QUESTIONS ON STAFF REPORT TOPICS:

Question 1 – Trip Cap & Transportation

- Does ride sharing mean carpooling throughout the NBS PP document? Or does it mean ride hailing (e.g., Uber, Lyft)?
  
  Response: Ride sharing typically means services like Lyft and Uber. Staff can clarify that these are ride-hailing services, to differentiate them from ride sharing/carpool references.

- Is there a way to address a development that never complies with TDMs (even after penalties)?
  
  Response: This will be something the City will be monitoring as we move forward. The intent is that if there are financial penalties, non-complying developments still must correct their SOV or TDM deficiencies.

- VTCap – Isn’t the 3 hour time frame more realistic of what is happening?
  
  Response: At the Shoreline Boulevard gateway the peak-one hour demand occurs for approximately three hours in the morning. With this peak hour to peak period relationship, the vehicle trip cap policy can be established for one-hour or a three-hour period. A peak-hour vehicle trip cap is likely a little easier to achieve, which would require the City and project applicants to conduct more detailed transportation studies sooner.

- What should come first, the transit infrastructure or the buildings?
  
  Response: Both are being planned concurrently. The exact timing depends on available roadway capacity to serve new growth and anticipated building occupancy and completion of transit projects.

- Page 147 - Green Ways Design Speed – why do we have a speed limit of 15 mph? Are the bikes and pedestrians separated or will they be sharing the pathways?
  
  Response: It depends on the context. They may be separated in some contexts, which is what we’ve heard a preference for, but there may be cases where they will share pathways.

- Page 162 - Stevens Creek Bridge – here and in other sections, there is mention of the Bridge. Could we clarify that the Bridge is not a definitive project but instead, it needs to be studied for feasibility first? Some people are thinking if we adopt the Precise Plan, the Bridge will be a given. We should clarify.
Response: Figure 47 and Table 20 articulate that these need feasibility studies. It is also listed as an action item.

- Page 178 and 179 - Employer sponsored shuttles – at the end of the paragraph, can we add language such as “ensure all employees can ride the shuttles”. As we’ve discussed in previous study sessions, I would like to make sure that TDM strategies including shuttles are for all types of employees, i.e. service employees, not just for certain classes of employees.
  
  Response: The adopted Precise Plan in 2014 did not specifically call out shuttles for all employees as a specific “baseline” requirement; however, some employer sponsored shuttles may be available to all site employees. Council could always require this for all site employees as a specific TDM measure/condition of project approval, or could require that TDM Plans include shuttle services for all employees of a site.

- Page 183 - I see that we are using 5.5 employees per 1000 sq ft of commercial space, which equates to 182 square feet/employee. I noticed that Sunnyvale uses 420 square feet/employee in their Lawrence Station Precise Plan. https://sunnyvale.ca.gov/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=23481 (p. 3.15)

  How can we use the same standard as Sunnyvale? Can we mandate the square footage per employee?
  
  Response: Our specific #’s for North Bayshore were based on our specific knowledge of how spaces are being used in the area through various transportation related studies and experience. It would be less defensible if we chose a number from a neighboring city that was not based on these Mountain View specific studies.

  It is difficult but not impossible to mandate square footage by employee. It may be easier though to tie employee head count to specific impacts, like the City has done for Charleston East.

- Why are we including a trip cap exception for residential? Can we condition it on internalization being high (higher than estimated?) If internalization is not achieved, then won’t we have more outbound SOV traffic which contributes to the unmitigatable traffic effects as noted in the SEIR?
  
  Response: Council directed that residential uses be exempt from the gateway trip cap as a way to incentivize new residential development, and to also help offset outbound gateway impacts. Monitoring of residential trip behavior will help determine what internalization rates are achieved by residential development.

- Page 220 - Capital Improvements – under Transportation, in the 2nd paragraph, it states “these improvements (transportation improvements) will only benefit
North Bayshore. Will this outcome hinder our ability to attract outside funding sources that tend to look for regional improvements? If the improvements only benefit North Bayshore, is the expectation that North Bayshore projects pay for them all?

Response: Because these improvements serve the relatively limited area of North Bayshore, most would generally not qualify for grants that are intended for projects with a strictly regional benefit. Other funding may be available, though, from grants focused on alternative transportation modes (particularly active transportation and transit). One of the projects, the pedestrian/bicycle bridge over Highway 101 at Shoreline, is included on a list of competitive pedestrian/bicycle projects in the Measure B program. Some of the improvements could also be incorporated completely or partially with highway projects that are eligible for grant funding. For instance, the Measure B competitive highway list includes improvements at Highway 101 and San Antonio, Charleston, Rengstorff and Shoreline. Staff is reviewing the list and candidate projects and will apply for grants as appropriate.

Absent grants, staff expects the projects to be completed from a combination of:

1) Included with other offsite improvements completed with individual developments;

2) Funded completely or partially with transportation impact fees on North Bayshore Developments;

3) Funded completely or partially with Shoreline Regional Park Community Funds.

- Staff has raised the possibility of bicycle/pedestrian bridges over Shoreline Blvd., but I could not find mention of that idea. Does that mean that they won’t be considered?
  Response: That idea is only in the exploratory stage at this early time, but could be further studied and detailed later.

- Did we ever resolve if having someone driven to work in a ride-sharing vehicle or taxi counts as something other than an SOV?
  Response: Our trip cap methodology would count this as a carpool going into NBS, and going out as an SOV trip.

- Is there a way to say more about providing mass transit during non-commute times? That will be important for residences.
  Response: The Plan EIR and supplemental transportation analysis focused on roadway capacity and transit service during the commute hours only. For non-commute times, additional strategies will be needed, but could include things
such as expanded TMA shuttle service, future AGT service, and other VTA sponsored service.

- Is there a reason the Plan doesn’t specifically mention “Dutch intersections” that provide preferential left turns for bicycles at signalized intersections? I thought we were considering those?
  
  Response: The Plan doesn’t anticipate any substantial new rebuilds of intersections, but can certainly study Dutch intersections for any new future intersection designs.

- As you know, VTA is currently studying transit strategies along the Highway 85 corridor and across Moffett Field. Why don’t we mention those?
  
  Response: The Hwy 85 study is too recent to be included in our study. Staff has coordinated with VTA staff on new transit strategies that could cross at Charleston over Stevens Creek. VTA supports the Council decision to study a transit bridge crossing at Charleston, as it would allow more potential transit technologies at this location than the La Avenida location (i.e. more straightforward approach; aligns with the Plan’s use of Charleston as a transit street).

- Can we be explicit about how bus routes can be used to develop travel patterns that can later be served by fixed transit?
  
  Response: In planning the future reversible bus lane along Shoreline, this idea was studied and supported. No other routes have been studied.

**Question 2 – Schools**

- Can TDRs be used within North Bayshore for a school?
  
  Response: Yes, it could be part of a Local School Strategy, which would need to be approved by the City Council.

- How many children are expected in NBS, considering that most of the proposed units are studios or 1 bedroom?
  
  Response: This is difficult to estimate. The EIR includes some estimates of school age children as presented from the school districts (appendix C of the FEIR). This estimate of 2,347 school age children (elementary to high school) is based on a mix of unit sizes and types, and a maximum build out of 9850 units. Post occupancy surveys and studies will be needed to confirm actual student generation numbers.

- I believe we have made progress on planning for new schools, but I’m wondering if we can do more. I am worried that we will paint ourselves into a corner, as we did in the San Antonio area. The plan mentions general locations for parks. Why not schools?
Response: Schools are listed as allowed in any area in North Bayshore with a Provisi

on Use Permit. It is suggested that this be kept as broad as possible to maximize the

flexibility of where a new school might be located, and where we might be able to

find land for a school from a private landowner. That being said, Council could add

language that encourages a school to be located within say the Complete Neighborhood

area where most of the residential is planned. The Plan does have policy language about

schools and the City sharing parks/open space.

Question 3 — Local Hire Policy

- Local Hire Policy- Are there any unintended consequence, or possible transition to requiring hiring practices? How would you measure this, if not, why have it?
  Response: The draft language is a policy that encourages but does not mandate, local hiring practices. Potential downsides include if developers can’t find a local, trained workforce; the City doesn’t have a mechanism to track implementation of a local hire policy; and that it could increase development costs.

Question 4 — Sustainability/Habitat

- Why is the HOZ boundary 200 ft for Stevens Creek and 150 ft for Permanente Creek? Why are they not the same?
  Response: Stevens Creek is considered a higher value habitat area than Permanente Creek, with more riparian habitat. Hence the greater buffer distance.

- Here are the additional issues I think the Council needs to discuss beyond the ones listed in the staff report. There might be more depending upon the answers to some of the questions above:
  - Sustainability combined with species/habitat in the monitoring plan
    Response: Staff is open to separating these studies out. Staff proposed to group them together to make our sustainability reporting more efficient.

- Enhance Ecosystems- why not zone for less building and not have to offer incentives to transfer rights?
  Response: The Plan does both—by requiring lower building heights and FARs in Edge areas adjacent to habitat areas. The Plan also incentivizes TDR from the Edge to the Core.

- Page 43- Shorebird Neighborhood – should there be high density- or medium density and lower since it is near the Egret Rookery?
  Response: The Plan includes building heights and FARs that are generally lower adjacent to habitat areas. Projects adjacent these areas will also have meet additional requirements to protect habitat (Chapter 5).
• Page 111 - 3. Egret Rookery HOZ Item b – building placement – why is there a difference of how far a residential bldg. vs a non-residential building should be placed? 300 ft and 200 ft seem rather close. How were these #’s derived?
   Response: Residential development will involve more people, noise, activity, and pets 24/7 than would be the case with non-residential, which is why we thought that the egret rookery HOZ buffer for residential should be greater than that for non-residential. The numbers came from our consulting biologist based on his experience, although they aren’t exact numbers based on specific studies, just general distances to allow some buffers between buildings and habitat areas.

• Page 113 - Exceptions to HOZ Requirements. I do not support exceptions 1 and 2. Why should we have these exceptions as I don’t see them as beneficial to the Habitat?
   Response: The exceptions to HOZ requirements can only be granted if the applicant demonstrates an ecological benefit per exception criterion (iii). If a project requests an HOZ exception to be constructed per exception criteria (i) and (ii), and then offers some benefit “package” to the City that will result in an overall net ecological benefit, then an HOZ exception may be granted.

• Page 108 - Standards #1- similar to my previous question, should we lower the allowable FAR in the HOZ, and should we also make adjacent parcels compliant with HOZ standards?
   Response: This is a Council policy decision; the Plan was drafted based on direction from Council and stakeholders on preferred FAR’s and other factors.

Question 5—Additional Plan Changes

No questions received.

Question 6—Affordable Housing Policy

• In the Affordable Housing Administrative Guidelines on page 3, it says that the actual affordable rental units can be reassigned to another location if certain requirements are met. Can they be reassigned outside of the North Bayshore Precise Plan area?
   Response: No. The intent of this provision is that affordable units can be moved to another location within the same building.

• In the Affordable Housing Administrative Guidelines on page 9, it says the City must approve the preservation plan. Who at the City would approve it?
   Response: The City Council would approve the preservation plan.
• In the Affordable Housing Administrative Guidelines on page 10, it says the tenure type of on-site units needs to be specified. What is tenure type?
  
  Response: “Tenure type” refers to whether the housing is a rental or a for-sale unit.

• Page 89 - On the Housing Options Chart, will the Rental Housing Impact Fee be removed once we adopt the 15% inclusionary zoning ordinance?
  
  Response: Yes.

• My biggest concern is the emphasis on small housing units. I believe this will force people to move out of town once they have kids. At this late date I don’t expect to change the allocations, but I’m hoping the Plan can be flexible. That is, if when perhaps half the homes are built, prospective residents indicate an interest in larger units, I would like there to be a mechanism to adjust the number.
  
  Response: Yes, the Plan is flexible. The mix of units is only a target. As development is submitted, the proposed mix of units and its effect on the overall Plan mix will be highlighted. At that time, modifications to the project can be made depending on the project, number of units, size of units, market, etc.

  For affordable housing projects, there will also be Council flexibility on the size of units the City may want to help fund through the NOFA process, etc.

• On a related issue, on page 91 (p. 97 of the PDF) it states, “The mix of affordable housing unit sizes and types should generally be proportionate to the mix of market rate housing unit sizes and types.” If we hold to that, despite recognition that low-income workers seem to have larger families, we will be creating hardship for them.
  
  Response: Some flexibility could be provided to respond to the housing needs of lower-income households that may be different than the needs of market rate housing.

• On page 91 (97 of the PDF) it states, “An FAR Bonus project may donate land to the City of Mountain View in lieu of providing on-site affordable units if the project meets requirements in the North Bayshore Affordable Housing Administrative Guidelines. Does this exclude discounted leasing? Leasing may be more practical in integrated mixed-use developments.
  
  Response: If a developer has an affordable housing obligation, they can choose to meet it by providing units onsite or donating the land. The same thing would apply to a mixed-use residential development: they can choose to build or donate. Whether there is a discounted (ground?) lease is up to the developer as they consider the economics of their project and how to meet their requirements.
Would you have any additional context that could potentially help clarify the question?

- What are the existing applicable preferences for accepting residents in affordable housing buildings or units?
  Response: The City of Mountain View has a live/work preference for its affordable housing.

- Are we considering any geographic preference?
  Response: The City Council has provided some input on a geographic preference for affordable housing. For affordable housing, the City has a geographic preference for households that live or work in Mountain View. As to market rate housing, the Precise Plan’s transportation requirements encourage developments to internally capture vehicle trips, which will likely encourage the provision of housing for households who live and work in or near North Bayshore.

Question 7—FAR Tier Requirements for Affordable Housing

- Housing- if the new standard for affordable housing is 15%, why not move the old Tier 2, and make it Tier 1, and incorporate all the request benefits at 20%?
  Response: The staff report lays out several options, including Option 3, similar to what is described above.

- We’re still using a bonus FAR tool to promote 15% affordable units in rental housing development. How does that fit with our recently restored ability to require 15% without providing a density bonus?
  Response: The Bonus FAR Tiers section of the staff report beginning on Page 14 provides four options for Council consideration given Council’s direction on November 28 to increase the citywide affordable housing requirement to 15%.

Question 8—Changes to FAR Bonus Guidelines

No questions received.

Questions 9A & 9B—Master Plans

- Page 102 - 8. - Expedited Review Process, why do we allow the ZA to approve the permits?
  Response: Council will discuss this issue as part of the Master Plan questions this evening.

- Master plans- why would you not do an entire master plan for the Joaquin Neighborhood, and not just for Gateway?
Response: If a Master Plan makes sense for a project developer in this area, then they could propose one under the current language. Some of this decision depends on the scale and timing of new development in this area—-if a new building or two are proposed, or if an entire block is proposed for redevelopment which requires a new street and therefore a Master Plan would be appropriate. Question 9B asks Council if it wishes to require master plans elsewhere.

- Why not require master plans for the Shorebird and Pear?
  
  Response: As noted above, the staff report includes a discussion where Council could have the discretion to require Master Plans in different areas based on certain criteria such as project or parcel size, ownership pattern, phasing, etc. (Question 9B).

POSSIBLE PROPOSALS TO BE MADE

I think I’m going to ask that we use the peak 3-hour period, rather than 7-10 am for the triggering trip count.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS:

FAR & Building Heights

- Would both public and private child care facilities be exempt from the FAR calculation?
  
  Response: Yes, as the idea is to incentivize a mix of diverse uses such as child care, and to make child care more accessible in the area for future residents and the large number of employees. The exemption is intended to encourage child care facilities on larger sites/campuses.

- I think a sentence needs to be added clarifying that this is the bonus FAR for office space. The ability to get a bonus on any particular building thru the tiers is separate from this and will continue throughout the length of the precise plan, right

- 3.3.5-if you have maximums heights, why are projects allowed to go higher? Rooftop features may exceed the max by 6 feet. Roof top screens may extend 4 feet taller.
  
  Response: This provides residential project developers some additional flexibility for rooftop features.

- Are there any requirement about light reflecting off buildings?
  
  Response: No.
• 3.3.3 FAR – if massing is a concern, why are parking structure excluded from FAR?
  
  Response: Parking structures are included in the FAR for residential buildings, but excluded from office buildings. This is the standard way the City has measured FAR for a number of years.

• Page 64- 1) Residential in general area – where did 3.5 come from?
  2) Residential/Non-residential Projects in Gateway 4.2 or 4.5? I thought we agreed on 4.2.
  
  Response: FARs were derived through community workshops and public input, City Council/EPC meeting discussions, and prototype testing by the project team. Changing the Core / Gateway FAR from 4.2 to 4.5 was presented to the Council and agreed to in the Spring 2017.

• Page 68 - Maximum Residential Building FAR by Tier
  For the Edge, where did we get 1.85? I thought the goal of the edge areas is to remove building FAR and try to encourage the FAR transfers to the Core?
  Response: See above. Also, the Edge area allows lower FAR’s and supports FAR transfers to the Core area.

• Page 71- Guidelines - 1. High Rise Building Locations – should we exclude the Edge and General areas?
  
  Response: High-rise buildings are allowed in some areas of the General character area, per Figure 14. They are not allowed in the Edge character area.

• Page 73 - The made shoes areas for 4 stories and 8 stories next to each other. How do we account for the need to transition from 4 to 8 stories?
  
  Response: Specific height transitions will be reviewed on a case by case basis. The Plan encourages a variety of building heights in larger development projects, to provide visual interest and to avoid the ‘tabling’ effect of all similar building heights. In some areas or developments it may be appropriate to move from 4 – 8 stories; others may need some urban design strategies to create a smoother transition.

• Page 91- In the Maximum Residential FAR Bonus Tiers by Character Area chart, again I don’t think we should allow 1.85 for Tier I Bonus in the Edge area

• Page 93 - Standard 5 – why should we exclude Office FAR Transfer projects from the maximum allowed Character Area FAR? If we are to do this, can we ensure that the transfers will not be placed on parcels adjacent to HOZ areas?
  
  Response: The intent is to encourage non-residential projects to redevelop their existing office sites for residential using office FAR transfers as an incentive. To
the second point, by restricting the transfer to the Core areas, the policy is targeting FAR movement away from sensitive habitat areas.

- How do we allocate residential development rights to smaller developers? There is at least one besides Sobrato, Google, and SyWest.
  Response: The allocation of development rights (FAR) only applies to Bonus FAR commercial projects.

- On page 63 (p. 69 of the PDF) the caption states, “Grocery stores may be excluded from residential projects.” I assume that is intended to say that the stores “may be excluded from the FAR calculations for residential projects.” Some people might be confused by the current wording.
  Response: Yes, will correct

EIR

- Unavoidable impacts - Would the light rail extension from NASA or the AGT have any effect on the impacts, have they been considered in the EIR?
  Response: In addition to the intersection specific mitigation measures described in the environmental document, there are other possible actions that could be taken to offset or address some of the transportation impacts identified in the EIR including adding gateway capacity.

  The addition of a new gateway(s) could provide additional capacity for travel in and out of the North Bayshore area. Possible gateway connections might include a bridge over Stevens Creek, and/or an additional crossing location of US 101 connecting Charleston Road to Landings Drive. Any new gateway connection would need to be evaluated to determine its benefits and impacts. The light rail extension from NASA or the AGT are possible options. Any new gateway capacity would need to create a mode shift that reduces the single occupancy vehicle target well below 45 percent and potentially provide vehicle capacity.

  Over the past few months, City Council has refined the NBPP policies to include future studies of additional gateways, selected the reduced residential parking standard, and modified gateway monitoring requirements to include reporting two-way total traffic during the morning and evening peak periods. These changes to the NBPP reduce the severity of the potential impacts to the transportation system.

- Overriding consideration—is the only solution – no project?
  Response: Under CEQA, the Council needs to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations in order to approve a project with unmitigated significant environmental impacts. The following is from the CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a):
CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance—as applicable—the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered acceptable.

- Is it possible to pass the Precise Plan without approving the SEIR? Is there a vote threshold for passing the SEIR?
  
  Response: No, Council must certify the SEIR and adopt the Statement of Overriding Considerations in order to approve the Precise Plan. A simple majority is required.

- I have concerns about voting for overriding considerations. As a member of the BAAQMD, it troubles me that the NBSPP will hinder us from reaching our GHG emissions targets. Is there any way to overcome this?
  
  Response: The amended plan reduces the greenhouse gas emissions per service population compared to the existing setting and the adopted plan buildout, as shown below in the table. The amended plan does not reduce emissions below our threshold, so there is still an impact.

However, the Plan uses a number of innovative tools, such as a residential trip performance standard, in order reduce GHG emissions as much as possible while also meeting the community’s vision for North Bayshore.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Category</th>
<th>Existing 2015</th>
<th>Adopted 2030 North Bayshore Precise Plan</th>
<th>Amended 2030 North Bayshore Precise Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>183,777</td>
<td>247,463</td>
<td>310,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency Metric</td>
<td>7.2 ²</td>
<td>6.4 ³</td>
<td>5.4 ⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 Threshold</td>
<td>4.5 MT CO₂e/year/service population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There is no mention of toxic exposure. Is that in the SEIR?
  
  Response: As noted on pages 277-278 of the Draft SEIR, hazardous materials that may affect human health are regulated by various state agencies. Those regulations include limits and requirements to prevent exposure to hazardous materials that are toxic (e.g., have harmful effects to people due to short-term or long-term exposure). The SEIR identifies, at a program-level, that potential impacts from hazardous materials and hazardous waste could pose a significant
threat to human health and identifies measures to reduce these impacts and human exposure to contaminants. While toxicity of specific chemical compounds are not listed, the standard conditions of approval and mitigation measures to be included in the Precise Plan include addressing measures to reduce exposure to toxic substances. For example, in the case of impacts to an individual site from hazardous materials, project applicants will be required to coordinate work activities with the oversight agency and the potentially responsible parties, including identifying conditions that could affect the implementation and monitoring of the remediation and/or mitigation remedy designed to reduce exposure of people and the environment to toxic or harmful substances.

• Similarly, although the Plan may have transportation benefits for the NBS area, the SEIR states that traffic congestion will be worsened throughout the region, and this effect will be unmitigatable. How do we address this situation?
  
  Response: The only ways to address this would be to significantly reduce the scale and intensity of the project, including the allowed number of units, size of units, parking ratios, residential trip performance standards, etc.; or require substantial TDM requirements or restrictions.

• Page 97 - Chapter 4 on Green Building and Site Design talks about lowering greenhouse emissions as an objective, but the Precise Plan SEIR shows that GHG emissions will increase beyond mitigatable levels. How do we reconcile this conflict?
  
  Response: There is no conflict – by including residential uses, the amended plan reduces the greenhouse gas emissions per service population compared to the existing setting and the adopted plan buildout. (Overall emissions will rise as traffic would increase over the adopted plan.) But the amended plan does not reduce emissions below thresholds, so there is still an impact.

• Will we require notification of building occupants of environmental responses?
  
  Response: The North Bayshore Precise Plan SEIR is a program-level EIR, and does not describe specific measures for hazardous materials. Similar to the process to date, as projects are proposed under the amended North Bayshore Precise Plan, a site-specific environmental checklist will be prepared that will tier off the NBPP SEIR. These checklists will include project-level hazardous materials review and site-specific conditions of approval. This has been the process with the projects approved so far in North Bayshore, including Plymouth, Shashi, Charleston East, Microsoft, etc. (Also true for projects approved under the San Antonio and El Camino Precise Plans.) Based on this approach, notification of building occupants about “environmental responses” will be determined on a case-by-case basis. There are a number of sites in North Bayshore that may not have substantial contamination, and other sites that cannot be developed until the oversight agency has released the site as clean (per
the standard City condition of approval “Toxic Assessment”). In these examples, notification might not be appropriate.
The oversight agencies could require Institutional Controls for sites undergoing remediation. Institutional Controls are non-engineered instruments of control, such as administrative and legal controls (i.e. Deed Restrictions, HOA Restrictions, etc.), that help minimize the potential for human exposure to contamination and/or protect the integrity of the response action. Institutional Controls typically are implemented through the City’s planning and permitting procedures so that the appropriate remedy is applied to particular building construction. These controls could require notification to building occupants. A notification of on-going remediation and the institutional controls could be added as a condition of approval during the review process for an individual project.

- Will we require some form of vapor mitigation on all properties above known Chlorinated Volatile Organic Compound groundwater plumes?

  Response: The City of Mountain View has a standard condition of approval for vapor barriers that is applied to projects where such measures are needed. Groundwater plumes containing CVOCs are generally under the oversight of regulatory agencies. These agencies would require site-specific vapor mitigation measures and/or soil, soil vapor and/or groundwater remediation activities that projects have to address prior to development. Mitigation Measure MM HAZ-3.1 in the SEIR requires future project applicants to coordinate with these oversight agencies, and MM HAZ-3.3 requires applicants to provide the oversight agency’s written approval of vapor mitigation plans to the City.

- Are the North Bayshore findings of significant impact in relation to the current conditions or to the 2014 adopted plan?

  Response: Regarding the significant impacts listed in the Findings:

  • The transportation analysis studied the impacts from the project compared to the existing conditions, with 2015 as a baseline year (vehicle counts collected in 2015 and 2016). The trip generation for the adopted 2014 plan was discussed for informational purposes (Section 4.14.3.3), particularly in regard to gateway capacity.

  • The air quality analysis compared the project to existing conditions.

  • The greenhouse gas emissions thresholds of significance under CEQA are different than those of other environmental issues. The projected GHG emissions for the proposed amended 2030 North Bayshore Precise Plan are compared to the future 2030 GHG reduction target to meet state and local goals, rather than existing conditions or the emissions of the 2014 adopted plan.
Hazardous materials, noise, biological resources, and other construction impacts were compared to existing conditions.

Parking

- Can residential developments use district parking facilities?
  Response: Yes, provided an agreement is in place between a development and the facility. This can also be done with a neighboring commercial parking lot.

- How would the minimum price for parking stalls be enforced?
  Response: Most probably through a condition of approval related to reporting of parking pricing, rental rates, etc.

- Here are the additional issues I think the Council needs to discuss beyond the ones listed in the staff report. There might be more depending upon the answers to some of the questions above:
  - Parking stall pricing

- At one point the Council indicated a willingness to allow Sobrato to raise slightly the allowable parking spaces per unit. How does that fit into the plan?
  Response: The Council noted the difficulty of newer residential projects meeting the 0.6 average spaces/unit, such as Sobrato.

  The Plan allows developments like Sobrato to submit their project with more parking than this standard, but must analyze what is keeping them from achieving reduced parking. This analysis must justify their request for more parking, and could include a list or map of available bike/ped/transit infrastructure in the area, including TMA service, that might justify a higher than average parking ratio.

  The Plan also requires these projects to submit garage designs that can be more easily retrofitted in the future to other uses (storage, habitable space, bike storage, etc.) when less parking is needed.

- I didn’t see any mention of parking strategies for movies or Shoreline Amphitheater concerts. At least the latter is an issue.
  Response: This was not part of the scope of the Precise Plan. The City has not designed any parking infrastructure for the Amphitheater, and has never studied this issue in depth.
Design

- Page 3- it is mentioned that Building will have simpler facades. Council is already complaining that the builds are all looking alike, so what does simpler mean?
  
  **Response:** The urban design direction for North Bayshore is one which is more urban, with building prototypes that typically result in simpler facades without a lot of deep stepbacks that you may see in other areas of the City. The images in the Plan attempts to capture the ‘look and feel’ of this direction. However, the updated design guidelines includes direction that these simpler facades should still be articulated (with projecting elements like bay windows, ground floor stoops and canopies, balconies, upper story stepbacks).

  The Plan also includes some images showing some residential buildings that could still be urban yet could be a little more unique, with angled facades that may create more interest.

- Page 3 – buildings would be located closer to the street, would there still be 10 foot sidewalk?
  
  **Response:** Sidewalks in North Bayshore are generally 7 feet wide with a 5-foot landscape strip. Sidewalks would generally be wider in commercial areas such as in the Gateway area to facilitate more pedestrian foot track, shopping, outdoor dining, etc. In general, buildings in NBS should be placed closer to the back-of-sidewalk to create a more urban, pedestrian feel.

- Neighborhood design- if locating buildings closer to the street, what is going to prevent the Canyon effect?
  
  **Response:** A “canyon-like feeling” can result from having narrow streets and continuous tall buildings on both sides of the streets. North Bayshore does place buildings close to the street to facilitate a more active pedestrian/placemaking experience. The Plan is attempting to balance a ‘streetwall’ presence – a continual pattern of 4-6 story buildings along a block – in order to create new urban neighborhoods without overwhelming the pedestrian; there are standards and guidelines that will help break up streetwalls so they do not overwhelm the pedestrian. Examples include creating new smaller blocks approximately 400’ in length in complete neighborhood areas; limiting building lengths to no more than 300’; breaking up building façade lengths greater than 200’ with at least one major massing break; and requiring articulation and design features at least every 50 feet.

- Gateway- what is pedestrian scaled buildings?
  
  **Response:** In this area, it is a design focus on the bottom three floors. These floors should include building details to create and maintain visual interest, including high-quality frontages, e.g. stoops, shopfront, landscaped yards. Pedestrian scaled
buildings may also include taller ground floors that can accommodate retail/restaurant/service uses; on commercial streets, a high-degree of transparency (i.e. store front windows, doorways, entries, awnings, and outdoor furniture. These buildings also typically do not include large blank facades or walls.

• If you make up smaller blocks and using land for more roads, isn’t the effect reducing open space?
  Response: Because the Plan allows greater heights and densities, greater site plan efficiencies can be achieved. This will allow new development to be relatively compact with private / public open space design opportunities. Additionally, new bike/ped connections also form part of the open space network. For example, the proposed Sobrato project on Pear Avenue includes a total of 7 buildings, but includes a number of private, semi-private, and publicly accessible open space areas, including new bike and pedestrian connections.

• Principle 5—it is mention many times about sidewalks being used to increase pedestrian use and encourage dining areas in the public right, should wider sidewalks be requirement?
  Response: Wide sidewalks would be encouraged in areas with commercial activities. However, while outdoor dining may occur on the sidewalk, it’s likely that a portion of outdoor seating areas will be provided within the front setback areas of new retail projects.

• 3.3.8—if you are encouraging outdoor dining, and allowing it in the public right of way – why not require a minimum of 10 feet not 8 feet sidewalks, to give extra space?
  Response: The Plan could, however some of the outdoor dining area could likely be located on private property; an 8 foot wide sidewalk still provides adequate pedestrian space.

• Principle 7 is good, but given recent Council discussions I’m wondering if the Plan can encourage design to not be all rectilinear. Some of the graphics show angles that are not 90 degrees, but I didn’t see anything about that in the text.
  Response: The Plan is trying to implement two key urban design strategies: create more urban, taller, dense buildings that are more likely to be rectilinear type structures found in other well designed urban places such as downtown, Mission Bay, Portland Pearl District.

  The Plan also encourages other more innovative, ‘edgy’ designs. These range from the new Google campus on one extreme for commercial buildings, to other images added to the Plan that show other residential examples that provide a bit different contrast to the classic rectilinear designs.
Council could request text be added to the Plan, something like “encourage non-rectilinear building designs to create visual interest and to break up rectilinear building patterns”, etc.

- How do buildings with stoops comply with the ADA?
  Response: The Building code requires that each unit have an accessible entry point in multi-family construction (this is not a requirement for SFD’s). The code also requires the accessible entry to be at the “primary” entry, but that can be determined by the Building Official. As such, most of these units have a second entry from the back side of the unit (usually from the parking garage) that is deemed the primary entry by the Building Official, and therefore meets the code requirements and the planning/zoning requirement to have stoop/steps and a porch.

  As part of the requirement the design usually needs to keep an accessible path to/through the garage that is less than 200-ft. from the elevator/ramp to the most remote unit entrance – which is often the more difficult design feature to provide.

- Street Walls- what is the idea about creating them?
  Response: Streetwalls help define urban places. They help form a feeling of comfort and enclosure for pedestrians. (Please also refer to the earlier response regarding streetwalls).

- Principle 4- what is meant by “simpler massing for office buildings? It was also mention for residual units, why are we going simpler and yet you mention in Principle 7 about memorable buildings, how do you do both?

- What makes a building memorable?
  Response: A building is “memorable” if it evokes a strong feeling — either negative or positive. The Plan is of course striving for new positive reactions and feelings to buildings. Ways that new buildings could be memorable in North Bayshore include innovative shapes and designs, such as the new Google-Charleston East building, or more traditional urban buildings that are both familiar and pedestrian friendly and comfortable.

- Building entries- how does entrances ( stoops, porches, and dooryards) into building with direct access work for a 7-10 story building, I see it working for smaller building.
  Response: It is not uncommon for taller residential buildings to have ground floor units. Higher floor units will be provided access typically through an elevator, but will access will be from a common ground floor entry or garage. Ground floor units will be provided access through internal corridors and from the street.
• Principle 9- what is an “appropriate amount of usable open space”?
  Response: Lot coverage standards generally dictate that open area / landscaping
  should be 20-30% of the site area at a minimum, which is in the Plan. Besides the
  numeric standard, the development review process will include additional
  opportunities to confirm if a particular development project has adequate open
  space based on the lot size, density, site plan, and circulation plan. Residential
  units would also be expected to provide additional open space required by city
  code.

• Gateway Character area-how does minimal setbacks and human-scale go
together?
  Response: See other response related to human scale building strategies and
  elements.

Open Space

• Public park- How big is the central park? The smaller ones were mention as .5 to
  2 acres.
  Response: This is to be determined, but could be bigger than the smaller
  neighborhood parks. The determining factors will be to ensure the space functions
  well as a central gathering place in the community. Ideas to help determine its
  ultimate size include redevelopment opportunities, need for a variety of passive /
  active recreation and events, such as farmers’ markets, cultural events, to
  encourage use of the space throughout the day and year.

• 3.3.6-is there any difference in minimum on residential open space in NBS, than
  else were in Mountain View? 80sf
  Response: The R3 standards require a minimum of 40 sf per unit for private open
  space.

Miscellaneous

• What is a P-34 designation?
  Response: This is the previously adopted (2014) North Bayshore Precise Plan
  designation.

• Promote Economic diversity- where is the spaces for startups coming from, who
  is going to build the space? Is it going to be required?
  Response: Some of the spaces could come from older, underused industrial
  buildings in the area, or from smaller office space leased as part of a larger
  development.
• Cost of additional City services for housing in NBS, staff report mention that it would not be a negative, any ball park figures?
  Response: The City has not done a detailed cost for additional services. Our high-level analysis generally indicates that at full build-out the Precise Plan has the potential to be fiscally beneficial, as the Plan’s projected growth and future revenues would likely exceed expenditures.

• Can we require Private art on new development – Art is mention numerous times?
  Response: Private art could be included as a community benefit in a private development if desired by Council.

• How many people will be house in the 9850 housing units? I did a rough guess that there would be about 13790 bedrooms , using Table 2
  Response: Our transportation analysis included a range: approximately 18,000 residents for small units (1.75 persons/unit) to approximately 21,450 for larger units (2.10 person/unit). Both of these numbers are based on the maximum buildout of 9850 units.

• Who is ultimately responsible if there is flooding in NBS, even with all of the requirements and infrastructure investments?
  Response: The answer to this question would depend on the particular facts of a flooding incident, because the answer is determined by what causes the flooding.

  To protect against flooding events, the City, the Santa Clara Valley Water District and others, maintain infrastructure that manages storm water and provides flood protection. In addition, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) assesses flood risk and maintains maps that show areas at risk of flooding and provides guidelines and regulations for flood protection in those areas. FEMA also manages the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) that provides flood insurance.

  Generally speaking, property owners may have flood insurance through the NFIP that could cover some losses. In a major flood event, additional assistance may come through FEMA or the State if a Federal or State disaster is declared. If a property owner thought that damages were caused by the negligence of another party, they could seek remedies through the legal system. Beyond that, property owners may be responsible for damage on their property due to flooding.

• 3.3.2 LAND USES- Condos, prohibited?
  Response: Condos are not prohibited by the Plan.
• Lot coverage-Is there a difference in lot coverage for a single family home than a residential building?
  
  **Response:** There is no specific lot coverage standard for single-family homes; .45 FAR is the maximum allowed for single family homes, which we can assume to also be the maximum lot coverage for a single story home. The Plan includes a maximum 70% building coverage standard for new residential projects.

• 3.4.1- Does smaller units and reduced parking translate into lower rents?
  
  **Response:** All things being equal, yes, our expectation is that these rents would be lower given these conditions when compared to larger units with more parking.

• 3.4.3 #4- Required Private/public art, can that be done in the Precise Plan?
  
  **Response:** Yes, public art can be required or programmed into new public spaces; Private art can be required through Bonus FAR or community benefit offerings.

• Page 100 - Standards #4 – Can we require not just being EV ready but include EV charging stations?
  
  **Response:** Our current code requires 10% of all parking spaces in new construction for residential and office to be installed with EV charging stations.

• Page 214 - Under Implementation Actions, could we include a timeline and sequencing of the development of the respective neighborhoods starting with the Gateway?
  
  **Response:** The complete neighborhood strategy and targets are a flexible tool Council can use to gauge how the mix and timing of new neighborhood development is progressing, and can make decisions on this as projects come forward. It may be difficult to impose a specific timeline on private development proposals.

• Does the 25% maximum on turf landscaping apply to parks? I hope we can have large lawns in parks.
  
  **Response:** The Water Conservation in Landscaping Regulations identifies “areas dedicated to active play, recreation or public assembly such as a park, sports fields, picnic grounds, amphitheater or golf course…” as special landscape areas, which are not restricted in the amount of turf.

• Does the limit on water features apply to fountains that use recycled water, such as those currently found at Intuit?
  
  **Response:** The Water Conservation in Landscaping Regulations identify recycled water use areas as “special landscape areas” which are not limited in size.
• Is there anything in the plan that would encourage, or even just allow the Computer History Museum to replace its surface parking lot with development and garage parking? I see it as similar to Lot 12 downtown.
  
  Response: No, in fact the Plan anticipates the long term replacement of surface lots with below grade or above grade parking structures.

• Are we considering additional market-rate housing as a community benefit, or just affordable housing? If additional market-rate housing is included, does the 9,850-unit cap still apply?
  
  Response: The City Council could potentially require Bonus FAR office projects to include new market-rate housing as a community benefit. The question for Council would be how much additional Bonus FAR office would be granted in return for X number of market units, or what kind of analysis of this relationship would Council require of Bonus FAR applications.

• On page 158 (p. 172 of the PDF) it states, “b. Lighting. Bollards or other low level lighting may be used along bicycle and pedestrian connections or Green Ways.” Have we considering low-level lighting for the Stevens Creek trail during winter commute hours? People biking home from work on the trail are currently in the dark.
  
  Response: No. The Stevens Creek Trail EIR analysis required low levels because of potential impacts to habitat. To address this issue, Council would need to direct staff to revisit the idea with an updated EIR analysis on this issue.

• I am pleased to see the section on implementation. Have we evaluated yet the workload (in Community Development and Public Works) involved in implementing the plan? Will we need to hire more people?
  
  Response: Public Works will likely need more resources to help with any feasibility studies related to a new Charleston/101 undercrossing or a Stevens Creek transit bridge. They may also need more land development staff to review housing developments.

  This upcoming budget cycle, staff will be bringing forward a list of action items for Council input on which are the highest priorities.

• I like the suggestion the roadways and other infrastructure be built at the same time. Since we include the Moffett Field purple-pipe extensions, should we mention that such excavation might take place in conjunction with proposed transit construction?
  
  Response: The PW department is coordinating excavations and utility improvements in conjunction with transit construction along Shoreline Boulevard, and will continue to do so for other future improvement projects.
- Editorial issues: - On page 13 (page 19 of the PDF) the first bullet is duplicated.  
  \textit{Response: OK}