



City of Sunnyvale

Meeting Minutes City Council

Tuesday, September 2, 2014

8:30 AM

Sunnyvale Heritage Park Museum Event
Room, 570 E. Remington Drive,
Sunnyvale, 94087

Special Meeting: City Council Strategic Planning Meeting

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Jim Griffith called the meeting to order in 8:38 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: 6 - Mayor Jim Griffith
Vice Mayor Jim Davis
Councilmember David Whittum
Councilmember Tara Martin-Milius
Councilmember Glenn Hendricks
Councilmember Gustav Larsson

Absent: 1 - Councilmember Pat Meyering

Vice Mayor Davis arrived at 10:20 a.m.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Deborah Marks provided comments and written materials regarding the Civic Center.

Michael Goldman provided comments regarding the Civic Center.

Mei-Ling Shek-Stefan provided comment regarding publicizing the meetings relating to the Civic Center.

OVERVIEW OF OPERATIONAL PRIORITIES

[14-0153](#)

City Manager's Memo to Council: September 2, 2014
Strategic Session

POLICY TOPICS & COUNCIL DISCUSSION / DIRECTION ON BALANCED STRATEGY

Study Session Summary:

Council met in a facilitated study session to receive staff presentations and discuss balanced strategy on the following policy topics:

1. Civic Center Campus and Main Library
2. The Ability of Infrastructure to Support Development and Traffic
3. Open Space Acquisition Planning; Future of Golf Courses
4. Downtown Sunnyvale

Council discussion included questions, comments, requests for additional information, and provided general direction relating to the policy topic areas and guiding principles summarized below (some comments were made by more than one Councilmember and are only listed once).

Civic Center Campus and Main Library:

Council expressed general consensus that community engagement is integral to creating a community vision and public support for civic center infrastructure improvements, and that there is a sense of urgency to move forward.

Councilmembers expressed:

- Support for City Manager's proposed decision tree - ideal process composed of City Council guiding principles and community engagement.
- Interest in understanding the financial aspects, including project financing options.
- Interest in receiving more comprehensive community input, having public engagement and developing public support.
- Interest in looking at higher level options and long-term planning; look at reserve funds to provide for infrastructure improvements and repairs; look at the operating budget in terms of helping with the infrastructure gap; develop ideas for converting capital funds to fill an operating gap; need to demonstrate to the public how this project helps with service levels and environment.
- Concerns as to whether partnering with private development could be successful and concerns regarding selling land when land is historically a good investment in Silicon Valley.
- Support for the majority to demonstrate listening to and respect for the minority view without compromising goals, and by means of process, establishing fairness in the general view among the community.
- Interest in developing community success criteria and establishing parameters for what a successful project would look like, while understanding that the timeline is critical.
- Request for more information or a list of urgent needs and repairs.

- Interest in doing a market analysis study to gain a better understanding of what the City's assets are.
- Comments that the basic requirements for pursuing civic center infrastructure improvements include community engagement, a strong sense of urgency to move forward, and a market analysis study.
- Comments that community engagement should include outreach to educate the public and Council with factual information and to dispel misinformation.
- Support for making decisions regarding debt financing options and bond financing vs. public-private partnership by the end of 2015, if possible.
- Support for creating a community vision with community involvement.
- Interest in exploration of putting the City's assets to work to create a revenue-stream, to go beyond just funding the building to help with the operating budget.
- Concerns regarding a public-private partnership, that entering into a 99-year ground lease might limit options of a future City Council if the City has growth needs in 40 or 50 years.
- Agreement that it is premature to consider public-private partnership as the Council-selected option for financing.
- Interest in developing a broader scope of what the community wants in its civic center, without constraints, such as leadership in "green" or environmentally sustainable standards and more space for community meeting rooms before the list can be whittled down to what can be done.
- Support for a needs assessment study for City Hall office space; look at appropriate use of space for parking, adequate green space, and expansion of the Library by 50%.
- Comments that the problem first needs to be defined; the goal would be to solve the problem; if voters don't approve the preferred approach, another solution to the problem will have to be developed. Public-private partnership should continue to be considered as an option. Whether the solution is voter-approved or not, the Council has to have the will to go down that road. It shouldn't be driven by timing; but the timing should be structured so that the opportunity to go to the voters in 2016 isn't missed if possible; the right public outreach is more important than the time scale.
- Interest in looking beyond scoping the basic needs (space needs, design needs, infrastructure needs) to look at what is inspiring, i.e., "What would be the 'Seven Seas Park' version of the civic center?"
- Support for phasing the community engagement part, such as by functions, sustainability goals, space, layout, open space, decisions intertwined with the financing options.
- Comments that, in this process, the City doesn't lose sight of the branch library project.
- Request of staff to provide a rough timeline and a realistic plan; identify if there

are issues that need to be de-prioritized to meet the timeline.

- Request for information on how the Senior Center was funded, and other past successes in financing.
- Interest in seeing information presented on the community benefit, improved quality of life, better service delivery, and managing of operational finances to control operating costs, such as projects that generate a net plus for the general fund or operational savings through energy efficiencies; need to demonstrate how operating costs will be financed for the new branch Library and civic center project.
- Comments that Council will have to make the commitment to move forward on the civic center, start the study and get it done, communicate with the public and receive input, and discuss the ramifications of every option including public-private partnership to come up with a plan.

City Manager Deanna Santana indicated staff will proceed with a market analysis study and will relay a timeframe on how long it would take to bring the studies up to date. With regard to the guiding principles, a communications and community engagement plan will be developed and brought back to Council with the proposed engagement process and timelines, quality of engagement, and an inventory of the ideas and themes Council proposes and would like integrated into the guiding principles.

Council recessed at 10:50 a.m.

Council reconvened at 11:03 a.m with Mayor Griffith, Vice Mayor Davis, Councilmembers Whittum, Martin-Milius, Hendricks and Larsson present.

The Ability of Infrastructure to Support Development and Traffic:

Council discussion included questions, comments, requests for information and provided general direction related to:

- Interest in feasibility of a relief sewer on the sewage treatment flow system to move the load from Homestead Road and move it up Wolfe Road rather than Sunnyvale and Lawrence Expressway.
- Interest in how to go about funding an automated, solar-powered, on-demand, transportation system and including it on the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) for all the large corporations that would be affected.
- Interest in issues that will result from the electrification of Caltrain rail lines and addition of rail cars by 2019, such as grade separations of both Sunnyvale Avenue and Mary Avenue.
- Interest in addressing development of better transit access from Lawrence Expressway to the Caltrain platform at Lawrence Station.
- Expressed concerns regarding the logic of taking out a stop light at the “monster interchange” to alleviate congestion while putting in a new stop light at Wildwood

and Lawrence Expressway one block from an existing stop light to fix a congestion problem.

- Support for the idea of examining whether City development fees are accurately assessed relating to the impact of new development costs.
- Support for improving the congestion management plan and inclusion of North-South oriented transit infrastructure and investment.
- Support for facilitating new delivery models such as companies that provide private shuttles to transit.
- Interest in an on-going discussion of a proposed light rail extension project through an area where there isn't much density and there isn't much support for density.
- Request for improved maps of existing roadway improvements to visually demonstrate impacts of each of the current projects.
- Request for maps that show traffic flow problems and challenges in red, green and yellow, to assist with understanding the bigger picture of traffic in the City.
- Interest in a better understanding of the impact of non-Sunnyvale growth on Sunnyvale traffic; would like to understand how pass-through traffic from other communities affects the Homestead, Wolfe, El Camino and Lawrence corridors.
- Interest in the question of whether specific new projects should be linked to traffic improvements.
- Interest in what can be done to accommodate traffic issues driven by new development and also those driven by people coming into existing homes and offices, such as a TMA that could serve existing companies in existing buildings.
- Comment that putting TDM requirements in place would only help for new developments and would not necessarily help with existing developments.
- Support for provision of more Caltrain parking; support for collection of more fees to pay for it.
- Interest in including on the sewer map growth in parts of the City where there are no development projects.
- Interest in regional coordination of regional issues.
- Interest in understanding the TDM load share and what should be required of new development;
- Comment that providing jobs attracts people and it is not a simple linear problem; interest in understanding a reasonable system that would fairly assess the impact of prior development and the non-linear effects when jobs are added; need some technical basis to fairly assess costs related to development.
- Interest in updating Traffic Impact Fees (TIF) to ensure development correctly pays its fair share; comment that it would be helpful if a range of conditions of approval are provided as options for correct assessment.
- Interest in looking seriously at the possibility of water rationing next summer.
- Interest in considering trails contiguous to development, with respect to the

demographics of a younger workforce.

- Interest in a global discussion of a plan for infrastructure for the next corridor that should be developed.
- Interest in looking at adjustments to TIF for Peery Park.
- Interest in methodologies other than Level of Service (LOS) analyses for looking at transit, such as vehicle miles traveled.
- Comment that discussions about transportation infrastructure are incomplete without a discussion about affordable housing; need a plan for affordable housing and infrastructure for transportation to have a balanced community.
- Interest in including more than one metric for looking at transit, not replacing one metric with another metric.
- Support for making the Council's priorities known to VTA and revisiting whether the current regional priorities are correct.

Council recessed for lunch at 12:39 p.m.

Council reconvened at 1:16 p.m. with Mayor Griffith, Vice Mayor Davis, Councilmembers Whittum, Martin-Milius, Hendricks and Larsson present.

Open Space Acquisition Planning; Future of Golf Courses:

Council discussion included questions, comments, requests for information and provided general direction related to:

- Interest in exploring options of offering incentives for developers to give more park dedication land, such as in relation to changing the allowable density of a development.
- Interest in looking at quality versus quantity with regard to acquiring acreage versus working to increase how much the existing parkland is used.
- Request for information on the operational perspective of pocket parks.
- Interest in exploring lighting and landscaping assessment districts for funding park maintenance costs.
- Support for a nexus to commercial property so that the commercial setting and attractiveness of the place would benefit by the open space; in Silicon Valley a significant demographic would like to work near parks for access to areas to exercise and use trails.
- Comments regarding the increase in park dedication fees and the increment in 'new' funds allocated to provide betterments and capital infrastructure for existing parks; the discussion of parks shouldn't be separate from the discussion of the budget and operating expenditures.
- Interest in developing a list of possibilities for parks projects, to be prioritized.
- Request for information about park needs from the Parks of the Future Study and update it with new parks; need to prioritize.
- Interest in looking at open space needs as part of the Peery Park and Lawrence

Station Area Plans.

- Interest in looking into an open space bond; need a project list and established priorities.
- Comments regarding the importance of the consideration of operating expense for open space.
- Comments regarding under-utilization of areas around golf courses, to consider how to improve return on investment or generate lease revenue.
- Interest in receiving more information about potential pocket parks.
- Interest in creating a succession plan for the Heritage Orchard.
- Request for information regarding use of park acquisition money for renovation of existing parks.
- Comments regarding joint use agreements in areas where the only open space is the joint use field; there is no access to the open space during the school day.
- Support for including areas served by joint use space as underserved areas and for consideration of creation of pocket parks in these places that can be used during the school day.
- Comments regarding the possibility of losing open space when a portion of the school fields convert to school buildings over time.
- Comments regarding the unlikelihood of the ability of Sunnyvale to successfully compete for purchase of real estate for parkland; the best opportunities will be land dedication as part of the park dedication fee, consideration of swap opportunities for the two large city-owned areas of Onizuka and the property off Mathilda.
- Support for a pocket park at Washington and Evelyn using 20% set aside.
- Interest in improving Plaza del Sol as part of the 20% as a priority.
- Support for separating the park dedication fee from the operating budget as is currently done, except when looking at the 20% acquisition, include consideration of the operating costs that goes along with buying the land.
- Support for looking at the area around Stewart for expansion and focusing dedication options in the area of Swegles Park.
- Support for giving serious consideration to the Southwestern corner of the Kimberley - Stevens Creek neighborhood, as their only open space is the West Valley School and Cupertino Union.
- Need a definition and discussion of what is meant by parks and open space, to segment on the map city-owned parks versus open trail space, and to distinguish between city-owned and school district open spaces.
- Support for acquiring new city-owned park space and large park spaces; support for developing strategies and giving direction to staff to pursue that.
- Interest in considering a commercial/industrial impact fee for parks.

Council recessed at 2:37 p.m.

Council reconvened at 2:50 p.m. with Mayor Griffith, Councilmembers Whittum,

Martin-Milius, Hendricks and Larsson present.

Downtown Sunnyvale:

Councilmember Whittum disclosed he lives within 500 feet of a portion of the subject area and stated he would abstain from discussions that relate to a portion of Block 1, a portion of Plaza Del Sol, the corner of Francis and Evelyn, and a portion of the west edge of 2.

Council discussion included questions, comments, requests for information and provided general direction related to:

- Interest in including in the Town Center Specific Plan concepts presented recently by a developer for the cinemas and the Town Square as a gathering place.
- Support for deferring the downtown parking plan until there is a new developer in place and dropping the study issue.
- Support for dropping the update of the Murphy Avenue Design Guidelines.
- Support for evaluating whether the amount of retail/commercial in Town Center is viable.
- Support for working with potential bidders about their ideas for developing the downtown.
- Support for updating the downtown plans now, or within two years.
- Request for better information/visibility for existing downtown parking; provide informational signs to downtown parking as soon as possible.
- Support for addressing blight and nuisance issues with Block 18, and communicating the City's efforts with the public.
- Interest in providing information to the public on the status of Town Center.
- Request for information on the Redevelopment Successor Agency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Griffith adjourned the meeting at 3:46 p.m.