

DATE: 1/23/24

TO: COUNCILMEMBERS

FROM: CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE

SUBJECT: COUNCIL Q&A FOR JANUARY 23, 2024 CITY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING

Study Session:

- Does the entire library commission endorse the position of the subcommittee presenting on Tuesday?
Answer: The Library Commission unanimously approved the recommendations at their January 4, 2024 regular meeting.
- Can the Council provide direction at the study session for the library agencies to move forward, or is a resolution at a regular meeting required? Are there any other requirements the Council must satisfy to allow a proposal to proceed beyond giving direction at the study session?
Answer: Council would provide direction at the meeting for next steps, which could include a presentation to North County Library Authority for consideration.
- If the Council approves any of the options presented by the Subcommittee, what is the timeline to move forward with the library improvements?
Answer: The timeline would be dependent upon the amount of funding and scope of improvements, as well as the required agreements of other stakeholders. Once an architect has completed the drawings, staff will better understand a timeline for improvement.
- It is my understanding that Council does not take actions during Study Sessions. Will Council be putting this as a Discussion agenda item and decision at the next Council meeting for action?
Answer: Council can provide direction at this Study Session for next steps. There is no action requiring a resolution.
- Please clarify what we are evaluating regarding this library remodel. (E.g. the use of the city's owned building for a remodel within the current square footage of the library?)
Answer: The proposal is to renovate the existing main library building within the current square footage.
- Please clarify whether this is a private project on public land/public building. Will the remodel be handled as a private project or a public project using private funds?
Answer: This would be a public project completed on a City facility and will have to adhere to the Santa Clara County Procurement Policy/Process.
- Who will be involved in making the decisions after city approves the application and puts out an RFP?

Answer: There is currently no application for approval. This project would follow standard processes for remodels of existing facilities and procurement will adhere to the Santa Clara County Procurement Policy/Process.

- Will this project be returning to Council like all public land and public building projects? What specific steps will be followed by the City and Library through the planning process including those identified in the Design and Transportation Review municipal codes 14.78.020, 14.78.030, and 14.78.040?

Answer: This project is an interior remodel only and is exempt from Design Review Pursuant to 14.78.020.

- How much staff time will it take and cost to review, study, and analyze the project pre and post RFP?

Answer: The Santa Clara County Library District will refer the final RFP to the appropriate procurement staff with the county for release and review of the responses received for the bid of the project.

- Will there be adequate public outreach and input? If so, what steps will be taken and who will conduct gathering this input?

Answer: This project will incorporate public input through the process. The presentation and proposed recommendations utilize existing needs assessments from 2008 and 2018 that indicated the biggest needs for the main library facilities.

Agenda Item 3 (Acceptance of City Hall Permit Counter Project):

- The mayor's name is misspelled on the proposed resolution.

Answer: Noted, this will be changed prior to signature of the Mayor.

- The Resolution will be signed by Mayor Weinberg.

Answer: That is correct.

Agenda Item 5 (PCI):

- Staff's recommendation is for "the City [to] continue to manage PCI in a manner consistent with the City Council's Strategic Priority-Assets goal of achieving a PCI of 76 by 2027." PMP scenarios 2 and 5 both lead to this result. Which scenario is staff recommending the Council approve?

Answer: Since both scenarios 2 & 5 lead to a PCI of 76 by 2027 based on the PMP report, staff recommends scenario 2, based on previous Council direction.

- Scenario 2 will increase our PCI by 2 points, but increase our deferred maintenance from \$9.8 mm to \$12.1 mm. Scenario 5 will increase our PCI by 2 points, but increase our deferred maintenance to \$11.5 mm. How does staff anticipate the City will address its PCI needs in the next 5, 10, and/or 15 years (etc.) given the added budget constraints of the increased costs of deferred maintenance?

Answer: During the next cycle, the new Transportation Division team will work with the consultant, who will prepare the next PMP report with the revised PCI. Then, staff will ask the

consultant to run scenarios with a higher preventive maintenance budget and determine the impact on the overall PCI.

PCI is one measure of health for roads, but a focus on an overall PCI number will not adequately capture the overall condition of how the City's network of roads are operating. Deferred maintenance with regards to PCI does not address other critical needs of the roadways including Complete Streets Principles, Safe Routes to Schools, ADA, or other considerations.

- In the current fiscal year, the City has budgeted \$2.6 mm (TS-1001 and TS-1004). Those figures include no expenditures of general funds. In each of the next four fiscal years, that amount is anticipated to rise to a total of \$4.075 mm which includes an expenditure of \$1.85 mm of general funds each year. (*FY 23-24 budget, pp. 168 and 170 of 228.*) Are these numbers accurate? If not, why not? If so, then can't the City commit to a different PMP scenario which would minimize our deferred maintenance costs?

Answer: The new Transportation Division team did not work with the consultant who prepared the PMP report in January 2023 and therefore, cannot speak to the accuracy of the numbers. During the next cycle, the new Transportation Division team will work with the consultant, who will prepare the next PMP report with the revised PCI. Then, staff will ask the consultant to run scenarios with a higher preventive maintenance budget and determine the impact on the overall PCI.

The current budget does include expenditures from the General Fund on Council priorities for road improvements, but they are not captured in TS-1001 or TS-1004.

- Has the CSC opined which scenario the City should adopt?

Answer: The CSC provides input and recommendations on the Complete Streets Master Plan, Safe Routes to Schools, and other improvements when the design of a complete street is presented.

The Transportation Division will follow the general guidelines of CSMP in future street selection, and the goal is to add more streets related to the various streets included in the Safe Routes to School (SR2S) while maintaining or exceeding the PCI goal, as directed by Council.

- On the second chart of page 3 of the staff report, a "weighted average PCI" is used. Why is a weighted average used instead of the actual average? How is it weighted?
Answer: The different distress types (e.g., various types of cracks, potholes, etc.) may have different impacts on the overall performance and safety of streets. Therefore, assigning weights to these distress types allows for a more accurate representation of the pavement condition, which helps develop effective maintenance and rehabilitation strategies.
- What is the basis for StreetSaver using an inflation rate of 3% and an interest rate of 2%? These seem low. Are there PMP scenarios using other assumptions?

Answer: MTC uses these standard rates for inflation and interest rates for analysis of budget scenarios. The PMP scenarios use the same assumed rates.

- The staff report says that staff’s goal is to maintain a PCI of 74 in FY 23-24. (*Staff Report, p. 7*). However, scenarios 2 and 5 both indicate expected PCI’s greater than 74 in 2023 and 2024. (In fact, each of the other three scenarios do as well.) Why is the City expecting to maintain a PCI lower than that indicated by all of the scenarios in the staff report (and Pavement Management Budget Options Report).

Answer: These scenarios are dependent upon minimum budgets set for each of the scenarios and consistently used each year, which is different from the actual budget available to the department depending on the priorities needing funding from the General Fund.

- Our FY 23-24 budget sets a “Strategies & Goals for FY2023-24” for the PW Department to reach a PCI of 75 by 2026. (*FY 23-24 budget, p. 97 of 228.*) Won’t the proposed resolution undermine that strategy and goal?

Answer: The proposed resolution supports the strategy and goal of FY 23-24 for achieving PC 76 by 2027. Achieving a PCI of 75 the year prior is an important milestone in reaching the overall goal.

- The CAPS’ 2023 PMP Report assesses the City’s PCI as of September of 2022. Since that time, the City experienced major storms with flooding and related challenges. Haven’t those circumstances seriously degraded our roads such that the PMP Report is out of date? What would be involved in acquiring a new PCI report and should the City obtain a new report before committing to a PMP scenario?

Answer: The PMP PCI report is created every two years, the next one will be in 2025. The changes in PCI due to last year's heavy storms will be reflected in this report.

- Please explain how the “Decision Tree” included in Appendix B of the expert’s report works. Please explain how staff will use the decision tree in support of whichever PMP scenario is adopted by the City.

Answer: Staff would need to contact the consultant for an in-depth discussion of the consultant’s work.

- Why is the city using a different PCI categorization (*consultant’s report, table 3, p. 5*) than is used by the VTA? See: [2022-TSMP-Report \(vta.org\)](https://www.vta.org/2022-TSMP-Report)

PCI	Los Altos’ Consultant’s Class	VTA (MTC) Class
100-90	Very Good	Excellent
89-80		Very Good
79-70		Good
69-60	Good	Fair
59-50		At Risk
49-25	Poor	Poor
24-0	Very Poor	Failed

Since our PCI was established by MTC, shouldn't we be using their nomenclature? Wouldn't that also allow us to compare how Los Altos is performing as compared to our neighboring Cities?

Answer: Staff would need to contact the consultant to find out why the PCI categorization from MTC/VTA was not used for the January 2023 PMP report.

- Regarding the "Current PCI Condition" map printed on 2/27/2023: what is the difference between a road that is "Good (Non-Load)" vs. a road that is "Good (Load)?" What is "Non-Load" vs. "Load?"

Answer: "Non-Load" vs. "Load" refers to the type of pavement distress. "Non-load" distresses are caused by environmental causes. "Load" distresses are caused by traffic loads.

- The staff report says (on page 3), "The PCI rating of 74 places the City's Street network condition in the upper position of the "Very Good" category but the table showing functional classifications shows that the total weighted average of 74 is only rated "Good". This seems inconsistent, please explain.

Answer: Staff would need to contact the consultant to find out why the PCI categorization from MTC/VTA was not used for the January 2023 PMP report.

- The Resolution appears to be inconsistent, the 3rd Whereas says, "Staff recommends the City continue to manage PCI in a manner consistent with the ... goal of achieving a PCI of 76 by 2027", but the 4th Whereas and the Now Therefore say, " ... maintain the current PCI of 74". In fact, none of the scenario tables show a PCI of 74 in 2023. Please clarify.

Answer: Maintaining the PCI of current improved roadways and improving the PCI of selected roadways are both consistent with achieving the overall Council goal of a PCI of 76 by 2027.

Agenda Item 7 (Establishment of an Inclusive Housing in Lieu Fee):

- Is it worthwhile to offer other alternatives to developers? For example, could we allow developers to buy an existing unit whose inclusivity restriction is about to expire for the purpose of renewing the restriction?

Answer: This is an alternative compliance measure the City Council could take up, however that would require a specific Zone Text Amendment to the Municipal Code. The in-lieu fee option is already established within the Zoning Code, this only creates the fee itself.

- AB 1505 requires that we provide developers with at least one alternative for complying with the inclusionary ordinance, such as an in-lieu fee payment, land dedication, or off-site construction of affordable units. This program defines an in-lieu payment but no other potential options. Is it possible/feasible to say we'd consider other alternatives in addition to an in-lieu fee if an alternative is presented to Planning Commission (or Council) but not define what those other options are, just that we would consider them?

Answer: This is an alternative compliance measure the City Council could take up, however that would require a specific Zone Text Amendment to the Municipal Code.

Agenda Item 8 (Tree Protection Ordinance and Fee Schedule):

- § 11.08.060: Why does the ordinance list both the circumference and diameter of a tree in subsection “A,” but only lists its diameter in subsection “B?”
Answer: Staff can incorporate the circumstance as a minor modification to the ordinance for the second reading.
- If a tree is removed for any of the reasons set forth in §11.08.100.A. 3, 4, or 5, does the removed tree have to be replaced? If not, where does the ordinance so indicate? If so, then how will the City ensure that the same interference with a utility line, etc. will not re-appear?
Answer: A replacement tree is still required. As a part of the new process a planting plan would identify the appropriate location and species of tree which would ensure that the same issue or interference does not reoccur; it is highly unlikely that the replanting would occur in the exact location or include the same species.
- What are a property owner’s obligations if a replacement tree dies before the replacement tree reaches heritage status?
Answer: A tree does not automatically reach Heritage Tree status because of age. As defined by Ordinance, a "Heritage tree" means any tree so designated by the historical commission, based on the finding that the tree has character, interest, or value as part of the development of, and/or exemplification of, the cultural, educational, economic, agricultural, social, indigenous, or historical heritage of the city. If a tree is determined to be a Heritage Tree then the City would require it to be replaced should it die.
- Please provide the list of Native Tree Species.
Answer: This will be attached to the meeting information where Q&A is found.
- Should the list not be available, when will it be available?
Answer: The planting list of trees is subject to change as discussed at the last City Council meeting. As with other lists maintained by respective departments it is updated as appropriate.

Agenda Item 9 (Council salary and benefits):

- If salaries for cities our size are set by law, why do the other comparable cities shown have higher Councilmember salaries?
Answer: State law allows cities to raise Council members salaries by ordinance. Previously, this was capped at 5% each year. The comparable cities each raised the salaries of Council members at one point or another while Los Altos City Council has not given that direction.