

Agenda Item-No Attachments (PDF)

File #: 16-0219, Version: 1

# **REPORT TO COUNCIL**

# <u>SUBJECT</u>

Authorize the Release of a Request for Proposal (RFP) for Consultant Services for the Mary Avenue Extension Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

# BACKGROUND

On August 18, 2015, the City Council held a Study Session to discuss four different items, including Study Session #4 - Transportation Impact Fee and Project Prioritization. As part of this session, staff discussed the City's transportation priorities within the approved Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) program. One of the key items the City Council discussed was the Mary Avenue Extension (Mary Avenue). Specifically, City Council discussed the requirement to construct Mary Avenue as it relates to: (1) how it fits within the Traffic Impact Fee (TIF), (2) how it is referenced in key policy documents approved by the City Council, (3) assumptions in traffic studies and land use plans based on these policies, (4) how it should be prioritized within the context of existing policies and/or project priorities, and (5) requests additional information on the background of Mary Avenue.

On November 10, 2015, staff prepared Report to Council (RTC) 15-0953. This informational RTC provided all the history and background on Mary Avenue. It also proposed the release of a Request for Proposals (RFP) to complete a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that would analyze and environmentally clear the following four options for the Mary Avenue project:

- A four-lane Mary Avenue with dedicated bike lanes and sidewalks
- A two-lane Mary Avenue with enhanced bike lanes and sidewalks
- A bicycle and pedestrian crossing
- Remove the extension from the General Plan

As part of November 10 discussion, City Council acknowledged that staff would return in early 2016 with a draft RFP, that allows for the study of four options, for the City Council's consideration prior to releasing it. The four options are designed to allow maximum flexibility and assessment of possible build out scenarios before the City Council determines how it would like to proceed.

# EXISTING POLICY

**General Plan - Policy LT-1.6** - Preserve the option of extending Mary Avenue to the Industrial Area North of US Highway 101.

**General Plan - Policy LT-5.2d** - Continue to evaluate transportation impacts from land use proposals at a neighborhood and citywide level.

# Moffett Park Specific Plan

**Page 26** - "The most significant transportation improvements necessary to facilitate development of Moffett Park are the Mary Avenue Extension (or equivalent alternative) and a Lawrence Expressway grade separation."

**Page 27** - "The Mary Avenue extension project is identified as a needed improvement per the City's General Plan and the Program EIR.

### ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The action being considered does not constitute a "project" within the meaning of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15378(b)(5) in that it is a governmental organizational or administrative activity that will not result in direct or indirect changes in the environment.

#### DISCUSSION

Staff has developed the draft Description, Background, and Scope of Work sections of the draft RFP for the EIR (Attachment 1). The scope of work includes the same options previously presented to the City Council:

- A four-lane Mary Avenue with dedicated bike lanes and sidewalks
- A two-lane Mary Avenue with enhanced bike lanes and sidewalks
- A bicycle and pedestrian crossing
- Remove the extension from the General Plan

These four options would provide City Council a full picture of the potential benefits and impacts associated with the construction of Mary Avenue, and would also disclose the future traffic conditions and impacts if it is removed from the General Plan and how it affects existing policy documents and the Traffic Impact Fee program. The EIR would provide a full environmental analysis for all four options and would give City Council the ability to proceed with any of them.

If City Council proceeds with the release of the RFP staff expects to have a consultant under contract in late 2016. The EIR is expected to take approximately 18-24 months and would be completed for Council consideration in late 2018 or early 2019. Once a consultant is selected, a schedule will be developed and a scope of work will be finalized that includes all required elements to ensure the EIR will provide full environmental clearance to proceed with a project or remove it from the General Plan.

#### FISCAL IMPACT

A future Council action will be required to appropriate Traffic Impact Fee funds and to award a consultant contract. The cost of the EIR to analyze all four options is expected to be in the \$750,000-\$1,000,000 range.

#### Funding Source:

Funding for this project will be provided from reserved Transportation Impact Fee revenue in the Transportation Impact Fee Sub-fund of the Capital Projects Fund.

#### 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.

# **ALTERNATIVES**

1. Authorize the release of an RFP for consultant services for the EIR with a scope of work including the four options described in the report.

2. Authorize the release of an RFP for an EIR that includes modified or additional options in the scope of work.

3. Do not authorize the release of an RFP at this time.

#### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Alternative 1: Authorize the release of an RFP for consultant services for the Mary Avenue Extension Project EIR with a scope of work including the four options described in the report.

Prepared by: Manuel Pineda, Director, Public Works Reviewed by: Trudi Ryan, Director, Community Development Reviewed by: Timothy J. Kirby, Acting Director, Finance Reviewed by: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager Approved by: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager

#### **ATTACHMENT**

1. Draft Request for Proposals