different levels of expertise including land use, engineering, environmental, economics, and community outreach. The Department of Public Works (DPW) would be responsible for managing the project which includes developing a scope of work, hiring a consultant, managing the consultant, reviewing all work products, participating in all necessary public outreach as well as presentations to commissions and City Council. There has been significant public feedback with regards to the orchard and museum and staff anticipates that this Study Issue will require a community engagement process beyond what is required for a typical Study Issue.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown; study would include assessment of potential costs.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Parks and Recreation Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Defer

Explanation: There has been a significant amount of discussion regarding the orchard and museum for the past year, and the development of an overall vision and a plan for future operations and maintenance would provide benefits to guide future decisions. However, at this time, the immediate improvements that the Council prioritized are underway and overall the orchard and museum are both relatively functioning. The orchard continues to be well maintained and is an asset to the City. The museum is also a City asset, and staff is moving forward with relocating the City maintenance facility and constructing permanent improvements to further enhance the site. The study issue does have benefits, but the project would be a significant effort that will include a number of staff already working on many other City major priority projects and, the trade-off of reassigning capacity to this effort, does not outweigh the need to focus on other significant capital projects. These include the reconstruction of the Water pollution Control Plant, the branch library, reconstruction of Lakewood Park, Washington Community Swim Center, and the Community Center. Similarly to the branch library where we had to delay Fair Oaks Park improvements to focus on the branch library, the same would need to be done to absorb this effort. The level of effort required for this study issue could require re-shuffling of City project priorities and schedules.

Prepared By: Craig Mobeck, Assistant Director of Public Works
Reviewed By: Manuel Pineda, Director of Public Works
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0888 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPW 17-07

TITLE Develop Mobile Version of Sunnyvale Bicycle Map

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Public Works
Support Department(s): Information Technology

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
The study would evaluate the feasibility of developing and maintaining a mobile application of the Sunnyvale Bicycle Map. The study will also identify the essential features of a mobile application, develop a cost estimate, and determine the need for distribution of hard copies of the bike map in the presence of a mobile application.

What precipitated this study?
The Sunnyvale Bicycle Map is currently available on line in pdf version, and also as a paper copy document. The map is currently updated every 10 years; a mobile application will allow City to update the map more frequently. Usage of mobile application is increasingly prevalent among Sunnyvale residents and visitors; since many cyclists carry smartphones having a mobile version of the map would therefore be useful.

Planned Completion Year: 2019

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study
Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $25,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost:
The cost associated with this will be for consultant services. The consultant will need to gather and evaluate the existing and future data of the City's bicycle network, do research on existing mobile applications, GIS map layers and recommend necessary features to include in the mobile applications, and determine costs for development and subsequent maintenance of the mobile application.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Support

Explanation: A mobile application could allow staff to keep the bike map updated more regularly, and could provide useful information like travel times, route navigation, and popular routes to the bicyclists. In addition, it could save the City the expense of printing and updating the bike map using consulting services.

Prepared By: Carol Shariat, Principal Transportation Engineer/Planner
Reviewed By: Shahid Abbas, Transportation and Traffic Manager
Reviewed By: Manuel Pineda, Director, Public Works
Reviewed By: Kathleen Boutté Foster, Chief Information Officer
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0986 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPW 17-11

TITLE Exploration of Creating Usable Open Space over Portions of Central Expressway

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Department of Public Works
Support Department(s): N/A

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Planning Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
Usable open space is valuable to the community, but it can be difficult to acquire the land necessary to develop new usable open space in a built-out community. The concept of building usable open space over a below grade road is a concept discussed by the Planning Commission that has the potential to enhance the look of an existing neighborhood, connect spaces, and utilize land for multiple purposes.

Central Expressway, which is owned and maintained by the County of Santa Clara, spans through the City and has segments that are below grade. These grade separations create distances between streets that would otherwise be adjacent or part of the same neighborhood. Creating usable open space at grade levels above Central Expressway may have the potential to unite those neighborhoods, enhance the pedestrian or bicyclist experience and create usable open space for the community.

An effort like this is complex and extends well beyond the City of Sunnyvale to accomplish. In addition, the ultimate effort would not be subject to Planning Commission review or approval. If the Commission sponsors the study issue, staff recommends the initial effort be limited to a feasibility study of the potential for the improvements to be made.

The feasibility analysis may include:

- Discussion with the County of Santa Clara to determine interest in this concept;
- Consideration of locations along Central Expressway where this type of development may be appropriate;

- Feasibility studies on how this type of development over a roadway may be possible including review of the engineering opportunities and limitations within the expressway;
- Community outreach to determine if this is a desired outcome of the neighborhoods adjacent to Central Expressway; and
- Information on the cost and time-frame that a project of this nature would entail.

What precipitated this study?
The Planning Commission sponsored this study issue after discussions on the necessity of usable public open space and the lack of available land that may be used for public open space.

Planned Completion Year: 2019

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Major

Amount of funding above current budget required: $750,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost:
The cost would be for consultant support services. The consultant would be responsible for reviewing the engineering feasibility of the project and develop conceptual cost estimates. Engineering feasibility would be complex as it would require an analysis of multiple elements including existing and future grades, utilities, roadway options and connections, and what changes would be required for the expressway to meet life and safety requirements to function as a covered roadway. The consultant would also be the lead in coordinating with the County and lead a community outreach process. Staff would manage the consultant contract, review all the engineering documents, participate in all outreach and coordination meetings, and determine overall feasibility.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Study would include assessment of potential costs

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: Yes
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: BPAC and PRC

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Drop

Explanation: Construction of usable land over an existing high-volume roadway may have positive effects, but it would be very complex and expensive to develop. Even though Central Expressway runs through the City of Sunnyvale, it is maintained and owned by the County of Santa Clara, and use of the areas above or around the roadway would require authorization and potential creation of

easements in order to grant Sunnyvale permission to construct open space in these areas. Even if a feasible alternative could be developed that was agreeable to the County and community, the cost at a minimum would be in the tens of millions, and there is no funding source that can be reasonably identified in the next 10-20 years.

Prepared By: Amber Blizinski, Principal Planner, Community Development Department
Prepared By: Manuel Pineda, Public Works Director
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Community Development Director
Reviewed By: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

17-0111 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPW 17-12

TITLE Evaluate the Development of a Class I Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail along Evelyn Avenue adjacent to the Caltrain Railroad Tracks, Between Sunnyvale and Mountain View

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Public Works
Support Department(s): N/A

Sponsor(s):
Councilmembers: Klein, Melton, Larsson

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
The study will evaluate the proposed implementation of a Class I Bicycle Trail along Evelyn Avenue adjacent to the Caltrain Railroad tracks that will connect Downtown Sunnyvale with Mountain View. Removal of the existing Class II Bicycle Lanes on Evelyn Avenue and restriping of the roadway will be needed to accommodate the proposed Class I Bicycle Trail.

What precipitated this study?
The study was proposed by Councilmember Klein and co-sponsored by Vice Mayor Larsson and Councilmember Melton during the annual public hearing on January 10, 2017. Councilmember Klein discussed this as an opportunity to create a pedestrian and bike friendly connection between Downtown Sunnyvale and Downtown Mountain View and connect two Caltrain Stations.

Planned Completion Year: 2019

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study
Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Major

Amount of funding above current budget required: $100,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost:
The cost associated with the study is for consultant services. The study, in coordination with the City of Mountain View and Caltrain, would examine the feasibility of the proposed Class I Bicycle Trail and develop a concept or concepts for implementation. It would include an assessment of right-of-way, signal modification, access, constraints, and conceptual cost estimates. The Study would also need to consider the Bernardo Undercrossing currently under preliminary design. Community outreach would also be required.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Support

Explanation: DPW staff could also utilize the results of the study for future bicycle and pedestrian facility planning. If the Class I Bicycle Trail is feasible, it will be included in the next update of the Sunnyvale Bicycle Plan to begin in FY 2017/2018. Once it is included in the Sunnyvale Bicycle Plan, it will be eligible for grant funding.

If feasible the project could greatly increase the connectivity between Downtown Sunnyvale and Mountain View and improve access to the future Bernardo Undercrossing. However, coordination for this project would require that both cities prioritize and fund the project in order for it to achieve the desired build out. In conversation with city officials from Mountain View, we have learned this is not currently identified as a priority project in their 2015 Bike Plan. Their City Council would need to similarly identify this concept as a priority for further implementation during their own priority setting process, fund the preliminary assessment studies, develop funding strategies for the build out of their portion of the project, and prioritize it amongst its near 200 other capital projects.

Prepared By: Ralph Garcia, Senior Transportation Engineer
Reviewed By: Shahid Abbas, Division of Transportation and Traffic Manager
Reviewed By: Manuel Pineda, Director, Department of Public Works
Reviewed By: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

17-0223 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPW 17-13

TITLE Investigate the Purchase of the Court House Property Located at 605 W. El Camino Real

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Public Works
Support Department(s): Office of City Manager, Office of City Attorney

Sponsor(s):
Councilmembers: Melton and Klein

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
The Study would analyze the process that's required for the sale of a state property, and determine what approach the City could take to pursue the purchase. The City already owns the parking lot that serves the property. Consultant support would be needed to research the process, conduct appraisals, and determine what steps, if any, the City could take to pursue the property.

What precipitated this study?
The Court House property is located within the Civic Center Campus and could provide future flexibility for the City in future Civic Center improvements. However, Councilmember Melton clarified that his interest in this study issue is not necessarily related to the Civic Center Modernization project, rather focused on the strategic opportunity to acquire land should the opportunity present itself. He further clarified that acquisition of this parcel was not part of the master planning process, nor did he intend to delay the Civic Center Modernization project with this request.

Planned Completion Year: 2017/2018/2019 (or upon availability of the land)

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study
Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $25,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost:
Consultant support would be needed to research the process, conduct appraisals, and determine what steps the City could take to pursue the property.

Cost to Implement Study Results
Unknown

Explanation of Cost: The cost to purchase the property would be determined as part of the Study Issue process.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS
Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: Yes
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: N\A

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Position: Defer

Explanation: The State recently renewed their parking lot lease with the City for the Court House building which the County closed in August 2016. As part of the discussion, staff asked whether the State was interested in selling the property. They stated that there was no near-term plan to sell the property. Deferral of this Study Issue is an appropriate position and, in the event that the property becomes available for purchase, the City could timely return to Council for the appropriate authority to pursue the purchase of this land.

Prepared By: Ryan Sandoval, City Property Administrator
Reviewed By: Manuel Pineda, Director, Public Works
Reviewed By: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

Council Summary Worksheet
2017 Proposed Budget Issues

#	Title	Estimated Impact to the Budget / Funding Source	Staff Rec.	Council Action
1	Lawrence Station Area Plan - Increased Housing Study and Sense of Place Plan	One-time cost: $200,000 Source: General Fund, Budget Stabilization Reserve	Refer to Recommended Budget	☐ Drop ☐ Defer ☐ Refer to Recommended Budget
				☐ Drop ☐ Defer ☐ Refer to Recommended Budget
				☐ Drop ☐ Defer ☐ Refer to Recommended Budget
				☐ Drop ☐ Defer ☐ Refer to Recommended Budget
				☐ Drop ☐ Defer ☐ Refer to Recommended Budget
				☐ Drop ☐ Defer ☐ Refer to Recommended Budget

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

17-0154 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

BUDGET ISSUE SUMMARY FORM

TITLE

Lawrence Station Area Plan - Increased Housing Study and Sense of Place Plan

BACKGROUND

Lead Department: Community Development

Sponsor:

City Council

SCOPE OF ISSUE

What are the key elements of the issue? What precipitated it?

The Lawrence Station Area Plan (LSAP) was approved by the City Council on December 6, 2016. During the hearing, the Council discussed allowing more housing units within the study area beyond the 2,323 units included in the LSAP. The Council approved the LSAP and directed staff to return with a study of potential additional housing in the LSAP area. Adoption of the LSAP also included an implementation action to prepare a Sense of Place Plan to address design criteria for streetscape elements (sidewalks, lighting, tree grates, benches, etc.) and to prepare implementation requirements for the plan elements.

The LSAP **Housing Study** may include options, such as:

- Raising the cap on allowable dwelling units in the plan area (without any other changes to development standards)
- Increase of the maximum dwelling units per acre allowance for properties where residential development is already allowed;
- Allow residential development in plan areas that were not originally zoned for residential units;
- Study the conversion of existing industrial condominium units to allow for live/work situations; and,
- Additional environmental review for the increased number of housing units being considered in the LSAP.

The LSAP **Sense of Place Plan** will:

- Identify desirable unifying streetscape elements;
- Determine which elements are developer requirements and which may require a fee for coordinated off-site improvement; and,
- Determine the Sense of Place fee amount for new development and changes of use.

Both the housing study and sense of place plan will include community outreach as well as study sessions and public hearings with the Planning Commission and City Council.

How does this relate to the General Plan or existing City Policy?
Land Use and Transportation Element
Policy LT-4.2c - Develop specific area plans to guide change in neighborhoods that need special attention.

Policy LT -5.2 - Integrate the use of land and the transportation system.
LT-5.2e Study potential transit station mixed use development.

Housing Element
Goal HE-1 - Adequate Housing - Assist in the provision of adequate housing to meet the diverse needs of Sunnyvale's households of all income levels.

Goal HE-4 - Adequate Housing Sites - Provide adequate sites for the development of new housing through appropriate land use and zoning to address the diverse needs of Sunnyvale's residents and workforce.

Policy HE-4.2 - Continue to direct new residential development into Specific Plan areas, near transit and close to employment and activity centers.

Is the budget issue a: Project

If the issue is operating, specify the change in service objective(s) that would result (from what, to what). If the issue is a project, write N/A.
N/A

FISCAL IMPACT
Projected cost (list rough annual cost of budget item):

Operating Issue (Annual Operating Costs, ongoing)	$
Capital/Project (Project Cost, one-time)	$ 200,000
Total (Associated Annual Operating Costs)	$

Recommended funding source:
The General Fund, Budget Stabilization Reserve would need to be the funding source unless a new revenue source is established and can cover the full costs. For example, Sense of Place Fees can be established to offset or cover the cost of plan preparation.

Please describe recommended funding source:
General Fund, Budget Stabilization Reserve

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Position:
Refer budget issue for consideration in Recommended Budget

Position Impact: The project cost will be used to hire an outside firm to prepare the amendments to the LSAP and complete the environmental review. A separate consultant may be required to prepare the Sense of Place Plan, although every effort will be made to find a single consultant to coordinate the work. Existing staff will oversee work done by the consultant(s).

Explanation:
Creating housing near transit is in keeping with the goals of the General Plan, and responds to the high housing demand in the Bay Area. Additional housing units could be provided with a higher cap on total residential units, on portions of the plan that currently do not contemplate housing, or at higher densities within the LSAP to increase the housing options in the City of Sunnyvale. Additional environmental review would be necessary to study increased housing in the LSAP and would enable the City to make informed decisions on where housing is best suited.

The Sense of Place Plan will ensure public improvements are coordinated and completed throughout the LSAP area in a distinctive and well-designed manner.

Prepared by: Amber Blizinski, Principal Planner
Reviewed by: Andrew Miner, Planning Officer
Reviewed by: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development
Reviewed by: Timothy J. Kirby, Director of Finance
Approved by: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

2017 Master List with B/C Rankings

Study Issue #	Title of Study Issue *Deferred or Below the Line items can not be dropped (Those papers are noted with an asterisk).	Origin of Issue	Planning	Heritage Pres	Housing & Human Services	Parks & Rec.	BPAC	Sustain.
			Nov. 14	Nov. 2	Nov. 16	Nov. 9	Nov. 17	Nov. 21
CDD 11-02	Downtown Development Policies for Parking*	Planning	2 of 6					
CDD 13-02	Consideration of Usable Open Space in Required Front Yards*	Planning	5 of 6					
CDD 15-04	Height Regulations to Accommodate Architectural Style*	Planning	3 of 6					
CDD 16-14	Exploring Options for Establishment of a Plaque Program for Heritage Resources*	Heritage Pres		1 of 1				
CDD 17-02	Increase Availability of Electric Vehicle Charging Stations in Private and Public Parking Facilities	Planning	4 of 6					Drop
CDD 17-03	Rent Stabilization for Mobile Home Parks	Davis, Griffith, Martin-Milius			1 of 4			
CDD 17-05	Consider Revising Certain Requirements of Sunnyvale Municipal Code Chapter 19.72: Mobile Home Park Conversions	Housing & Human Services	Drop		4 of 4			
CDD 17-06	Explore Introduction of a Rent Stabilization Ordinance	Housing & Human Services	Drop		2 of 4			
CDD 17-08	Evaluation of the Residential Single-Story Combining District Process	Planning	1 of 6					
DPS 17-01	Regulation of Marijuana Cultivation in the City of Sunnyvale for Research and Development and Medical Marijuana Cultivation for Personal Use	Griffith, Martin-Milius	Drop					
DPS 17-02	Bicycle and Pedestrian Collision Analysis	BPAC					3 of 4	
DPW 13-10C	Pilot Bicycle Boulevard Project on East-West and North-South Routes*	BPAC					Drop	
DPW 16-10	Consider Sunnyvale Municipal Code Amendments to Clarify, Strengthen and Enforce Tree Preservation and Tree Planting Requirements within Right of Way and Public and Private Property*	Meyering, Whittum	6 of 6					2 of 3
DPW 17-01	Develop Implementation Standards for Cycle Tracks / Separated Bikeways	BPAC					4 of 4	
DPW 17-02	Develop Implementation Standards for “Bicycles May Use Full Lane” Regulatory Sign	BPAC					2 of 4	
DPW 17-05	Orchard Heritage Park and Heritage Park Museum - Analysis and Options for the Long-Term Operations and Maintenance of Orchard Heritage Park and Review of the Sunnyvale Historical Society and Museum Association Proposed Expansion of the Sunnyvale Heritage Park Museum Site	Staff				3 of 3		
DPW 17-07	Develop Mobile Version of Sunnyvale Bicycle Map	BPAC					1 of 4	
DPW 17-11	Exploration of Creating Usable Open Space over Portions of Central Expressway	Planning				Drop	Drop	
ESD 13-05C	Eco-district Feasibility and Incentives*	Griffith, Martin-Milius	Drop					3 of 3
ESD 17-01	Eliminate the Use of Chemical Pesticides on City Owned or Leased Property	Sustainability				2 of 3		1 of 3
FIN 17-01	Evaluation of New Revenue Strategies to Address New and Increasing Demands for Service and Unfunded Needs	Staff						
LCS 17-02	Potential Membership in the Global Network of Age-Friendly Cities and Communities (GNAFCC)	Staff				1 of 3		
OCM 17-01	Storing Outdoor Dining Furniture Overnight on Sidewalks on Murphy Avenue	Larsson, Griffith, Martin-Milius						
			13 to Rank	1 to Rank	4 to Rank	5 to Rank	13 to Rank	4 to Rank

2017 Master List with B/C Rankings

Study Issue #	Title of Study Issue *Deferred or Below the Line items can not be dropped (Those papers are noted with an asterisk).	Origin of Issue	Planning	Heritage Pres	Housing & Human Services	Parks & Rec.	BPAC	Sustain.
			Nov. 14	Nov. 2	Nov. 16	Nov. 9	Nov. 17	Nov. 21
Sponsored after Public Hearing								
OCM 16-02	Consider Adoption of a Wage Theft Ordinance	Klein, Smith, Melton, Goldman						
OCM 17-02	Evaluate Proposing a Charter Amendment to Revise Section 604 regarding Filling Vacant Council Seats by Special Election	All Council						
CDD 17-09	2017 Housing Strategy	Staff						
DPW 17-12	Evaluate the Development of a Class I Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail along Evelyn Avenue adjacent to the Caltrain Railroad Tracks, Between Sunnyvale and Mt. View	Klein, Melton, Larsson						
DPW 17-13	Investigate the Purchase of the Court House Property Located at 605 W. El Camino Real	Melton, Klein						
Dropped by Sponsoring Board/Commission								
CDD 17-01	Evaluation of the Special Development Permit Process as it Relates to R-1.5 and R-1.7 Planned Developments	Planning	Drop					
CDD 17-07	Review and Consider Increasing the Below Market Rate (BMR) Ownership Housing Requirement (Chapter 19.67 of the Municipal Code)	Planning	Drop		3 of 4			
DPW 17-03	Update Mathilda Avenue Plan Line North of Washington Avenue	BPAC	Drop				Drop	
DPW 17-04	Update Bicycle Master Plan Every Five Years	BPAC					Drop	
DPW 17-08	Develop and Adopt Design Standards for Bike Way-finding and Route Signs	BPAC					Drop	
DPW 17-09	Increase Bike Mode Share to 5% for Commuters by 2020	BPAC					Drop	
Deferred by Sponsoring Board/Commission								
DPW 17-06	Alternative Parking Strategies	BPAC					Defer	
DPW 17-10	Street Maintenance Roadway Re-Allocation	BPAC					Defer	
LCS 17-01	Consider Development of a Teen Center and Other Spaces Dedicated to Teens in Sunnyvale	Parks & Rec.				Defer		

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0824 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPW 17-06

TITLE Alternative Parking Strategies

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Public Works
Support Department(s): Office of the City Attorney

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
This study would analyze the recurring situations that lead to the demand for street parking and develop innovative solutions to address these situations. These innovative solutions would in turn minimize the negative impacts on street space that is needed for safe and efficient traffic flow.

When street parking removal is proposed as a necessary element of a project in order to meet traffic safety and capacity needs, the innovative solutions developed by this study can assist staff to develop alternatives that will address the concerns of opponents and also ensure the greatest utility for transportation users. Among the items to be included in this study are:

- The needs of the mobility impaired. One possible approach is to allow a dedicated handicapped parking space to be installed in front of the residence. A single handicapped space would satisfy the concern of the resident and could be less disruptive to safe traffic flow compared to designating street parking along the entire corridor year round.

- Accommodating social events. One possible approach is to allow the event host to apply for a reservation of the street space for the specific time needed, as is done for many other special events in the city. Limiting street parking to a defined period would satisfy the concern of the resident and could be less disruptive to safe traffic flow compared to designating street parking along the entire corridor year round.

- Access for service vehicles. One possible approach is to work with the Department of Public Safety so that they do not interfere with service vehicles stopped temporarily in a no-parking

DEFERRED

zone if it is clear they need to be there and take reasonable safety precautions. Allowing such sort-term stopping on an occasional basis satisfies the expressed concern and could be less disruptive to safe traffic flow compared to designating street parking along the entire corridor year round.

- Level of vehicle ownership. The study would recommend establishing a baseline for the number of vehicles that should be regarded as sufficient to meet the needs of a typical household. For households with off-street parking capacity that is less than the baseline, street parking may compete with all other needs for street space. For households with off-street parking capacity that equals or exceeds the baseline, vehicle owners will be expected to justify any request for street space dedicated to parking.

What precipitated this study?
Increasingly, the main solution for our traffic safety and capacity problems is the allocation of additional street space. It is important that this limited resource be used more efficiently. Providing alternative means to serve parking needs would reduce demand for street parking and thus, making more of this space available for critical transportation needs.

Planned Completion Year: 2018

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Major

Amount of funding above current budget required: $200,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost:
The cost associated with this study will be for consultant services. The consultant would be required to review existing policies, existing codes, develop alternatives, and develop new codes and policies as needed. It is expected that items like “establishing a baseline for the number of vehicles that should be sufficient” or “apply for a reservation of the street space for the specific time needed” would require a significant amount of community outreach. The consultant would implement a full community engagement process. Staff will manage the consultant, review and approve all proposals, and lead part of the community engagement process.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

DEFERRED

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Position: Drop

Explanation: Staff proposes to drop the proposed Study Issue. As part of road allocation or bike projects where parking removal is considered, staff already takes into consideration both on-street and off-street parking capacity while formulating options and recommendations that are reasonable, manageable, and take into account that each individual recommendation has its own pros and cons to consider.

The types of options described in the Study Issue would be very difficult to implement and manage The option for the City to establish a baseline for the number of vehicles that should be regarded as sufficient to meet the needs of a typical household would be difficult to define. Implementing definition of number of vehicles for a “typical household” and “sufficient” will be complex and the City would have a limited ability to enforce. The City also serves the needs of the mobility impaired on a request basis, and parking by service vehicles has never been an issue.

If the Study Issue does move forward, a significant community engagement program will be required to get feedback on these types of definitions and also for programs (as provided as an example above) that would require special reservation to use on-street parking. Any new programs would also require new staffing.

Prepared By: Carol Shariat, Principal Transportation Engineer/Planner
Reviewed By: Shahid Abbas, Transportation and Traffic Manager
Reviewed By: Manuel Pineda, Director, Public Works
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

DEFERRED

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0926 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPW 17-10

TITLE Street Maintenance Roadway Re-Allocation

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Public Works
Support Department(s): N/A

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
This study would develop policies for street space reallocation after roadway construction or pavement rehabilitation projects. Complete streets facilities may be accommodated on existing facilities through street space re-allocation. A policy to incorporate street space allocation modifications during road work will be explored. Street space re-allocation can include striping changes and modifications to medians, curb, and gutter.

What precipitated this study?
Street maintenance and construction occurs on a routine basis and provides an opportunity for street space allocation improvements. Many of the City's streets can be made safer for non-motorists with some adjustments to the lane striping. Routine pavement maintenance includes treatment with slurry seal and restriping, which provides periodic opportunities to apply the City's Complete Streets policies in a cost effective manner. If the planning for street maintenance operations includes a review of Complete Streets policies, these important safety benefits could be delivered more expediently.

Planned Completion Year: 2018

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study
Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Major

Amount of funding above current budget required: $100,000

DEFERRED

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement.

Explanation of Cost:
The cost associated with this study would be for consultant services and staff time. Staff will work with a consultant to develop policies for allocation of street space during roadway construction and rehabilitation projects. The study would also examine the cost effects of this policy on street reconstruction and rehabilitation projects.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Drop

Explanation: In 2008, the City adopted a policy on the Allocation of Street Space and subsequently amended the General Plan to include the policy. Staff already takes into consideration the elements of Allocation of Street Space policy on all street reconstruction and rehabilitation projects, and further explores opportunities to expand and enhance bike and pedestrian facilities where possible as per the City's Bicycle Plan and Pedestrian Safety and Opportunities studies.

Prepared By: Carol Shariat, Principal Transportation Engineer/Planner
Reviewed By: Shahid Abbas, Transportation and Traffic Manager
Reviewed By: Manuel Pineda, Director, Public Works
Reviewed By: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

DEFERRED

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0349 **Agenda Date:** 2/3/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
LCS 17-01

TITLE Consider Development of a Teen Center and Other Spaces Dedicated to Teens in Sunnyvale

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Library and Community Services
Support Department(s): Public Works, Community Development

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Parks and Recreation Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: Dropped

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
Unlike the study issue that was dropped in 2015, this study issue would require a more comprehensive approach to address the Commission's request. It would not only research the feasibility of establishing dedicated space for teens, it would also identify how other cities address the needs of teens programmatically. Research would be conducted of successful models for teen centers and other teen spaces in addition to assessing target markets within the Sunnyvale teen population. The following components would be included in the study:

- Demographic data and needs of Sunnyvale teens and their parents/guardians
- Bench marking data from teen centers within other communities
- Capital and operating costs
- Staffing models
- Optimal locations for dedicated teen spaces, taking into consideration feasible transportation options for those who do not drive
- Exploration of possible partners
- Social service programs and other programs/activities provided at Teen Centers and other teen spaces.
- Onsite security considerations and neighborhood impact

With assistance from the Teen Advisory Committee, a survey of middle and high school teens and their parents/guardians to assess their interest in a teen center and other spaces would also be conducted.

DEFERRED

What precipitated this study?
The study issue was proposed by a member of the public at the Parks and Recreation Commission meeting on February 10, 2016 and approved by commissioners at that meeting. The member of the public stated that in light of several neighboring cities having teen centers and public facilities such as movie theaters and malls he felt there were not enough locations in Sunnyvale for teens to socialize in a safe environment. In addition, at their March 9, 2016 meeting, the Parks and Recreation Commission discussed and approved several key elements that are identified in this document.

Planned Completion Year: 2017

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $50,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost: Consultant fees to conduct research, community needs assessment including facilitation of community meetings and surveys, facility scenarios, program recommendations, and submission of formal reports and project updates.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Parks and Recreation Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Defer

Explanation: Staff recommends deferring this item until consideration of dedicating space for teens is assessed through the current civic center modernization process. Two years ago, the City Council dropped Study Issue LCS 15-03 with discussion indicating that the community would have an opportunity to express their interest in a teen center through the Civic Center Modernization process.

In the meantime, staff will continue to provide teen programs and activities at the community center, library, schools and parks and through continued engagement of teens through events created by the City-sponsored Teen Advisory Committee.

Prepared By: Daniel Wax, Superintendent of Community Services
Reviewed By: Cynthia E. Bojorquez, Director, Library and Community Services
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

DEFERRED

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0269 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
CDD 17-01

TITLE Evaluation of the Special Development Permit Process as it Relates to R-1.5 and R-1.7 Planned Developments

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Community Development
Support Department(s): N/A

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Planning Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
There are two low-medium density residential zoning districts-R-1.5 and R-1.7. These two zoning districts were created to allow small lot, small single-family home developments, with the notion that the homes would be more affordable than other single-family homes. To date there are 11 areas zoned R-1.5 and three areas zoned R-1.7. The R-1.7 district is required to be paired with the Planned Development (PD) combining district zoning (i.e. R-1.7/PD). Eight of the R-1.5 districts are combined with the PD zoning district.

The Planned Development (PD) combining district is paired with a base zoning district and provides the City more oversight of the development and use of a site through the Special Development Permit (SDP) process. If a project meets the general intent of the base zoning district, the SDP allows modifications, additions and limitations to the requirements of the base zoning to meet special conditions and situations. The code expressly states that one of the purposes of the district is "allowing a proposed use that is compatible with the neighborhood but requires deviations from development standards for a successful project."

Unlike the low density zoning districts (R-1 and R-0), which have no maximum floor area ratio (FAR), both the R-1.5 and R-1.7 zoning districts have a maximum FAR of 50%. The zoning code establishes that all single-family and duplex sites which exceed the 45% Floor Area Ratio (FAR) threshold require Design Review by the Planning Commission. For each of the R-1.5 and R-1.7 developments that have the PD combining district some of the units in these developments may have been approved with modified setback standards, FARs or other zoning requirements.

DROPPED

Recently, single-family homeowners in older R-1.5 and R-1.7 developments (built 1993-1994) have applied to exceed the 50% FAR maximum. The Planning Commission reviewed these applications as the projects exceeded the 45% FAR threshold requiring Planning Commission design review. For sites without a zoning requirement for a SDP, a variance is required to deviate from a zoning standard. The findings for a variance are more stringent than the findings for a SDP. The Planning Commission has raised the question of whether the original SDP approvals should establish the maximum FAR for the properties such that applications to allow additions in excess of 50% should not be approved or if a different process is required to consider these requests.

This study could include an evaluation of the SDP process for additions in PD areas as it relates to small lot single-family residential projects:

- Review of existing small lot single-family residential projects (lot sizes, home sizes and FARs, requests for modifications, etc.);
- Review of prior additions/modifications that resulted in more floor area with a review of impacts of additions on the surrounding neighborhood (adjacent homes, trash collection, parking, privacy, etc.);
- Survey of residents to determine interest in allowing/not allowing further additions in their development
- Review the 50% FAR maximum to determine if it is too restrictive.
- Evaluate the factors that prompt owners to desire additions (e.g. changes in family situation, personal health or other reasons).
- Consider design guidelines for additions that are considered appropriate on small-lot single-family homes within PD areas;
- Understand the fire and building safety requirements that pertain to bedroom egress and ingress; and
- Evaluating the approval process and whether some additions may be considered administratively.

What precipitated this study?
The study was suggested after the Planning Commission reviewed several applications for single-family home additions in R-1.5/PD and R-1.7/PD zoning districts that resulted in a FAR over 50%.

Major home remodeling and reinvestment frequently starts when residential structures are about 20 years old. Approximately 224 of the 291 homes in the R-1.5 and R-1.7 developments were constructed over 20 years ago and the City is receiving requests for additions or modifications to these homes. The PD combining district zoning designation and the fact that many of the houses already exceed 45% floor area ratio, require approval of a Special Development Permit by the Planning Commission for projects involving additions to dwellings, even if a project only proposes a small addition. Planned Developments with higher densities, such as townhouse units, are less likely to request additions to homes due to the nature of ownership (often condominium where only air rights are owned and structures are owned in common) or lack of available land (for townhomes built on individually owned land and structures).

Planned Completion Year: 2017

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required: Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $15,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost: Funds would be used to hire a consultant to create Design Guidelines.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Some cost to implement

Explanation of Cost: Depending on what new regulations are adopted there would be a range of costs for training of staff and for processing applications under potentially modified regulations. These costs would be offset with development applications fees.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Planning Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: No Recommendation

Explanation: The demand for additions to homes in the R-1.5 and R-1.7 zoning districts is relatively low. There is no guarantee that an SDP will be approved; often applications are not filed where staff has indicated difficulty in supporting the request. There are many ways that residential Planned Development projects could deviate from the Municipal Code; therefore it may be difficult to fully evaluate the topic when developments are unique. Staff advances a No Recommendation on this study issue, but understands the desire for more direction on small lot single-family SDP applications to deviate from the zoning standards.

Prepared By: Amber Blizinski, Principal Planner
Reviewed By: Andrew Miner, Planning Officer
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development
Reviewed By: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

DROPPED

16-0956 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
CDD 17-07

TITLE
Review and Consider Increasing the Below Market Rate (BMR) Ownership Housing Requirement (Chapter 19.67 of the Municipal Code)

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Community Development
Support Department(s): Office of the City Attorney, Office of the City Manager

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Planning Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: Dropped (CDD 15-05)

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
The BMR Home Ownership Program, codified in Chapter 19.67 of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code (SMC), was adopted in 1980. The program has been amended several times since 1980, with significant code amendments in 2003 and 2012, described below. Various studies and reports have been completed over the past fifteen years regarding possible changes to the BMR Program, including a nexus study in 2011 and a Housing Strategy in 2008.

This study would include:
- A survey of the BMR requirements of other cities in the area with BMR homeownership programs, the number of BMR homes they have produced cumulatively to date, and average annual production numbers, to the extent that data is available;
- An update of the 2011 BMR nexus study, with a financial feasibility analysis describing projected impacts on for-sale housing project feasibility and/or long-term production trends, if the BMR percentage requirement were increased;
- Evaluation of the existing BMR homeownership requirements;
- Information on the need for BMR homeownership units in Sunnyvale; and
- An evaluation of input from local community members and other stakeholders on the above issues.

Background
The initial BMR program required all rental and for-sale developments of ten or more units to provide

DROPPED

10% of the units as BMR units subject to a 20-year affordability covenant. In 2003, code amendments were enacted to drop the project size threshold to nine or more units for all projects, increase the BMR requirement to 12.5% of units in for-sale projects, and extend the affordability term to 30 years. For rental projects, the BMR requirement was increased to 15% and the affordability term extended to 55 years.

In 2012, the BMR rental requirements were changed due to the *Palmer* court decision and placed in a separate chapter of the SMC. The ownership program was modified and renumbered to SMC Chapter 19.67. Changes to the ownership requirements at that time included: dropping the project size threshold from nine to eight units, adding several alternative compliance options, updating definitions, and improving administrative and enforcement provisions. Although offered as a friendly amendment to the motion, the 2012 Council action did not include any provisions to reconsider the percentage of units required as BMR units.

A similar study issue was proposed in 2015 (CDD 15-05). That study issue proposed raising the BMR percentage requirement and/or in-lieu fee requirement. It was dropped for various reasons, primarily because the ordinance had been revised significantly in mid-2012 and the full impact of those changes could not be evaluated after so few years of development application data. In addition, each time the ordinance is revised, it requires a major commitment of time and funding, and involves some degree of legal risk.

What precipitated this study?
This study issue was raised due to concerns about insufficient affordable home buyer opportunities in the area, and whether or not the City's requirements are consistent with those of surrounding communities, such as San Jose, Mountain View, Santa Clara, etc. In addition, there were concerns that changes in market conditions over the past several years might warrant increasing the BMR percentage requirement. Affordable housing continues to be one of the most difficult challenges facing Sunnyvale and many other cities across the country. Currently in the Bay Area there is a shortage of affordable housing for residents and/or workers with lower and moderate incomes.

Planned Completion Year: 2019

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Major

Amount of funding above current budget required: $50,000 or more.
Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost:
The nexus study completed in 2011 cost approximately $30,000 for the consultant contract. That amount does not include many staff hours also spent in order to administer the contract, collect City data required by the consultant, review the report and presentation materials, complete public outreach on the study, and present the study results at several stakeholder, commission and Council meetings. In addition, outside counsel was required for specialized legal advice on housing issues, and it is anticipated that would be necessary again in order to conduct this study. Currently Housing Division workload is very high related to a number of City-subsidized affordable housing projects, a high volume of BMR home sales, new BMR

development projects, and new affordable rental units in rental projects. In addition, there is a high volume of public and Council inquiries on topics such as rent control, mobile home parks, and homelessness programs. Due to this high workload, staff would need to postpone implementation of some of the current capital projects which would add new affordable units, or use contract staff to conduct this study, which would add additional costs.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

Explanation of Cost:
Potential costs would be one-time costs to update program documents. Depending on the results of the study, additional on-going costs, based on the number of units subject to the program, could also be incurred.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Planning, Housing and Human Services

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Defer

Explanation: There are a number of activities at the state and local levels that will affect the programs and staff efforts related to affordable housing. There is recent state legislation on accessory living units, by-right residential development and modifications to the State Density bonus regulations. The Council has adopted the Housing Element that has several actions requiring further study and there are several proposed study issues that relate to affordable housing. Staff recommends that City Council consider an overall strategy that addresses and prioritizes affordable housing efforts (this concept will be included in the strategic planning sessions in January 2017).

Staff further notes that a study of the BMR program was completed in 2011, and zoning code amendments based on that study were adopted in July 2012. Economic and housing markets, particularly in California, tend to rise and fall in approximate five-year cycles. Four years is not enough time to gather data on development trends related to the BMR program since it does not cover a full cycle (i.e., one rising and one falling market cycle). Studies of this nature are major work efforts with some legal risk that could ultimately reduce the effectiveness of the BMR program. It can be counterproductive to undertake such a major effort and related risks every several years. Further, most of the unmet demand for affordable housing is for rental housing, as many households in need of such assistance do not have the reliable income, solid credit history, and assets needed to buy a BMR home. Staff recommends deferring this study until 2021 or 2022, which would be ten years after the last amendments were adopted, and shortly before the Housing Element must be updated. Questions about the BMR requirements are often raised during public discussions held before the Housing Element update, which is intended to be a time for the City to evaluate its housing programs, policies, and community needs comprehensively. Therefore it may be preferable to update the BMR ownership program nexus study and consider possible program changes at that time, in the context of analyzing all City housing policies, programs, market trends, and local needs.

PROPPED

Prepared By: Suzanne Isé, Housing Officer
Reviewed By: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development Department
Reviewed By: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

DROPPED

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0539 **Agenda Date:** 2/3/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPW 17-03

TITLE Update Mathilda Avenue Plan Line North of Washington Avenue

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Public Works
Support Department(s): N/A

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
In September 2015, Council approved a new plan line for Mathilda Avenue from El Camino Real to Washington Avenue. A plan line allows for the City to designate future build-out of roadway segments by delineating planned right-of-way. The plan line south of Washington Avenue was widened to specifically accommodate bike lanes and wider pedestrian facilities. This study would investigate the feasibility of updating the Mathilda Plan line north of Washington Avenue to the northerly City limit to take into account all users of the roadway as did the approved plan line south of Washington Avenue.

What precipitated this study?
BPAC would like to update the plan line north of Washington as it was approved by the City in 1960 and did not consider all users of the roadway. An updated plan line north of Washington Avenue would then provide a comprehensive multimodal Mathilda Avenue plan line from El Camino to the northerly City limit.

Planned Completion Year: 2019

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study
Level of staff effort required: Major

Amount of funding above current budget required: $150,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

DROPPED

Explanation of Cost:
The cost associated with this will be for consultant services. The consultant will need to gather and evaluate traffic data to assess and propose new layout of the roadway, which will include options for travel lanes, intersection geometrics, and bike and pedestrian facilities. The consultant will also identify the street and right of way requirements.

Cost to Implement Study Results
Unknown; study would include assessment of potential costs.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS
Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission, Planning Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Position: Drop

Explanation: The intent of a plan line is to determine locations where additional right of way dedication is required because of proposed widening to the curb-to-curb of the roadway. This section of Mathilda Avenue is fully developed from a curb-to-curb width and no further widening is expected or required. New wider sidewalks are already being implemented with the City's new sidewalk standards as part of new development. Plan lines are not necessary to implement wider sidewalks.

Prepared By: Carol Shariat, Principal Transportation Engineer/Planner
Reviewed By: Shahid Abbas, Transportation and Traffic Manager
Reviewed By: Manuel Pineda, Director, Public Works
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

DROPPED

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0547 **Agenda Date:** 2/3/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPW 17-04

TITLE Update Bicycle Master Plan Every Five Years

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Public Works
Support Department(s): N/A

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
This study would investigate the feasibility of updating the City's Bicycle Master Plan every five years instead of every ten years.

What precipitated this study?
BPAC recommends increasing the frequency of updating the Sunnyvale Bicycle Master Plan to every five years instead of ten years. As alternative modes of transportation such as walking and bicycling gain more users, it becomes more important to update these plans more frequently. Updating the Bicycle Master Plan every five years would aid in making necessary course corrections due to more frequent plan updates. In addition, more frequent updates will assist with achieving a higher level Bicycle Friendly Community class designation by the League of American Bicyclists.

Planned Completion Year: 2018

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study
Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Major

Amount of funding above current budget required: $50,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement

Explanation of Cost:

DROPPED

The cost associated with this will be for consultant services. The consultant will need to gather and evaluate the existing city and neighboring jurisdictions bike plans and policies to determine the level of need the City might have and how often other Cities' bike master plans are updated. The Consultant will also need to review the capital projects delivery schedule to determine the need to update the Bicycle Master Plan every five years.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown; study would include assessment of potential costs.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Drop

Explanation: Updates to the Bicycle Master Plan depends upon the number of bike related capital projects completed in a given time period and by significant changes in policies and standards. Given the existing bike capital project delivery schedule, recent updates to the City's bicycle policies (as part of the upcoming LUTE), guidelines (such as when to use green color bike lanes) and standards (such as buffered bike lanes), and the proposed update to the Bicycle Master Plan as part of the upcoming Capital project cycle, staff does not recommend the Study Issue. However, staff does recommend that as part of the new Bicycle Master Plan, staff will evaluate the appropriate frequency for future updates.

Prepared By: Carol Shariat, Principal Transportation Engineer/Planner
Reviewed By: Shahid Abbas, Transportation and Traffic Manager
Reviewed By: Manuel Pineda, Director, Public Works
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

DROPPED

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0890 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPW 17-08

TITLE Develop and Adopt Design Standards for Bike Way-finding and Route Signs

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Public Works
Support Department(s): N/A

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
The purpose of the study would be to develop policies and Sunnyvale specific design standards for way-finding (guide) signs along bicycle routes. The study would also determine cost and a funding source for the future installation of these signs.

What precipitated this study?
Sunnyvale recently installed bicycle route signs through some neighborhoods. They are labelled with the route name and a unique route number. A directional arrow was also attached to these signs at places where the route changed direction. BPAC now wants to develop a policy to guide future implementation of way-finding signs on existing and future bike routes and also develop Sunnyvale design standards for the signs.

Sunnyvale promotes and encourages bicycling as an alternative mode of transportation, and including way-finding information on existing and future bike routes would encourage increased bicycling throughout the City. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission feels that In order to promote and encourage bicycling in Sunnyvale, the City should adopt a policy to guide the implementation of way-finding information on signed bicycle routes and have Sunnyvale sign standards .

Planned Completion Year: 2019

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study

DROPPED

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Moderate

Amount of funding above current budget required: $50,000

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement.

Explanation of Cost:
The cost associated with this will be for consultant services. The consultant will review the existing regulations and guidelines as given in California Vehicle Code (CAVC), and California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), and develop design standards and guidelines for placement of these signs on City streets along bicycle routes. The consultant will also help to develop policy language to guide future implementation of the signs, and the cost to implement the way-finding signs on existing and future bike routes.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown; implementation costs will be site and project specific and included in the study.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Drop

Explanation: Design and placement guidelines of these way-finding signs are already established per the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD). Per the Municipal Code, staff uses CA MUTCD for evaluation and placement of these way-finding signs on City streets.

Prepared By: Carol Shariat, Principal Transportation Engineer/Planner
Reviewed By: Shahid Abbas, Transportation and Traffic Manager
Reviewed By: Manuel Pineda, Director, Public Works
Reviewed By: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

DROPPED

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0895 **Agenda Date:** 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER
DPW 17-09

TITLE Increase Bike Mode Share to 5% for Commuters by 2020

BACKGROUND
Lead Department: Public Works
Support Department(s): N/A

Sponsor(s):
Board/Commission: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

History:
1 year ago: N/A
2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY
What are the key elements of the study?
This study would research and document how nearby cities and other communities in California are achieving higher bicycle mode share for commuting than Sunnyvale, which is at 1.5% (as per *Bicycle Transportation and Safety in Santa Clara County 2015*). The study would also develop plans, costs, and policy recommendations to achieve a 5% bicycle commute mode share by 2020.

What precipitated this study?
Sunnyvale is behind Santa Clara County (1.7%) as well as nearby cities such as Mountain View (5%) and Palo Alto (8%) of percentage of commuters who journey to work via bicycle. Sunnyvale should increase its bicycle mode share to help meet its Climate Action Plan, reduce congestion and air pollution. Sunnyvale has many policies which advocate bicycling as an alternative mode, however there is no bicycle specific mode share goal. Improvements in bicycle infrastructure and transit connection could also enable more children to travel to school without being driven and enable residents to complete numerous errands/trips without driving.

Planned Completion Year: 2018

FISCAL IMPACT
Cost to Conduct Study
Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Major

Amount of funding above current budget required: $250,000

DROPPED

Funding Source: Will seek budget supplement.

Explanation of Cost:
The cost associated with this study will be for consultant services and staff time. The consultant will gather and evaluate the existing city and neighboring jurisdictions bike data, plan and policies. The consultant will develop a plan which will identify and prioritize the projects and associated costs that will result in increased bicycle commute mode share by 2020. There will also be community outreach to get feedback on the proposal.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No
Council Study Session: No
Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Drop

Explanation: The City's existing Bicycle Plan establishes and prioritizes the development of bicycle infrastructure throughout the City (including the use of best practices and progressive policies) with the goal of providing a convenient transportation alternative to motor vehicles and encourages increased bicycling in the City. Per the *Bicycle Transportation and Safety in Santa Clara County 2015,* Sunnyvale ranks fifth in the County and has increased bike mode share every year since 2009 (1% in 2009). Outside of Mountain View and Palo Alto, mode share for other Santa Clara cities ranges from a low of 0.2 to a high of 2.5. Staff agrees that having a mode share goal could be useful, but it should also be realistic (5% by 2020 would be over a 200% increase over a three year period). Staff instead would propose that including a mode share goal should be considered as part of the proposed bike master-plan update, which will provide a comprehensive review of bicycle policies and projects for the City. Staff will include a proposed capital project to fund the update of the bike masterplan next fiscal year as part of the capital budget process.

Prepared By: Carol Shariat, Principal Transportation Engineer/Planner
Reviewed By: Shahid Abbas, Transportation and Traffic Manager
Reviewed By: Manuel Pineda, Director, Public Works
Reviewed By: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager
Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

DROPPED

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

17-0010 **Agenda Date:** 1/10/2017

REPORT TO COUNCIL

SUBJECT
Annual Public Hearing - Discussion of Potential Council Study Issues and Budget Issues for Calendar Year 2017

BACKGROUND
Council typically reviews all study and budget issues once a year at the Annual Public Hearing which provides the opportunity for members of the public to comment on proposed issues for study or budget consideration, and/or to suggest potential new issues. The public testimony for study and budget issues is held during the January 10, 2017 City Council meeting.

On February 17, 2017, Council will conduct a workshop devoted to a review of all proposed study and budget issues. At the workshop, Council will rank study issues for completion during 2017 and will identify budget issues to be forwarded to the City Manager for consideration in the FY 2017/18 budget. A study issue is a topic of concern that can result in a new City policy or a revision to an existing policy. A budget issue represents a new City service or a change in the level of an existing City service (including possible service reduction or elimination).

City Council initiated a review of operational priorities and adopted policy priorities during their Strategic Workshops in summer 2014 and winter 2016. To help guide decision making, staff recommends that Council continue to focus on prioritizing study and budget issues that align with existing policy priorities. The following is the list of policy priorities established by Council during the last Strategic Workshops:

1. Civic Center Campus and Main Library
2. Ability of Infrastructure to Support Development and Traffic
3. Open Space Acquisition Planning: Future of Golf Courses
4. Downtown Sunnyvale
5. Improved Processes and Services through the use of Technology

As part of the upcoming Strategic Workshops in January, staff will recommend to amend priority number three to “Open Space Acquisition Planning” and drop the reference of golf courses. The City Council held a Study Session on September 29, 2015 to discuss the golf course’s finances and possible options and next steps. The three options discussed included: (1) maintaining the golf course as it currently operates today, (2) pursuing a private golf course operator, and (3) pursuing other land use options for the golf course property. Council discussed the presentation at length, and although the discussion was focused on maintaining current operations, staff prepared Study Issue DPW 16-07, Golf Course Land Use Options and Opportunities, for Council consideration. The Study Issue was dropped and the City will continue to operate the golf courses as it currently does, while trying to maximize revenues to minimize subsidies.

In addition, and via separate actions, the Council also prioritized adoption and implementation of the Climate Action Plan. Therefore, staff will recommend adding the implementation of the Climate Action Plan as a Council policy priority.

Staff appreciates that Council has limited and aligned issues to existing policy priority areas and considered limited staff resources to complete study issues. Two Strategic Planning Workshops are scheduled for January 26 and 27 and will be an opportunity for staff to share with Council the progress made since their action to focus City efforts on specific policy goals. These workshops also will provide the context for the review of newly proposed study/budget issues for 2017. Formal review and ranking of those proposed study/budget issues is scheduled for February 17, 2017.

Study and Budget Issues Process
The study issues process provides a method for identifying, prioritizing and analyzing policy issues important to the community. It provides a structured approach for addressing the large number of issues that are raised each year, allowing Council to rank the issues and set priorities within the limits of time and resources.

The budget issues process provides a method for identifying and addressing proposals to add a new service, eliminate a service, or change the level of an existing service. Please note, that no budget issue papers are submitted for the public hearing.

Major Steps in the Process Leading to the Public Hearing

- Study and budget issues are proposed year round by Council, boards and commissions, the public, or the City Manager.
- Staff prepares study issue papers or budget issue papers for all qualifying issues. These issue papers describe the topic of concern and provide information Council will use to determine whether or not to further explore each issue. The study issue paper is also designed to capture the intent and interests that originated the issue. The purpose of the budget issue summary form is to briefly summarize the issue and provide an initial estimate of the fiscal impact.
- In October and November boards/commissions review and rank proposed budget and study issues under their purview; these rankings are forwarded to Council for consideration.

EXISTING POLICY

Council Policy 7.3.26 *Study Issues Process*
Council Policy 7.1.7 *Budget Issues Process*

Council Fiscal Policy 7.1.1 A.1.2 which states, “A Fiscal Issues Workshop will be held each year prior to preparation of the City Manager’s Recommended Budget to consider budget issues for the upcoming Resource Allocation Plan.”

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

N/A

DISCUSSION

Staff has prepared write-ups of the study issues proposed to date. As noted above, no budget issues

have been proposed, yet. These study issue papers and other materials can be viewed on the City's Study Issues Website at StudyIssues.inSunnyvale.com <http://www.studyissues.insunnyvale.com/>, at the Sunnyvale Public Library, or at the City Clerk's office. Copies will also be available to the public at the Study Issues/Budget Issues Public Hearing.

From the time since the last Study Issues/Budget Issues Workshop in 2016, staff returned to Council nine completed studies. Additionally, staff has five Study Issues still underway. Staff has recommended supporting 11 studies on their merit from the proposed 2017 issues, however, staff is concerned about capacity to complete even some of them due to the tremendous policy priority related efforts underway.

The table below summarizes study issues proposed by Boards and Commissions (B/Cs). Based on B/Cs requests, staff prepared 24 study issues. After review, B/Cs dropped 6 study issues and deferred 4 study issues advancing 14 of the B/C sponsored study issues.

Study Issues Proposed by B/C	
Prepared by Staff	24
Dropped by B/C	6
Deferred by B/C	4
Total B/C Sponsored Studies going to Council	**14**

Study Issues/Budget Issues Public Hearing
This Public Hearing is a critical step in the City's policy-setting process. A number of policy issues are submitted annually for possible study by City Council in the upcoming calendar year. The purpose of the hearing is to invite public comment on the relative importance of proposed issues, and for the public to suggest new issues for Council's consideration. Issues proposed by the public must be sponsored by at least two Councilmembers in order to be considered at the Study/Budget Issues Workshop. Staff has advised the board and commission chairs that this is also the appropriate time for them to testify on issues recommended by their board or commission.

Should new issues be added during the January 10 Public Hearing, those issue papers will be developed and distributed to Council as soon as possible prior to the February 17 Workshop. The deadline for Council-initiated study or budget issue papers this year is January 27- three weeks prior to the Workshop. It is important to note that the City Council will be holding a separate public hearing on City Council Policy and Operational priorities on January 26 and 27. During the two day strategic session, City Council will be presented with internal operating priorities and the status of its adopted policy priorities.

Study Issues/Budget Issues Workshop
On February 17, Council will conduct a workshop devoted to a review of all proposed study and budget issues. Council will prioritize or rank study issues that are not dropped or deferred. Budget issues receiving majority support from Council will be forwarded to the City Manager for consideration in the upcoming fiscal year's recommended budget.

Following the Council Workshop, and based on Council's priority rankings, the City Manager

identifies the number of Council-ranked study issues that can be completed during the calendar year without disrupting service delivery or modifying service levels set by Council. Staff updates the Tentative Council Meeting Agenda Calendar for the coming year, identifying when the results of staff's study of specific policy issues will be brought back to Council for action. Lower-priority issues ranked by Council, but not placed on the Council calendar, are automatically reconsidered during the next year's study issue process.

All budget issues referred to the City Manager are returned for Council's consideration as a part of the City Manager's Recommended Budget for the next fiscal year in the form of budget supplements. These supplements are considered by the City Manager in the context of all the other City projects and services, but are not automatically recommended by the City Manager for funding.

For many years this approach has provided both City Council and City staff with a valuable planning and management tool. It allows Council to set priorities for examining policy issues, provides preliminary review of budget issues, and allows staff to balance policy study with the delivery of day-to-day City services.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact associated with this report. Each issue paper provides information regarding fiscal impact where warranted, including an estimated cost of studying the issue and estimated implementation costs. Staff recommends any Council-prioritized study issues that require funding be resubmitted as a budget supplement to be considered within the context of all new requests for funding in the FY 2017/18 Recommended Budget. This is consistent with past practice.

PUBLIC CONTACT

Public contact was made by posting the Council agenda on the City's official-notice bulletin board outside City Hall, at the Sunnyvale Senior Center, Community Center and Department of Public Safety; and by making the agenda and report available at the Sunnyvale Public Library, the Office of the City Clerk and on the City's website.

The public hearing is open to the public and public testimony regarding study issues and budget issues will be heard by Council. Copies of study and budget issue papers may be viewed by accessing the City's Study Issues Website at StudyIssues.inSunnyvale.com <http://www.studyissues.insunnyvale.com/>.

The February 17 Workshop is open to the public and will be televised live and rebroadcast on KSUN, Channel 15. Consistent with past Council practice, however, public testimony will be limited. The public's primary opportunity to comment on study and budget issues is on January 10.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

No action is needed at this time. Councilmembers may request new study issues and/or budget issues be developed for review at the Annual Study Issues/Budget Issues Workshop; a minimum of two Councilmembers is required to sponsor either. The deadline for Council sponsorship of new issues for 2017 is January 27, 2017.

Prepared by: Yvette Blackford, Senior Management Analyst
Reviewed by: Timothy J. Kirby, Director of Finance
Reviewed by: Walter C. Rossmann, Assistant City Manager

Approved by: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed 2017 Study Issue Papers (Hyperlink)