CITY OF SUNNYVALE  
City Council Study Session Minutes  
Study Session on  
December 4, 2012

Discussion of Land Use Alternatives for East Sunnyvale ITR Expansion

The City Council met in study session in the West Conference Room at City Hall, 456 W. Olive Avenue in Sunnyvale, California, on May 15th, 2012 at 6:00 p.m., with Vice-Mayor David Whittum presiding.

City Councilmembers Present:
Mayor Anthony Spitaleri
Vice Mayor David Whittum
Chris Moylan (via phone)
Jim Griffith
Patrick Meyering
Tara Martin-Milius
Jim Davis

City Councilmembers Absent:
None

Planning Commissioners Present:
Gustav Larsson, Chair
Glenn Hendricks
Russell Melton

City Staff Present:
Gary Luebbers, City Manager
Robert Walker, Assistant City Manager
Hanson Hom, Director of Community Development
Kent Steffens, Director of Public Works
Joan Borger, City Attorney
Kathy Berry, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer
Connie Verceles, Economic Development Manager
Scott Morton, Superintendent of Parks and Golf
Shaunn Mendrin, Senior Planner
Brice McQueen, Senior Management Analyst-Finance
Visitors/Guests Present:
Spansion Group (Carmeine Renzulli, Ajay Changaran and Patricia Castillo)
Promethues Group (Jon Moss, Jonathan Stone and support group)

Call to Order: 6:00 p.m.

Study Session Summary:
Directors Hanson Hom and Kent Steffens gave a slide presentation on the subject, including a brief background, the project status, park issues, park options, staff recommendation and a request for further direction on the proposed plan and park.

Questions and comments were provided by Council.

- Can residential uses be developed over the entire site? Staff clarified that yes they could be, subject to the standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB).
- The Fairchild redevelopment in San Jose resulted in birth defects due to contamination at the site. Redevelopment of the site raises concerns and should not be considered until the site it cleaned up.
- The larger question is whether residential is appropriate for the site due to the contamination of the site.
- Clarification was requested regarding the soil contamination of the site and what it means for the park. Staff clarified that it is both soil and groundwater and vapor issues with the site.
- Could a concrete cap over the site contain the contamination? Staff clarified that containment of the site is up to the remediation plan approved by the RWQCB.
- Is there concern regarding the requirements for the employees at the site? Staff clarified that the standards are usually less for the work place, but they are determined by the RWQCB.
- The contamination of the soil and groundwater are an issue for residential uses, although the location seems appropriate for housing.
- To date, there have not been issues related to contamination voiced in the neighborhood across the street from the site.
- There seem to be two issues, the soil contamination and the groundwater contamination.
- Not convinced that there is a reasonable risk with remediation of the site.
- There are challenges with the use of Fair Oaks Park.
- It seems to make sense for the study to move forward to evaluate the issues further.
- There was reference to the former IBM site, where chemical were directly dumped into the soil.
• The details seem to be coming from different sources and it is difficult to get a clear picture on what the issues are.
• How is the City getting affordable units with the project proposal? Staff clarified that the City is looking at zoning the site at a lower density and allowing the applicant to use the State Density Bonus to achieve higher density. The Density Bonus requires the applicant to provide a certain number of affordable units based on State requirements.
• Does the groundwater contamination move? Staff clarified that it can and does depending on the water table that it is in and the remediation that is in place. Generally, it flows north towards the bay.
• A ½ mile radius seems too far to put a park for the development. Staff clarified that the applicant is studying alternative sites for the park.
• Prefer not to get half way with a study and then stop. Would like see the study move forward.
• Is the Hendy plume another one in the area. Staff clarified that it is.
• Does the groundwater contamination occur in the different water tables? Staff clarified that it’s usually in the upper layer, but there is and can be commingling of the tables.
• It was noted that the plume maps indicated that they flow under the Fremont Union High School District “School District” property.
• Does the School District know about the plume under the site? Staff stated that the City had not discussed the issue with the district.
• Is the existing industrial an appropriate use for the site? Staff clarified that the existing industrial is appropriate. Staff further clarified that redevelopment with a new industrial use would require further remediation based on the RWQCB standards.
• The school district should be notified about the contamination of the site.
• The proposal does not seem to provide any type of profitability for the City.
• Staff clarified that direction from the City Council would be helpful to refine the scope of the study if moving forward.
• The study should move forward so the Council can have all the information before making a decision.
• Staff clarified that the City will be setting up a joint meeting with the RWQCB to discuss the contamination and remediation of the site.
• A motion was made to continue with further analysis of the contamination and remediation of the site.
• A Councilmember indicated lack of support for residential use on the site until the contamination is removed.
• Four Councilmembers indicated support to further evaluate the contamination and soil conditions of the site to come back to the City Council before proceeding on further work on the General Plan study and Precise Plan.
Follow-Up Items:
• Provide contamination information to the Fremont Union High School District.

Members of the public offered the following comments:
• Carmine Renzulli (Spansion) indicated that they are meeting with the RWQCB and would like to come back to the City Council with more information.

**Adjournment:** 6:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shaunn Mendrin
Senior Planner