



APPROVED

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

**MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
August 18, 2015
Downtown Library
270 Forest Avenue
Palo Alto, California**

13 **Commissioners Present:** Stacey Ashlund, Deirdre Crommie, Jennifer Hetterly, Ed Lauing, Pat
14 Markevitch, Keith Reckdahl

15 **Commissioners Absent:** Abbie Knopper

16 **Others Present:** Council Liaison Filseth

17 **Staff Present:** Catherine Bourquin, Rob de Geus

18 **I. ROLL CALL CONDUCTED BY:** Catherine Bourquin

19
20 **II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS:**

21 None.

22
23
24 **III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

25 None.

26
27
28 **IV. BUSINESS:**

29
30 **1. Approval of Draft Minutes from the July 28, 2015 Meeting.**

31
32 Approval of the draft July 28, 2015 Minutes was moved by Vice Chair Markevitch and
33 seconded by Commissioner Hetterly. Passed 4-0 Knopper absent, Reckdahl and Ashlund
34 abstaining

35
36 **2. Review of the Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Facilities Master
37 Plan.**

38
39 Chair Reckdahl: MIG is here. Ellie, are you going to present?



40
41 Ellie Fiore: Yeah.
42

43 Rob de Geus: Let me give an introduction. Good to see everyone. I'm on my own
44 tonight. Daren Anderson is on a well-deserved vacation, so is Peter. It's just me and
45 Ellie here tonight. We have only one item on the agenda, and it relates to our Parks
46 Master Plan project. There's two things we hope to do today. One is the focus areas for
47 the workshop and the survey that we're going to put out. You've seen that a few times.
48 Thank you to the ad hoc committee that's been working with staff and MIG to refine that.
49 It's much better because of that. To finalize those 12 focus areas. Then look at the online
50 survey that we hope to put out next week if possible, so we can gather some data for the
51 workshops and the stakeholder meetings that we're putting together for later in
52 September. Those are the two objectives for this evening. Ellie's going to walk us
53 through both of those two items.
54

55 Commissioner Ashlund: Who was the ad hoc?
56

57 Mr. de Geus: The ad hoc is Commissioners Hetterly and Lauing and Reckdahl. We've
58 met two or three times. Ellie.
59

60 Ms. Fiore: As Rob said, we're going to walk through the staff report and your packet. As
61 you can see, you have a redline version now of the areas of focus list, that you've seen a
62 few times. This was done in consultation with the ad hoc, based on some input we
63 received from you at previous meetings and also in consultation with staff. We wanted to
64 float this in front of you one more time and see if you had any additional questions or
65 comments or if we're comfortable using these 12 to move forward. Again, these are the
66 structure we'll use in the prioritization exercise.
67

68 Commissioner Lauing: It's stated here, but I want to note that we added Number 12
69 which was discussed at the end of the last meeting. "Proactive approach to adding more
70 parks and open space lands" came up at the last meeting with Council Member Filseth as
71 well. We changed the batting order in certain places to mix it up a little bit. I understand
72 it's going to be mixed up even more when it gets to the public, so there's not any official
73 rankings here, or presumed rankings because there aren't any official rankings.
74

75 Mr. de Geus: Jen or Keith, do you have anything to add?
76

77 Chair Reckdahl: I didn't take notes at our last meeting, but I thought there were a couple
78 that we were going to combine. Did I misremember that?
79

80 Commissioner Hetterly: I don't remember that.
81

82 Mr. de Geus: I don't think we agreed to combine any, did we? I don't think.
83

84 Commissioner Hetterly: I do have some new comments. I have had my say a couple of
85 times, so if anybody else wants to go first. Nope, okay. On number 1, "improving and
86 enhancing community center and recreation spaces across the community." This is in the
87 areas of focus. What you're meaning is maintaining and upgrading what we have. My
88 comment is about the example of replacing key facilities at Cubberley. That could be
89 confusing, and people might think that we mean replacing them elsewhere. That's not
90 consistent with this title heading. If that's what we mean, then maybe it goes in the last
91 focus. I would say something like "updating" or "upgrading" instead of "replacing" for
92 that example. I wonder if you don't want another example that's not quite as massive as
93 that. Maybe "improve tech connections in community centers." I don't know if there's
94 another example that needs to go there or if that could stand alone. I leave that up to the
95 Commission. On page 5, in the ad hoc we talked about that example of signs illustrating
96 exercises that can be completed using existing features. It was not something that came
97 up during the public outreach. We preferred to have that later in that listing of things.
98 On trails, I'd make it "loop trails" as opposed to "trails to and from a park." What we
99 meant was loop trails within a park.
100

101 Commissioner Ashlund: Which item was that? Could you ...
102

103 Commissioner Hetterly: I'm sorry. On number 5, "increasing health and wellness
104 opportunities in parks."
105

106 Commissioner Lauing: That's old 5.
107

108 Vice Chair Markevitch: You said page 5. Could you go to the redline version?
109

110 Commissioner Lauing: That's number 6 now, Jennifer. That's the batting order change.
111

112 Commissioner Hetterly: I'm sorry. Yeah, number 6.
113

114 Vice Chair Markevitch: Page 4, number 6.
115

116 Commissioner Hetterly: Page 2, number 6.
117

118 Vice Chair Markevitch: Page 2, number 6?
119

120 Commissioner Hetterly: Yes. Sorry. The next one is page 2, number 8, "integrating
121 nature into Palo Alto parks." This is one we kept struggling with, every time we talked
122 about it. The problem I keep coming back to is as it's written now it's about integrating
123 nature into our neighborhood parks. We don't have anything in the whole list about

APPROVED

124 nature and open spaces. I wonder if we can't combine that into this by calling it the same
125 thing but saying "preserving, enhancing and providing access to nature in parks and open
126 spaces" and then adding as the first example "protecting delicate ecosystems" followed
127 by "creating bird habitat islands." I don't know if native plantings count as integrating
128 nature or not. You all can debate that.

129
130 Commissioner Crommie: I had a comment on this. Maybe I can chime in?

131
132 Commissioner Hetterly: Let me make sure I don't have any more on that one. Yeah, you
133 can chime in.

134
135 Commissioner Crommie: I like your suggestion, Commissioner Hetterly. I like native
136 plantings, but I was wondering if in addition to bird habitat—I don't know if we should
137 say islands. I wanted to say "bird, bee and butterfly habitat," because that's what we hear
138 is missing. It's those three: birds, bees and butterflies. Creating habitat for birds, bees
139 and butterflies. I don't know if we need to say "islands." I'd rather include those other
140 insects in that. I just wanted to say that was language I wanted to add there. I like what
141 you suggested as well.

142
143 Mr. de Geus: Can you repeat the first part you said? Protecting ...

144
145 Commissioner Hetterly: It's "preserving, enhancing and providing access to nature in
146 parks and open space." For example, "protecting delicate ecosystems" would be the first
147 one followed by "creating bird, bee and butterfly habitat." I had swapped educational
148 signage, because that had come up for drought-tolerant plants, but I don't feel strongly
149 about that. Finally "creating access to creeks in or adjacent to parks."

150
151 Commissioner Crommie: It's important to have the native plantings. I don't care if it
152 says "drought resistant" or not, but the native plantings are very important.

153
154 Commissioner Hetterly: "Improving access to the full range of recreation opportunities,"
155 number 9, same page. The last sentence, "for example adapting existing programming
156 for people with physical disabilities or investing in targeted programs." I struggled with
157 this area of focus when we got into the elements, because it seems to focus on
158 programming. I didn't know if you wanted to include facilities and programming or just
159 programming. Once you include facilities, then you have some overlap with other areas
160 of focus. I don't know if you want to do that or not. On number 12, page 3, rephrase it to
161 be more clear of what kind of future purchases we're talking about. I would delete "for
162 future purchase" and insert "to purchase land for future parks or recreation facilities."

163
164 Commissioner Ashlund: Can you repeat your replacement?
165

APPROVED

166 Commissioner Hetterly: "To purchase land for future parks or recreation facilities."
167 That, of course, limits it for purchases, a little broader. I don't know if anyone else has an
168 opinion about that.

169
170 Commissioner Crommie: I want to have the sense that this includes community gardens.
171 I don't know if that falls into future parks and recreation.

172
173 Commissioner Hetterly: I think that falls into "increasing variety of things to do" or no.

174
175 Commissioner Crommie: That one has to do with targeting an existing park. We don't
176 know. We might need more space for other things. I don't want to limit it, unless you
177 think ...

178
179 Commissioner Hetterly: Community gardens could fit under parks or recreation
180 facilities.

181
182 Chair Reckdahl: It could fit under either one.

183
184 Commissioner Crommie: Gardening is a recreation. As long as we think it can fit, I'm
185 fine with it.

186
187 Chair Reckdahl: It's under our purview, and we're the Parks and Rec. This "parks and
188 recreation facilities" would be interpreted in the broadest sense.

189
190 Commissioner Crommie: Exactly. As long as we think that's the case, I'm happy with it.
191 I like that change.

192
193 Commissioner Hetterly: Those are—go ahead, Rob.

194
195 Mr. de Geus: Jen, you were working off the document that was in the packet. That's our
196 fault by the way. I should have had the redline in the packet. Sorry about that confusion.
197 I didn't catch your first one, because I was looking at the redline and you were working
198 off the other one. I want to be sure I got it.

199
200 Commissioner Hetterly: You mean on number 1?

201
202 Mr. de Geus: It was 1 or 2.

203
204 Commissioner Hetterly: It was number 1, wait, which is now number 2.

205
206 Mr. de Geus: On the redline?
207

208 Commissioner Hetterly: It was number 2. I was suggesting that we swap "updating" for
209 "replacing." Instead of "replacing key facilities at Cubberley," we're "updating" them.
210 To avoid confusion that you might be ...

211
212 Ms. Fiore: Replacing them also.

213
214 Commissioner Hetterly: Right.

215
216 Chair Reckdahl: I had a question, Commissioner Crommie. You were talking about the
217 native plantings. Is this native plantings for the plant purposes or to support native
218 creatures?

219
220 Commissioner Crommie: It's to support native creatures. They tend to have adapted to
221 native plants.

222
223 Chair Reckdahl: We should make sure that the wording includes the native creature
224 support if that's what you're driving at.

225
226 Commissioner Crommie: Do we need to specify that? It's already a very long sentence.

227
228 Commissioner Hetterly: Where are we?

229
230 Commissioner Crommie: It's on the nature (inaudible).

231
232 Chair Reckdahl: If the purpose is that you're worried about the native creatures, then we
233 should make sure that that's in there.

234
235 Commissioner Crommie: Okay. "Increasing native plantings for habitat." You can put
236 in "habitat."

237
238 Chair Reckdahl: Go ahead.

239
240 Commissioner Crommie: Commissioner Hetterly addressed all of mine except on
241 number 6.

242
243 Vice Chair Markevitch: Could you give the page number, please?

244
245 Commissioner Crommie: I'm talking about number 6. It's on page 2 on the redline
246 version. It's areas of focus, number 6, page 2. I hope I got the right one. Yes, I did. I
247 don't like the use of loop trails. I like trails, because it's more general. Loop trails are a
248 subset of trails. Some of our stakeholders that are concerned about animal habitat having
249 a sensitivity toward loop trails, because they tend to have a greater impact. I have learned

APPROVED

250 from that viewpoint that dead-end trails, going into a place and stopping and looking at
251 something, also serve a purpose. I wanted to have it general. I don't know if we should
252 debate it as a Commission.

253
254 Commissioner Hetterly: That's fine with me. I'm not going to fall on my sword over
255 loop trails. That's good.

256
257 Commissioner Crommie: Great. In other words, I like it the way it is.

258
259 Chair Reckdahl: The genesis of that was on the survey people did say that they wanted
260 loop trails.

261
262 Ms. Fiore: Loop trails came out very high.

263
264 Chair Reckdahl: That was something that people triggered on.

265
266 Commissioner Crommie: Isn't that a subset of trails? Do you think we're going to ignore
267 those? I don't think so.

268
269 Chair Reckdahl: I'm happy leaving it trails. Down the road, between the park staff and
270 us we'll determine whether we want loop trails or whether we want dead-ends.

271
272 Commissioner Crommie: Right. We put a lot of them in Byxbee Park. Then we had to
273 step back. That's also my perspective, that we went overboard in the last park we did this
274 with.

275
276 Commissioner Ashlund: We've looked a lot on number 8 on the redline. We increased
277 "bird" to say "birds, bees and butterflies." If we're talking about wildlife, it seems more
278 inclusive to say "habitat and native plantings for wildlife" or "native wildlife." I'm not an
279 expert in that area, but it seems more general to use that word. Possibly in the tail-end of
280 that sentence, "creating access to creeks," I wondered if creeks was one example. If we
281 wanted to be broader, just say "natural elements such as creeks." It's not necessary to say
282 "in or adjacent to parks," because the whole report is about parks. Creeks are just one
283 example of natural elements.

284
285 Chair Reckdahl: Other elements would be rock formations or something like that?

286
287 Commissioner Ashlund: It could be ...

288
289 Ms. Fiore: The Bay or other kinds of water.

290

291 Commissioner Ashlund: There would be other types, and I didn't want to just say creeks.
292 That is obviously a big, important one. On the following one on number 9 ...

293
294 Chair Reckdahl: I want to go back to that one. You're requesting that we get rid of
295 "creeks" or just say "natural features such as creeks"?

296
297 Commissioner Ashlund: "Natural elements such as creeks" or "including creeks" would
298 be a more inclusive statement. On number 9, the following one, right now it reads
299 "improving access to the whole range of recreation opportunities." It might be more
300 inclusive to say "improving access to nature and recreation activities" or "full range."
301 Right now it's "recreation opportunities," and it doesn't include access to nature.

302
303 Commissioner Hetterly: Can you elaborate on that more? Is it the headline that you're
304 having trouble with?

305
306 Commissioner Lauing: Is it the headline or the copy?

307
308 Commissioner Ashlund: It's the title. It feels limited.

309
310 Commissioner Hetterly: Outdoor activities in nature aren't recreational activities?

311
312 Commissioner Ashlund: In the description?

313
314 Commissioner Hetterly: In the title.

315
316 Commissioner Ashlund: I'm reading the redline. It says "number 9, improving access to
317 the full range of recreation opportunities."

318
319 Commissioner Hetterly: Right. Outdoor nature experiences are included in recreation
320 opportunities, in the full range of recreation opportunities.

321
322 Commissioner Ashlund: When I read "recreation opportunities," I think inside a facility.
323 It doesn't sound to me like it implies nature, outdoors. It doesn't seem like it implies
324 outdoors. It seems like access to recreation is a ramp or an elevator but not necessarily
325 outdoor activities as well. That's what it implies. I'm open to that if you disagree. My
326 perception of it makes me think a rec facility, an indoor rec facility.

327
328 Commissioner Crommie: When you read the description, it does say you can enjoy
329 parks. I wonder if we can put "open space" into that description.

330
331 Commissioner Ashlund: Maybe "access to nature and recreation opportunities" in the
332 title would make more sense. The way people typically go through the survey is they

333 scan quickly over the descriptions, but they're making their priority decisions based on
334 the title.

335
336 Commissioner Hetterly: The "full range of recreation opportunities" is fully inclusive of
337 everything.

338
339 Mr. de Geus: What if we say "parks and recreation opportunities"? Is that too much
340 there?

341
342 Commissioner Hetterly: That's fine.

343
344 Commissioner Ashlund: That's good. Then I don't have the sense that it's indoors.
345 That's what comes to mind when I see "rec." In the example, I would remove the word
346 "physical" in front of "disabilities." It says "adapting existing programming for people
347 with" Things like ramps are the most common accommodation that's already
348 available. If we're improving our access, then I would say "disabilities" blanket
349 statement, because there's lots of other accommodations that aren't physical. 90 percent
350 of disabilities are not physical. That would be a better example if it were without that
351 word. That's it.

352
353 Chair Reckdahl: Commissioner Markevitch.

354
355 Vice Chair Markevitch: On page 1, number 2, I'd like to add something. "Maintaining a
356 mix of programmable space for indoor sports including gyms and fitness as well as
357 gatherings, classes, theater and community programs." We have two theaters in this town
358 that we use for classes and for live performances that are not being spelled out in here.
359 While they don't fall under our purview, they do fall under recreation. I want to make
360 sure that theater is in there, so it doesn't get lost.

361
362 Chair Reckdahl: Commissioner Lauing, do you have any comments?

363
364 Commissioner Lauing: I'm good.

365
366 Chair Reckdahl: I'm good. Do you have any questions for us on this or do you want to
367 move on to the next topic?

368
369 Ms. Fiore: We can move on. That was very helpful. Thank you.

370
371 Mr. de Geus: To go back to Commissioner Markevitch's point. If we put "theater," we
372 probably should put "arts" or "arts and theatre."

373
374 Ms. Fiore: What about "performing arts?"

375
376 Commissioner Crommie: "Arts" is good.

377
378 Mr. de Geus: Yeah. "Performing and visual arts." That's inclusive of both.

379
380 Chair Reckdahl: Are you happy with "arts" by itself or do you want "theater and arts"?

381
382 Mr. de Geus: It's true we do have theater ...

383
384 Vice Chair Markevitch: "Theater and arts."

385
386 Mr. de Geus: ... but we also have arts in our recreation facility.

387
388 Vice Chair Markevitch: "Theater and arts," because they are not one and the same. You
389 can have art; you can have theater; they can combine but not always.

390
391 Ms. Fiore: Moving on to the online prioritization challenge. I believe this link all went
392 out to you this week. We did want a quick run through of how it looks and how it works
393 and get your feedback on the exercise itself, again with the hope that we can get it online
394 and start promoting it next week. It would be up for about a month, going a little bit past
395 our proposed community workshop date in September. Briefly, there's an introduction.

396
397 Commissioner Ashlund: Ellie, on the prior pages. Are the comments that we sent to
398 Peter going to be received in time, before launch?

399
400 Ms. Fiore: Sure, yes. Is there something you commented on that you didn't see
401 reflected?

402
403 Commissioner Ashlund: "Prioritization."

404
405 Ms. Fiore: That would be a good one.

406
407 Commissioner Ashlund: I sent him a couple of suggestions. As long as they will be
408 received (crosstalk).

409
410 Ms. Fiore: There's plenty of time to code all of them. Thank you for pointing that out.

411
412 Commissioner Hetterly: Ellie, I have some comments on the areas of focus that fall
413 under each element. Do you want to go through this first and then ...

414
415 Ms. Fiore: Let me do a run through so we have the big picture. The power on this laptop
416 might run out at some point. This is the introduction. The idea is that every person is

417 given 25 virtual dollars. We're forcing them to make some decisions about how they
418 would spend them. We structured the areas of focus by the three elements that we've
419 been working with: parks, trails and open spaces; recreation facilities; and recreation
420 programs. For each of those three, the first exercise is people are given \$5. I believe
421 there's six areas of focus within each. That was intentional, that you would get fewer
422 dollars than there are options. We want to force some decisions. We want to force
423 people to prioritize and give something a zero; otherwise, we could end up with equal
424 votes on every single option. Some of them are repeated where we thought they were
425 applicable across the three elements. We can discuss that further. Essentially you're
426 repeating this exercise three times with \$5. The final is the second layer. The
427 prioritization exercise is the whole list of 12, and you get \$10. On this last page, we
428 didn't want to overwhelm people with text, so we hid the descriptions. If you want to
429 read them again, you click on "hide" and here's that full list of 12. Then here they are
430 again. You can do any combination of dollars. Right now it's set up to do whole dollars.
431 We can break that into cents if we want to go there. The system will not allow you to
432 spend more than \$5, \$5, \$5 and \$10, for the total of \$25. The last screen is simply an
433 open-ended comment field and then sign-up for our email list. That's the big picture. I
434 don't know if you have comments either on the content or the usability as you went
435 through it or anything else.

436
437 Chair Reckdahl: When I came through, I had \$3 left and I wanted to split it equally
438 between two. It wasn't bad. It forced me to go back and look and say, "If I have to give
439 an extra \$1 to one of these, which one do I have to give it to?" It worked out for me, but
440 my gut instinct when I ranked them was that the \$5 didn't give me enough resolution. I'm
441 not sure if I want to advocate changing that \$5 to \$10 to get more resolution or whether
442 we like it. One of the things that's nice about the \$5 is it forces you to have some zeroes.

443
444 Commissioner Hetterly: I did dollars and cents and it took it just fine.

445
446 Commissioner Lauing: You broke the system.

447
448 Chair Reckdahl: I tried to do dollars and cents, and it wouldn't let me.

449
450 Vice Chair Markevitch: It's because she did it first and broke it.

451
452 Chair Reckdahl: I'm curious what other people's thoughts are. Do you like the
453 coarseness of having \$5 for six items and force some zeroes?

454
455 Vice Chair Markevitch: Yes.

456
457 Commissioner Lauing: I have a broader question than that. I had quite a negative
458 reaction to the idea of this being dollars, particularly \$5. Folks are going to take it

459 literally and think about this as the parks and recreation budget. Not that it's \$5. They're
460 going to be thinking more on "What can I get for a small amount of money and get a lot
461 of stuff accomplished." As we've said many times before in this setting, if we need a \$20
462 million something 20 years from now, we have to start planning for it now. If there isn't
463 money for that, it doesn't matter. We have to figure out a way to make it happen. I'm
464 concerned that there's going to be—I don't want to say confusion, but it's going to get so
465 focused on the amount you have to spend, that it's not going to get as much "What do we
466 really need over the next 20 years, not the next 2 years." I'd welcome my colleagues'
467 comments on that.

468
469 Chair Reckdahl: You'd prefer points instead of dollars?

470
471 Commissioner Lauing: A weighting system that isn't specifically monetary.

472
473 Commissioner Hetterly: I liked pennies better than dollars for that reason. It gave me a
474 different feeling when I was doing it. Dollars made it feel more like ...

475
476 Commissioner Crommie: How about points?

477
478 Commissioner Ashlund: I liked the dollar analogy. It was fun and simple. The only
479 thing is it doesn't say the word "virtual." At first glance, I thought, "This is like an
480 incentive for (inaudible) an actual \$25." That was a fun and approachable way of
481 prioritizing.

482
483 Vice Chair Markevitch: I liked the \$5.

484
485 Commissioner Hetterly: Ed's point about the next 20 years is important. There should be
486 something upfront about as we're planning for the next 20 years, this isn't what should we
487 do first or in the next year or if you had \$5 to spend today, would you spend it on this.

488
489 Ms. Fiore: That's a good point. I appreciate the idea that it should be more abstract.
490 We'd been talking about the pennies in a jar exercise for a while now, and that's where it
491 started. Then we rounded up to dollars. We could also name them something like "Palo
492 Alto bucks" or something to make it sound more like a game piece or a point system than
493 a monetary amount.

494
495 Mr. de Geus: I brought this one up. I remember an award that an East Bay city had
496 received when they were going through budget cuts, and they had pennies. It was a
497 penny for your thought, and they had this whole theme around it. It was specifically
498 because there are limited resources. That's why they used money, but it was pennies. It
499 wasn't quite as real in some way. I'd prefer pennies too by the way. It's a little easier, a
500 little more fun even.

501
502 Commissioner Hetterly: Then nobody can try to do cents, partial payments.
503

504 Commissioner Lauing: I'm concerned that people are going to think about what's this
505 really going to cost if we do X versus Y. That could distort it. Obviously we're trying to
506 take out any possible distortion to get true votes of feelings from the community.
507

508 Mr. de Geus: Should we be thinking about costs to some extent?
509

510 Commissioner Lauing: I don't know that the public should be, because they don't know
511 what some of these things cost. That's because they're not involved in it. What we saw at
512 the dog parks last public outreach, there wasn't an awareness of how much fencing would
513 cost to put up multiple parks and so on. I'm not sure there's enough knowledge there to
514 be voting real dollars like you have to do with the budget.
515

516 Commissioner Ashlund: It's not real dollars. It is prioritization. The dollar is just a
517 metaphor in this case.
518

519 Mr. de Geus: If they thought this was important, this was the biggest need, then they
520 would put all five pennies or all \$5 in that. It's not real dollars; it could be \$20 million
521 what that's going to cost.
522

523 Commissioner Lauing: What Commissioner Hetterly suggested would be helpful;
524 upfront say "You can weight important things that way, because this is a plan for 20 years
525 from now." I don't know that you'd have to go into details about we can raise an extra
526 bond measure or something like that. I don't think so.
527

528 Ms. Fiore: We can add a couple of sentences that accomplish both; emphasizing that it's
529 hypothetical dollars and, as you said, talking about the planning horizon, not that this is a
530 fiscal exercise.
531

532 Commissioner Lauing: Just say it's a weighting exercise, not purely a budget exercise.
533 That's the way to couch it. I still vote for pennies instead of dollars.
534

535 Chair Reckdahl: The thing that's nice is that people do have that experience of going into
536 a store with a limited amount of cash and saying, "What should I buy?" Having either
537 pennies or dollars does relate to that's the issue. If we had an infinite budget, half these
538 problems would not be there. Part of this is due to our limited budget.
539

540 Commissioner Ashlund: I don't think they're going to think \$5 is real budgetary dollars,
541 because it's so small. That seems clear that it's a metaphor for prioritization.
542

543 Commissioner Crommie: I agree. I get turned off by pennies. It seems silly. I agree
544 with Commissioner Ashlund that no one really thinks that that buys anything that was on
545 this list.

546
547 Commissioner Lauing: What does it do to the survey if you do a "5, 4, 3, 2, 1?"
548

549 Mr. de Geus: It makes it less interesting to fill out. It adds a little bit of a fun component
550 too. As Commissioner Reckdahl said, people are used to evaluating how they spend their
551 resources, their money, and thinking about it a little bit. That way adds value to the
552 experience of filling out the survey, recognizing that we can't fund everything that we
553 want.

554
555 Chair Reckdahl: The thing I don't like about "5, 4, 3, 2, 1" is that if there's one thing
556 that's head and shoulders above everything, you want to be able to put it all on one and
557 say, "This is really important to me." Conversely, if something's not important to me, I
558 can zero it out. I don't have to give it a "1." I can give it a hard zero or give two of them
559 a hard zero.

560
561 Commissioner Hetterly: That's a good point. I have a whole pile of comments on this.
562 (crosstalk).

563
564 Ms. Fiore: On this page?
565

566 Mr. de Geus: I don't think we have any consensus on this. It doesn't seem like it.
567 Pennies, dollars, points.

568
569 Commissioner Crommie: Is anyone here in favor of points?
570

571 Commissioner Lauing: I could be.
572

573 Commissioner Crommie: If it was versus dollars is what you're saying?
574

575 Commissioner Lauing: Probably. I don't think it's a major point. We want to make sure
576 we get the right results. I'm not arguing about whether they're drachma or shekels. We're
577 trying to get ...
578

579 Commissioner Crommie: Chips?
580

581 Commissioner Lauing: Chips, yeah.
582

583 Chair Reckdahl: As long as we say virtual or hypothetical dollars, people will get the
584 drift that this is a point system. I do like the concept, because a lot of these things are

585 budgetary. If you are applying priorities, you're applying priorities on a budget level.
586 Dollars are not misleading.

587
588 Commissioner Lauing: That's exactly why I brought it up. If we really need something
589 that costs \$10 million, then we need to figure out a way to get that. If that's something
590 that, say, senior citizens need 15 years from now, I don't want to say it doesn't matter. It's
591 a big deal, but we have to make sure we solve for that need even though it's the most
592 expensive thing on the list. I'm making this up; this is hypothetical. I wouldn't want
593 folks to say, "Let's pick a few cheap things, because I know we can afford that." That's
594 the distortion I'm concerned about in the survey.

595
596 Commissioner Ashlund: The money's left out of it. The five random dollars or points
597 that they're distributing, there is no mention of budget. Are you concerned that they
598 should know budgets to make decisions?

599
600 Commissioner Lauing: No. I'm saying they should do a weighting system with regards
601 to budget. That's basically what I'm saying.

602
603 Commissioner Ashlund: The budget's irrelevant. When I have \$5 to play with and I put
604 \$2 or \$3 here, I am weighting it. I said this is more important so I'm putting more of my
605 money here. This is less important, so I'm putting less or zero here.

606
607 Commissioner Lauing: I don't think we need to go to the mat on this one. I was just
608 raising a concern for discussion.

609
610 Vice Chair Markevitch: Are we sticking with the \$5? A show of hands.

611
612 Commissioner Lauing: With upfront copy to describe the weighting?

613
614 Vice Chair Markevitch: Yeah.

615
616 Mr. de Geus: Yeah. Hypothetical dollars, weighted exercise.

617
618 Chair Reckdahl: I don't have strong feelings of pennies versus dollars, but some type of
619 currency unit would probably be a good thing.

620
621 Mr. de Geus: The thing about dollars is you can do the \$1.50. If you get stuck on the
622 end, you can split it up. It's hard to do that with pennies. People won't naturally ...

623
624 Commissioner Crommie: What's the problem splitting it up? I don't see.

625
626 Mr. de Geus: If it's pennies, it's hard to do it.

627 Commissioner Crommie: I'm saying why can't you say \$1.50?
628

629 Mr. de Geus: You can.
630

631 Commissioner Hetterly: That's what he's saying. He's saying that's the benefit of the
632 dollars.
633

634 Commissioner Crommie: Oh, okay. I agree with that. I like that. I didn't get to do it.
635 We should be able to use dollars and cents. It should be designed to accept that.
636

637 Mr. de Geus: We'll have to check it. When Keith tried it, it didn't work. When Jen tried
638 it ...
639

640 Commissioner Ashlund: You tried it and it wouldn't take it?
641

642 Chair Reckdahl: It wouldn't take it. Maybe it was limited to three characters. I tried to
643 do "1.50," and it wouldn't get that zero in.
644

645 Commissioner Hetterly: That's what I did to, but I didn't submit it.
646

647 Chair Reckdahl: I didn't either.
648

649 Commissioner Hetterly: I went to the next page. It let me go to the next page.
650

651 Chair Reckdahl: It wouldn't get all my characters in there.
652

653 Ms. Fiore: We'll double check. It should be coded either way.
654

655 Chair Reckdahl: This was using IE, so maybe there were some issues. Did you have any
656 more to talk about here or do we want to move on to the questions?
657

658 Ms. Fiore: No. I think we can move on to other comments.
659

660 Commissioner Hetterly: I have (crosstalk).
661

662 Chair Reckdahl: Commissioner Hetterly gets first crack at this.
663

664 Commissioner Hetterly: On this page, I would add at the end of that first paragraph "for
665 more information about the Master Plan process and what we've learned so far, click here
666 to go to the website."
667
668

669 Chair Reckdahl: That's good. You're saying on this page that's up on the screen right
670 now?

671
672 Commissioner Hetterly: Yes. At the end of the first paragraph. On the end of the second
673 paragraph, where will you spend your money, I'd say "where will you invest your
674 money." That's a word choice. The introduction page, I had a lot of comments. Starting
675 with the third paragraph, I thought this was a little—I don't know what I thought it was. I
676 didn't like it. Some alternatives for this third paragraph in each of these elements.
677 Instead of saying "we're going to make recommendations in a variety of areas and these
678 are the areas," I'd say "for each of these elements, we've identified areas of focus that
679 generally describe types of goals, investments for that element" and then go on to say
680 "these areas of focus are drawn from earlier input" I can give you (crosstalk) or two.

681
682 Ms. Fiore: Great. I like that.

683
684 Commissioner Hetterly: I'm just saying them so if other folks don't like them, we cannot
685 do it. The last sentence, I would replace entirely with "your input will help us evaluate
686 how much emphasis to give each area of focus as we begin to prioritize recommendations
687 for future projects, programs and investments." I was worried as I read this that it was
688 going to create confusion about what's an area, what's a focus, what's an element. I
689 wanted to be a little more clear about what each was. For the next paragraph, for this
690 challenge and before you go to each element, I'd insert "you will be asked to allocate
691 limited resources among the various areas of focus." Then a new sentence, "each element
692 will be explored" That was all I have on that page. My next issues were about the
693 areas of focus under each element. Keith, should I go on to that?

694
695 Chair Reckdahl: Yep, please do.

696
697 Commissioner Hetterly: Under "parks, trails and open space," it's important to include
698 area number 5, "increasing the variety of things to do in existing parks for all ages and
699 abilities." That ...

700
701 Commissioner Crommie: What page on this one?

702
703 Commissioner Hetterly: I'm on page 4, where it's prioritization by element. Page 4 of
704 the redline, under that first element, parks, trails and open space, I want to talk about
705 which ...

706
707 Commissioner Crommie: You're back to that.

708
709 Commissioner Hetterly: ... six or seven areas of focus should be included.

710

711 Commissioner Crommie: You're on this redline.
712

713 Ms. Fiore: You'd like to add back number 5.
714

715 Vice Chair Markevitch: You're on page what?
716

717 Commissioner Hetterly: I thought this was the only document. I'm on page 4.
718 "Increasing the variety of things to do in existing parks for all ages and abilities" that's
719 crossed out but should stay. Maybe remove "improving access to the full range of
720 recreation opportunities." There's overlap between those two. I was torn about where to
721 put them, because I wanted to add in ...
722

723 Commissioner Crommie: Age?
724

725 Commissioner Hetterly: Oh, no, no. I wanted to re-add number 5 which puts us to seven
726 instead of six. In that context, I thought we could eliminate "improving access to the full
727 range of recreation opportunities," because we have "all ages and abilities" in the
728 "increased variety of things" topic. Under "recreation facilities," we have to add in area
729 of focus number 4, "distributing park activities and experiences across the city." That's
730 where we get into community gardens, pools and that kind of thing.
731

732 Chair Reckdahl: You're inserting this into number 2?
733

734 Commissioner Hetterly: I wanted to add it to "recreation facilities" as a seventh item.
735 Again, with the same question of can we eliminate nine since we have five in that section.
736 Is everybody with me?
737

738 Mr. de Geus: Yeah. Makes sense so far.
739

740 Commissioner Crommie: Will you restate number 4 that you want to put in?
741

742 Commissioner Hetterly: The one I want to add to "recreation facilities" is "distributing
743 park activities and experiences across the city." That's about distribution; it's not just
744 about parks. It's distribution of everything. That needs to appear in both of those. The
745 same comment under "recreation programs." That number 4, "distributing activities and
746 experiences across the city," should appear in all three elements. For the "recreation
747 programs," number 5 and number 11 have a lot of overlap. I would get rid of number 5,
748 and maybe change number 11 to "trying out new types of programs, classes, events and
749 activities for all ages and abilities."
750

751 Ms. Fiore: Can you say that one more time?
752

753 Commissioner Hetterly: I would add "for all ages and abilities" at the end of number 11,
754 if we were to take out number 5.

755
756 Mr. de Geus: We should change that as the title of the area of focus for number 11?

757
758 Commissioner Hetterly: Mm-hmm.

759
760 Mr. de Geus: Ages and ability.

761
762 Chair Reckdahl: I have an issue with number 5. The difference between number 5 and
763 number 9, there is some overlap there. I don't like that the title, at least to me, "for all
764 ages and abilities" echoes what number 9 is. If we deleted that phrase, "for all ages and
765 abilities," in the title, would that make it more representative? You're saying "increasing
766 the variety of things to do in existing parks."

767
768 Commissioner Crommie: We had that added if we're taking out "improving access."
769 What Commissioner Hetterly recommended was under "parks, trails and open space" if
770 we take out number 9. If we're taking out that, we have to comment on abilities
771 probably.

772
773 Commissioner Hetterly: I think so too.

774
775 Commissioner Crommie: Access implies that. Commissioner Reckdahl, are you saying
776 you also want to leave number 9 or do you agree that we can remove number 9 and edit
777 number 5? They were linked.

778
779 Chair Reckdahl: If we go back to the list of the 12, do we need 5 and 9? Can we
780 combine them into a single one?

781
782 Commissioner Crommie: That's what Commissioner Hetterly recommended.

783
784 Commissioner Hetterly: No, that's not what I recommended.

785
786 Chair Reckdahl: She's talking about the sub-listing.

787
788 Commissioner Crommie: I'm sorry. I'm now confused. I thought I was tracking with
789 you. Under "parks, trails and open space," Commissioner Hetterly wanted to remove
790 number 9 and leave number 5.

791
792 Commissioner Hetterly: I do, but I don't want to eliminate number 9 altogether from the
793 whole list of 12.

794

795 Commissioner Crommie: Yeah, okay. That's what I assumed. Can you present your
796 idea again?

797
798 Chair Reckdahl: If we go back to the list of 12, in an ideal world 12 would not be the
799 number I would pick. What would be an important number of areas of focus? I would
800 not pick 12. When you're looking at this, are there any combined? Again, 5 and 9 do
801 have some overlap. Five is parks; 9 is recreation. We're trying to support things for
802 everybody. We want to remove access. We want to do a variety of things, not just the
803 same old, same old.

804
805 Commissioner Hetterly: Five is parks and facilities, having the spaces that can
806 accommodate a variety of things. Whereas, 9 is much more about programming, so that
807 we have programming that accommodates people with different physical programmatic
808 language and financial situations. That's the way I was looking at it.

809
810 Commissioner Lauing: Even if it got down from 12 to 11, that's not material. I'm not
811 sure it's worth fighting for.

812
813 Chair Reckdahl: No.

814
815 Commissioner Crommie: Eleven isn't as nice a number in a way. You'd have to get it
816 down to ten, then we'd be struggling.

817
818 Vice Chair Markevitch: It's that odd number thing.

819
820 Commissioner Crommie: Most lists aren't 11 things. I don't know. It's not that big of a
821 deal. I agree that by eliminating it from 12 to 11, does that help you, Commissioner
822 Reckdahl?

823
824 Chair Reckdahl: It's not a silver bullet. To me this list is long. I'm trying to say is there
825 a way of simplifying it, so people who are doing this don't get overwhelmed. I agree
826 there's not 100 percent overlap between the two. In the Venn diagram, there is a little
827 overlap there.

828
829 Mr. de Geus: It's more manageable in the survey when it's split up. You don't see all 12
830 all the time. You just see six when you're thinking about "parks, trails and open space,"
831 and then six for "recreation facilities." You see them all at the end.

832
833 Commissioner Hetterly: That is the benefit of having it split up first, so you don't ever
834 see the full list until you've already mastered what they are.

835
836 Mr. de Geus: That helps a lot.

837
838 Chair Reckdahl: That's true. I agree with that. If you take little nibbles, then
839 Commissioner Hetterly, can you go through and list the numbers that you want in each of
840 the three?

841
842 Commissioner Hetterly: Yeah. I'll have to compare because I have different lists. For
843 "parks, trails and open space," I want to have number ...

844
845 Chair Reckdahl: You're using the redline numbers?

846
847 Commissioner Crommie: Here. I wrote notes.

848
849 Commissioner Hetterly: I got it. Number 3, number 4, number 5, number 7, number 8
850 and number 12 are what I want to have in the first element.

851
852 Chair Reckdahl: You are eliminating 9 and adding in 5.

853
854 Commissioner Hetterly: Right.

855
856 Chair Reckdahl: Then "recreation facilities."

857
858 Commissioner Hetterly: "Recreation facilities," I'd like to see number 1, number 2,
859 number 5, number 6, number 7 and number 4.

860
861 Chair Reckdahl: We're getting rid of 9 and adding 4.

862
863 Commissioner Hetterly: Yeah.

864
865 Commissioner Crommie: And with the edit. Oh, I see.

866
867 Commissioner Hetterly: The edit is later. Under "recreation programs," I would do
868 number 2, number 5 ...

869
870 Commissioner Crommie: You said before you want to get rid of that one. No?

871
872 Commissioner Hetterly: Hang on.

873
874 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, you eliminated number 5.

875
876 Commissioner Hetterly: Yeah, I want to get rid of that one. Yes, thank you. Number 2,
877 number 6.

878

879 Commissioner Crommie: Add 4.
880

881 Commissioner Hetterly: Add 4. Number 9, number 10 and number 11, adding "for all
882 ages and abilities" at the end of 11.
883

884 Chair Reckdahl: The last one, we are getting rid of 5 and adding 4.
885

886 Commissioner Crommie: And then there's an edit on 11.
887

888 Mr. de Geus: Yeah. Wherever 11 shows up, we need to add that additional language.
889

890 Commissioner Hetterly: Right.
891

892 Chair Reckdahl; Including the whole list?
893

894 Commissioner Hetterly: Right. I had some final words, snippy stuff. Should I go ahead
895 with that?
896

897 Chair Reckdahl: Yes, please.
898

899 Commissioner Reckdahl: On every element, when you say you have \$5 to allocate
900 across the six areas, you want to make sure it's the right number of areas and that they're
901 in the same order as they are presented in the descriptions.
902

903 Ms. Fiore: Above, yeah.
904

905 Commissioner Hetterly: I would call it "areas of focus." Always say "areas of focus;"
906 otherwise, people may do the same thing we did and say "What's an area and what's an
907 area of focus?" After that first sentence, I would move up the first sentence in the bottom
908 part, but change it a little. It would be "you have \$5 to allocate across the following six
909 areas of focus. The dollars and cents you allocate," assuming we're going to allow them
910 to do cents, "to an area of focus, represent the portion of the available resources you
911 would like directed to that particular area." The second paragraph would start with "you
912 can distribute money in any way you'd like, but the sum of your responses cannot exceed
913 the available budget." Does that make sense?
914

915 Ms. Fiore: It does.
916

917 Commissioner Hetterly: My last thing is on the back under "final thoughts." Two
918 questions here. First is the easier one. You ask if you'd like to be added to the
919 notification list for the in-person prioritization workshop, why would we want people

920 who took the survey online to be invited to join the workshop? It seems like we're
921 inviting duplicative input.

922 Ms. Fiore: We can't exclude them.

923 Commissioner Hetterly: We can't exclude them, but why would we actively recruit them
924 if we already have their input? That's my question.

925 Ms. Fiore: We can make it more general. "If you'd like to be added to the notification
926 list for workshops and updates."

927 Chair Reckdahl: Can you talk about what's going to happen at the workshops? Do you
928 have that planned out yet?

929 Ms. Fiore: It's essentially a parallel exercise, but using worksheets instead of what's in
930 front of you now.

931 Chair Reckdahl: It'll be mimicking what was online?

932 Ms. Fiore: Exactly.

933 Vice Chair Markevitch: I would leave that off. I wouldn't invite it. They're going to
934 hear about the meetings.

935 Mr. de Geus: Maybe "if you want updates on the Parks, Recreation ...

936 Vice Chair Markevitch: Leave it at "updates."

937 Commissioner Hetterly: If you want to be on the list for future updates on the Plan. The
938 final thing I was struggling with. As you guys, Ellie, have been telling us all along, as
939 soon as you give examples, then you raise issues of "I don't like that example, but I like
940 this example. What I want isn't listed in the examples. What does that mean? I'm not
941 going to get what I want." I wonder if we can add something in this final thought section
942 that says it's tricky offering survey questions with hypothetical examples. If a particular
943 example gave you pause though you would otherwise strongly support that area of a
944 focus, feel free to elaborate in the space below. I know you hate that.

945 Commissioner Crommie: It's the lawyer in you, in a way. It's good thinking, but it will
946 confuse people potentially.

947 Vice Chair Markevitch: Yeah, I agree.

962 Commissioner Hetterly: Alternatively, I would suggest ...

963
964 Chair Reckdahl: Can you (inaudible) what we're talking about right now, so we can see
965 what the exact language is right now?

966
967 Commissioner Crommie: It's also on the last page of our handout.

968
969 Commissioner Lauing: Don't worry. We don't have to tabulate that; they have to
970 tabulate that.

971
972 Commissioner Hetterly: My alternative suggestion would be to throw it up at the
973 beginning somewhere, when you talk about how we're going to ask them to allocate
974 limited resources among various models, we've provided hypothetical examples.

975
976 Vice Chair Markevitch: You're lawyering again.

977
978 Commissioner Hetterly: I am.

979
980 Vice Chair Markevitch: It's adding a layer of complexity that some people might just
981 give up.

982
983 Commissioner Hetterly: Yeah?

984
985 Vice Chair Markevitch: Yeah. Keep it simple.

986
987 Commissioner Hetterly: You don't want to hold their hand and say, "Don't worry if all
988 your stuff is not on here. This is just hypothetical"?

989
990 Vice Chair Markevitch: That's what the last sentence is. If you have any other—I can't
991 read it.

992
993 Commissioner Crommie: Use the space below for other ideas, comments or questions
994 about the Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Master Plan.

995
996 Vice Chair Markevitch: I like it.

997
998 Ms. Fiore: In my experience, whenever you give an open-ended opportunity, people are
999 going to put in whatever their pet project is or whatever their number 1 idea is regardless
1000 of how you phrase it. We will get that out of this.

1001
1002 Commissioner Hetterly: If they read their first area of focus and they think bathrooms
1003 are the worst investment the city could possibly make, but they would love to have

1004 drinking water in every park, are they going to say, "Forget it. This is a stupid survey.
1005 I'm not going to answer this, because their options force me to vote for something that I
1006 don't want to vote for." If you give them a little blurb at the beginning that says the
1007 examples are ...

1008
1009 Ms. Fiore: Illustrative.

1010
1011 Commissioner Hetterly: ... examples.

1012
1013 Chair Reckdahl: You will have space at the end ...

1014
1015 Commissioner Hetterly: To comment.

1016
1017 Ms. Fiore: Previewing the open-ended.

1018
1019 Commissioner Hetterly: Then maybe they will do the survey, instead of saying "Stupid
1020 city people."

1021
1022 Vice Chair Markevitch: That makes sense, what Commissioner Reckdahl said.

1023
1024 Commissioner Hetterly: I'm good with that.

1025
1026 Commissioner Crommie: We'll also leave a comment space. You want a qualifier, an
1027 explanation.

1028
1029 Commissioner Lauing: A hand holder.

1030
1031 Commissioner Hetterly: Up front is better. A hand holder, yeah. That's it. Thank you
1032 for indulging me.

1033
1034 Chair Reckdahl: Other comments?

1035
1036 Commissioner Ashlund: If I captured this all correctly, I'm a little bit worried. I don't
1037 want to lose the accessibility for some of these areas. I like the deletions and the
1038 additions that you did in the groupings, Commissioner Hetterly. On the "parks, trails and
1039 open space" grouping, we've eliminated accessibility altogether from that grouping by
1040 removing number 9.

1041
1042 Commissioner Hetterly: We still have number 5. We've added back in number 5.

1043
1044 Commissioner Ashlund: We cut off the tail-end of number 5.

1045

1046 Commissioner Hetterly: No, no. We left it on.

1047
1048 Chair Reckdahl: No. They scoffed at that suggestion.

1049
1050 Commissioner Ashlund: You kept it there?

1051
1052 Commissioner Hetterly: Right. What's redlined in that first section, number 5, will be
1053 reinstated as written.

1054
1055 Ms. Fiore: If I understood correctly, the changes that Commissioner Hetterly suggested,
1056 the phrase "all ages and abilities" appears in each element, but the word "access" does
1057 not.

1058
1059 Commissioner Ashlund: I've lost track a little bit. If we remove number 9 from that first
1060 grouping, "improving access to the full range of recreation opportunities," it seems like it
1061 would fit well in number 3, "enhancing comfort and making parks more," instead of
1062 "more welcoming" "more accessible and welcoming." That seems like it would fit well
1063 in there.

1064
1065 Commissioner Hetterly: That's an order of magnitude different from what it currently is.

1066
1067 Commissioner Ashlund: Than the description?

1068
1069 Commissioner Hetterly: Yeah.

1070
1071 Chair Reckdahl: The description is talking about bathrooms and stuff like that.

1072
1073 Commissioner Hetterly: Bathrooms and water fountains.

1074
1075 Chair Reckdahl: And shade.

1076
1077 Commissioner Crommie: If someone's coming to the survey and they want more access
1078 for people with disabilities, do you think they would—these are votes. It comes down to
1079 voting. Do you think they would vote for number 5 as written or not? Do you think it
1080 has to be rewritten?

1081
1082 Commissioner Ashlund: The word "accessibility" was key. All the shade and water and
1083 bathrooms that you have, if it's not accessible, it's not accessible, it's not welcoming to a
1084 large percentage of the community. That's a disservice to lose that word in the grouping.
1085 I wouldn't feel comfortable saying, "These are our six proposals for each of these three
1086 areas," and we've eliminated the word "access" from the first grouping, from the second

1087 grouping. We've left it in the third grouping; that's the only place. That feels limiting to
1088 me, unwelcoming as a city.

1089
1090 Commissioner Hetterly: What does "access" mean to you?

1091
1092 Commissioner Ashlund: If it's facilities, if it's outdoor or indoor facilities, it's physical
1093 access. It's stairways, it's ramps, it's hearing. If it's programming, a lot of times it's
1094 staffing and training. Is the staff not willing to make accommodations based on
1095 disability? It's a clear word. It's part of the law. That's why it would feel bad to me to
1096 lose it from these other two groupings and saying we're ...

1097
1098 Chair Reckdahl: The thing that concerns me is that you add "accessibility" and people
1099 vote for it, are they voting for bathrooms or are they voting for accessibility?

1100
1101 Commissioner Ashlund: Yeah.

1102
1103 Chair Reckdahl: Maybe they're voting for accessibility, and we interpret that as they
1104 want bathrooms.

1105
1106 Commissioner Ashlund: No, no. I see what you're saying about maybe it doesn't fit into
1107 number 3, but it worries me to omit number 9 without making sure that we're saying that
1108 word somewhere in the front part of the groupings. Unless it needs to go back into the
1109 description of number 3, and say it's a given that we're including that.

1110
1111 Commissioner Crommie: Can we add the word "access" to number 5? Can we put it in
1112 there somehow?

1113
1114 Commissioner Ashlund: The problem with number 5 is that's increasing the variety of
1115 things to do. That says maybe our parks and facilities aren't accessible, but we're not
1116 going to worry about that. If we increase the variety, then we're going to worry about it
1117 from that point forward. That doesn't feel like it fits in with number 5.

1118
1119 Commissioner Crommie: We now have that beautiful Magical Bridge park, for instance.
1120 I would like to see the most popular, successful elements of that park replicated in all
1121 parks across the city. That would go under number 5. Correct? Am I thinking correctly?

1122
1123 Commissioner Ashlund: Yeah, yeah, for playgrounds.

1124
1125 Commissioner Crommie: For playgrounds, making things accessible.

1126
1127 Commissioner Ashlund: Since we're talking parks, rec, open space, trails, we're talking
1128 more than just playgrounds.

1129
1130 Commissioner Crommie: We're missing the programmatic piece is what you're saying?
1131

1132 Commissioner Ashlund: The key word is "accessibility."
1133

1134 Commissioner Crommie: We don't need the programmatic piece of access as much in
1135 parks, trails and open space, do we? Is that more relevant toward classes and gyms?
1136

1137 Commissioner Ashlund: It applies to both. It applies to programs as well as facilities,
1138 indoor facilities and outdoor facilities. It definitely applies to parks, trails and open
1139 space. For example, if we're distributing park activities, we're enhancing comfort with
1140 the shade and bathrooms or the water fountains, we're allowing dog access, we're
1141 integrating nature, but have removed improving access to the full range of opportunities,
1142 then we're ...
1143

1144 Commissioner Crommie: Maybe we need to stop. Maybe we need seven choices.
1145

1146 Commissioner Ashlund: I don't know. I could go back to the description of number 3.
1147 We're talking about comfort and welcoming, it seems that that is where it needs to be in
1148 the description. It's not a separate thing. It's part of comfort and welcoming.
1149

1150 Vice Chair Markevitch: Would you be happy with "improvements may include access,
1151 creating a sense of arrival"? Put "access" before "creating a sense of arrival."
1152

1153 Commissioner Ashlund: I want it in the title is what I'm saying. When I was pretending
1154 to be a normal person going through the survey, I wasn't going to study each paragraph,
1155 memorize each paragraph. When I'm ranking and putting my dollars into the buckets, at
1156 that point I'm looking at the title. The dog people look for the dog word. The
1157 accessibility people look for the access word.
1158

1159 Commissioner Crommie: I hear you. We don't have gardening wrapped in this, but we
1160 have to know it's under activities. I was questioning that in the survey. I see your point.
1161

1162 Commissioner Hetterly: "Access to the full range of recreation opportunities" isn't
1163 inclusive of that? That's what I keep coming back to.
1164

1165 Commissioner Ashlund: I'm sorry. What number?
1166

1167 Commissioner Hetterly: Number 9.
1168

1169 Commissioner Ashlund: We eliminated number 9 from group 1. That's what I'm saying.
1170 The word was there, and then we eliminated it. It would fit nicely with the description of

APPROVED

1171 number 3. If comfort and welcoming doesn't mean accessible, I don't know what does.
1172 It's a given at this point. We shouldn't shy away from saying it, because it's going to
1173 harm anybody. If anything, it makes things more comfortable and welcoming.
1174

1175 Commissioner Crommie: I don't want to sell access short, because those things are
1176 automatically going to be accessible. That's not an issue. When you put in a bathroom
1177 and a drinking foundation, it by definition is accessible. It's a very narrow universe.
1178 When you put in the word "access" to number 3, are you talking about only the bathroom
1179 and the drinking foundation and the benches?
1180

1181 Vice Chair Markevitch: No.
1182

1183 Commissioner Ashlund: It applies to the park space. You say, "Is this park space
1184 accessible?"
1185

1186 Mr. de Geus: I don't know if it works or not, but if "access" is added to number 5,
1187 "increasing variety and access of things to do in existing parks."
1188

1189 Commissioner Ashlund: That's not bad. That's not bad. I didn't think of adding it to
1190 number 5. Yeah, that could work.
1191

1192 Commissioner Lauing: You've already got in there "ages and abilities" at the end.
1193

1194 Commissioner Ashlund: Like I said, it's a key word. Dog people look for "dogs." Sports
1195 fields look for "sports fields." Theater look for "theater." That's another way of saying it.
1196 I don't want it left off of these groupings as if it's not important in parks and open space,
1197 but we're going to handle it in programming.
1198

1199 Commissioner Crommie: It's stronger if it goes into number 5 than number 3.
1200

1201 Chair Reckdahl: Yeah.
1202

1203 Commissioner Crommie: You get more bang for the word, because it relates to more
1204 things, if we can get it into number 5.
1205

1206 Ms. Fiore: I would caution that the intent of 9 also includes things like language and
1207 financial barriers. Nine was intended as its own item to be removing barriers and
1208 increasing all types of access, not just about recreation or programming. Merging it you
1209 will lose a little bit of that. I would ask you if you are open to having seven items under
1210 some of these.
1211

1212 Commissioner Ashlund: I haven't done the table. Are you putting each of the areas in
1213 two out of the three?

1214
1215 Ms. Fiore: Good question.

1216
1217 Commissioner Ashlund: Is that how it's working out?

1218
1219 Commissioner Hetterly: No. I don't think so.

1220
1221 Mr. de Geus: No, it doesn't work out that way.

1222
1223 Commissioner Hetterly: It certainly is not calculated to be that way.

1224
1225 Commissioner Crommie: Do we like number 5? It's all encompassing.

1226
1227 Commissioner Ashlund: Rob, how did you have it added to number 5 again?

1228
1229 Mr. de Geus: "Increasing the variety and access of things to do in existing parks for all
1230 ages and abilities." It's just adding the word "accessibility" or "access."

1231
1232 Commissioner Ashlund: That works.

1233
1234 Ms. Fiore: Are we taking number 9 off the list of 12?

1235
1236 Commissioner Ashlund: No, no.

1237
1238 Ms. Fiore: We're adding "access" to number 5.

1239
1240 Commissioner Ashlund: We're adding the "access" to number 5, yeah.

1241
1242 Commissioner Hetterly: We're taking 9 off of the first element.

1243
1244 Commissioner Ashlund: No, no, no. Oh, we already have it.

1245
1246 Mr. de Geus: Out of the first two.

1247
1248 Commissioner Hetterly: First two, right.

1249
1250 Ms. Fiore: And adding the word "access" back.

1251
1252 Commissioner Ashlund: That works really well.

1253

1254 Mr. de Geus: Adding it back. Was it in there originally?
1255

1256 Ms. Fiore: Oh, no, it was not adding it back. Adding it, yes. That makes sense. I
1257 thought you were proposing eliminating number 9.
1258

1259 Chair Reckdahl: We're changing the title of number 5?
1260

1261 Ms. Fiore: Yes. (crosstalk) access.
1262

1263 Chair Reckdahl: What's the new title going to be?
1264

1265 Ms. Fiore: Leaving number 9 as is, right?
1266

1267 Chair Reckdahl: What's the new title for number 5?
1268

1269 Mr. de Geus: Increasing the variety and access of things to do in existing parks for all
1270 ages and abilities.
1271

1272 Ms. Fiore: "Variety of and access to."
1273

1274 Commissioner Ashlund: Do we have to switch it? Do you think that sounds awkward?
1275

1276 Vice Chair Markevitch: We should leave it as what Rob said.
1277

1278 Commissioner Ashlund: I'm fine with it. You could also flip it, "access to and variety
1279 of" would be fine. Either way it's okay.
1280

1281 Commissioner Hetterly: "Increase the variety and accessibility of things to do," then you
1282 have matching word tenses.
1283

1284 Chair Reckdahl: Variety and accessibility.
1285

1286 Commissioner Ashlund: More parallel language. Thank you.
1287

1288 Chair Reckdahl: I'm digesting this. One second. In the three sets, five appears in the
1289 first one and the second one. Nine appears in the third one. Nine is a programming
1290 accessibility. Five is for recreation facilities and parks. I'm happy with that. Any other
1291 comments? Deirdre, do you have any comments?
1292

1293 Commissioner Crommie: Nope.
1294

1295 Chair Reckdahl: Jen, are you tapped out?

1296
1297 Commissioner Hetterly: Yep.

1298
1299 Chair Reckdahl: Your ball.

1300
1301 Mr. de Geus: They were the two things that we wanted to get to today. It might be
1302 helpful to have the ad hoc committee do one last review of the survey, because there were
1303 a lot of comments, before we go live with it. If that would be okay. Next week.

1304
1305 Commissioner Lauing: Target live date is when?

1306
1307 Ms. Fiore: Next Wednesday. We can get you a redlined version too of the online survey
1308 for that meeting.

1309
1310 Commissioner Crommie: You probably already covered this. How are we advertising
1311 this?

1312
1313 Ms. Fiore: About the same as we did for the last online survey. It will go out to our
1314 mailing list. It'll go out through the city's social media and newsletter. I forget exactly.
1315 We'll also send it to our stakeholder advisory group and ask them to forward it. Send it to
1316 you folks and ask you to forward it.

1317
1318 Chair Reckdahl: Will it go out to the neighborhoods, PAN?

1319
1320 Ms. Fiore: Yes. They're on that list.

1321
1322 Vice Chair Markevitch: The schools can get it?

1323
1324 Ms. Fiore: It should be through the stakeholder advisory group.

1325
1326 Commissioner Ashlund: How are we getting it to schools? Is that covered?

1327
1328 Ms. Fiore: I don't know that we have direct access to the PTA list. Someone on our
1329 stakeholder advisory group has offered to forward it.

1330
1331 Mr. de Geus: I can help you with that too. Definitely should get it through the schools.

1332
1333 Vice Chair Markevitch: I can help you with that.

1334
1335 Commissioner Crommie: Do we have that same protection to look at the electronic
1336 address to figure out if multiples are being submitted?

1337

1338 Ms. Fiore: We do, yeah. We'll have a record of that.
1339

1340 Commissioner Crommie: There's a little confusion over the last survey. Are you hoping
1341 that multiple ages within the family are doing this? Mother, father, children, each
1342 submitting one.
1343

1344 Ms. Fiore: Absolutely, if they're all interested.
1345

1346 Vice Chair Markevitch: If they're only using one email address ...
1347

1348 Ms. Fiore: Your IP address will show up more than once.
1349

1350 Commissioner Crommie: Each one has to do it from their own computer?
1351

1352 Chair Reckdahl: It says your name. As long as they use different names ...
1353

1354 Vice Chair Markevitch: They could be making up names.
1355

1356 Commissioner Hetterly: You don't put your name. The name doesn't go in the survey.
1357

1358 Commissioner Ashlund: That's optional.
1359

1360 Chair Reckdahl: Optional, oh shoot.
1361

1362 Commissioner Ashlund: That's to be added to the list.
1363

1364 Chair Reckdahl: You don't require an email address, which means that you just look at
1365 an IP.
1366

1367 Ms. Fiore: Yeah.
1368

1369 Commissioner Crommie: Is that written in the directions? I remember a lot of people in
1370 my neighborhood were confused about that. They were all asking me, "What should we
1371 do? Do we need to try to make that explicit?" Is it written anywhere that it's okay to do
1372 it that way?
1373

1374 Ms. Fiore: We can indicate that.
1375

1376 Commissioner Crommie: Do you want to leave it open? I don't know everyone's feeling.
1377 I had people coming up to me and saying, "Can my daughter do it? I've already done it."
1378 I didn't know what the answer was.
1379

1380 Ms. Fiore: We have a little blurb at the end. "Please help us reach as many of your
1381 friends, neighbors and coworkers." We could make that up front.

1382
1383 Commissioner Crommie: Family members?

1384
1385 Ms. Fiore: Yeah.

1386
1387 Commissioner Hetterly: The tricky thing about a family all having the same email
1388 address ...

1389
1390 Commissioner Ashlund: IP address? Do you mean IP or do you mean email?

1391
1392 Commissioner Hetterly: I don't have any idea. If they're going to use the same computer
1393 and they have the same answers ...

1394
1395 Ms. Fiore: That's what raises the red flag.

1396
1397 Commissioner Hetterly: ... coincidentally, they may get thrown out. Right?

1398
1399 Ms. Fiore: If they had exactly the same answers for every question, that would raise a
1400 red flag for us. If there are four people ...

1401
1402 Commissioner Hetterly: Can they put a note in the final box?

1403
1404 Ms. Fiore: Mm-hmm.

1405
1406 Vice Chair Markevitch: If it's one person sending in five different things with slightly
1407 different answers, their attention to detail on this is impressive.

1408
1409 Chair Reckdahl: If they think that strongly about it, maybe they deserve extra weighting.

1410
1411 Commissioner Crommie: We all feel like parents ...

1412
1413 Vice Chair Markevitch: I don't care.

1414
1415 Commissioner Crommie: It shouldn't matter. It's like more voices ...

1416
1417 Commissioner Reckdahl: My son would not agree with my choices.

1418
1419 Commissioner Crommie: It would be highly unlikely they would all match, first of all.
1420 Unless you're doing it for your infant child, on their behalf.

1421

1422 Commissioner Lauing: Let's not try to solve those corner cases right now.

1423
1424 Commissioner Crommie: Yes, I agree.

1425
1426 Commissioner Hetterly: I have one last question about the community prioritization
1427 process. That includes this workshop which will be advertised how we discussed, and the
1428 survey. What about the stakeholders' prioritization process? How does that work?

1429
1430 Ms. Fiore: They will be doing a similar exercise. We were talking earlier today about
1431 the date. One option is to have them meet earlier in the day, like immediately before the
1432 community workshop. Rob had a question whether they would want to reflect on what
1433 we heard at the workshops and build on that or what the appropriate timing would be.
1434 We're still discussing that.

1435
1436 Commissioner Hetterly: They will want to have, I presume, a more robust discussion
1437 than would be allowed in the survey or would necessarily happen in the regular
1438 community workshops. You're going to be able to accommodate that?

1439
1440 Ms. Fiore: Yeah, that's the intent.

1441
1442 Chair Reckdahl: I would think you would want the results of the survey ...

1443
1444 Ms. Fiore: To present to them.

1445
1446 Chair Reckdahl: ... to present to them, and say, "This is the results. What are your
1447 comments on this?" Last time, we went through and we had a meeting and we wrote
1448 down all the suggestions. It was collecting of ideas. What is the purpose of the next
1449 workshop? This is for the stakeholders.

1450
1451 Ms. Fiore: For the stakeholders, it is the same intent as what we just went through with
1452 this online and what we'll do at the workshop. What Commissioner Hetterly is
1453 suggesting is probably more detail. Part of that may be "Here's what we heard from the
1454 survey and in our workshop."

1455
1456 Chair Reckdahl: The order is we're going to do the electronic questionnaire. We're going
1457 to close that, and then we will go to the workshop.

1458
1459 Ms. Fiore: There will be a little overlap.

1460
1461 Chair Reckdahl: People then will be able to get the same input at that workshop. We
1462 will compile those results from the workshop and the online survey and present those at
1463 the stakeholders meeting. What is the purpose of the stakeholders meeting? Is it to get

1464 their feedback, to get a specific list? Is it a general kvetch fest? They can tell their ideas,
1465 and we're collecting ideas? Are we trying to achieve some specific goal?
1466

1467 Ms. Fiore: We're trying to get at their prioritization, again with limited resources and
1468 these areas of focus. It's more challenging because each of them was chosen because
1469 they represent one or more interest groups. We probably know what some of their
1470 answers are going to be. Replicating the prioritization weighting exercise with them and
1471 figuring out how to do it in a way that has a little more meat on the bones. Something
1472 between what we discussed with the Commission and what we're putting out to the
1473 general public.
1474

1475 Chair Reckdahl: Last time, there was a lot of cooks there.
1476

1477 Ms. Fiore: It's a big group.
1478

1479 Chair Reckdahl: A lot of people were able to say a sentence and that was it.
1480

1481 Commissioner Hetterly: If I were on the stakeholders group, I would want to comment
1482 on this survey before it goes out. My interest would be in making sure that all the bases
1483 are covered in one way or another, just like our interests are that way as well.
1484

1485 Mr. de Geus: My view on this is the stakeholders group should not be only looking at the
1486 areas of focus. They have a deeper understanding and appreciation of parks and
1487 recreation and the issues. The areas of focus is for the general public and maybe the new
1488 person that's just starting to look at the Plan and what we're doing here. I was telling
1489 Ellie about the different tiers of analysis. This is the deepest analysis with the
1490 Commission and the staff and the matrix. The stakeholders group is the second tier.
1491 They have a pretty good understanding of that matrix. They will have. We should talk
1492 about that and the principles and the areas of focus. The workshop should be designed
1493 differently for that stakeholder group ...
1494

1495 Commissioner Hetterly: I agree with that.
1496

1497 Mr. de Geus: ... a much deeper conversation. It can't just be ideas at this point. It needs
1498 to be focused conversation about tradeoffs, about different ways we could invest in the
1499 parks and recreation system. Then it still comes up to us and the Commission after that
1500 to then further synthesize that information from those tiers to come up with a final Plan.
1501

1502 Chair Reckdahl: I'm concerned there's going to be a lot of long-winded people at that
1503 stakeholders workshop.
1504

APPROVED

1505 Mr. de Geus: Yeah. A lot of them come with a specific interest. We need to design that
1506 thoughtfully and ask people to think outside of their particular area of interest. I haven't
1507 seen a plan for the stakeholder group meeting yet.

1508
1509 Commissioner Ashlund: Are you asking or expecting them to speak outside of their
1510 area? If they're there for stakeholders, I thought their whole purpose was to represent the
1511 sports field people, the dog people, and so forth.

1512
1513 Mr. de Geus: We do want to hear that, but we want them to think beyond their area of
1514 interest, think about the person sitting next to them that cares about tennis courts or dog
1515 parks or other things, that there is a balance of thinking. Otherwise, we hear a focused
1516 interest from 25 different people. That's not necessarily ...

1517
1518 Commissioner Ashlund: Twenty-five different interests or you're hearing ...

1519
1520 Mr. de Geus: Yeah. We'll have the seniors saying the senior pieces. What we're trying
1521 to look at as we get closer to developing and putting the Plan together is where is there
1522 overlap and themes and emphasis that we could solve more than one problem by
1523 investing in a certain way. Where we've got field users thinking about dog exercise, and
1524 senior folks thinking about what the teens are interested in.

1525
1526 Commissioner Hetterly: Is there only one stakeholders meeting left?

1527
1528 Mr. de Geus; I think there's two left.

1529
1530 Ms. Fiore: There will be two. There's a third one that will be a review of the draft Plan.

1531
1532 Commissioner Hetterly: I'm wondering how sensible it is to wait for the survey and then
1533 share that with them. I'm not sure that's the most efficient use of their time, because then
1534 they'll get bogged down in what the results of the survey were. You might want to talk
1535 about the principles and the criteria ...

1536
1537 Commissioner Crommie: I agree with that.

1538
1539 Commissioner Hetterly: ... and the process and then come back around ...

1540
1541 Mr. de Geus: That's not a bad idea.

1542
1543 Commissioner Hetterly: ... at the next stage with "this is what we're hearing."

1544
1545 Commissioner Crommie: I agree.

1546

1547 Chair Reckdahl: I'm worried about it becoming a zoo. If we don't present the results, it
1548 could be a little less of a zoo. It can still be a zoo, but there will be a few less animals.
1549

1550 Commissioner Crommie: Their results feed in too. There's multiple pathways in, and
1551 they're one of the pathways in. They don't have to react a lot to this pathway. They have
1552 their own voice as a group.
1553

1554 Commissioner Ashlund: The question is do we feel from that initial stakeholders
1555 meeting that those views are represented in this thinking that we've got so far in here. A
1556 couple of us were at that first stakeholders meeting. From those notes, do we say, "We
1557 forgot the Girl Scout House?"
1558

1559 Ms. Fiore: The areas of focus are intended to be and how we've been vetting them
1560 hopefully is are they high level and inclusive enough that any suggestion that would
1561 come out of this Commission or out of the stakeholders group would fit into one of those
1562 12 areas. That's what those are designed to do, to be inclusive.
1563

1564 Commissioner Ashlund: I think they are.
1565

1566 Chair Reckdahl: Have we gone back and reviewed the whiteboard notes?
1567

1568 Mr. de Geus: Mm-hmm.
1569

1570 Chair Reckdahl: We're convinced that what we have here does not omit any of those
1571 areas?
1572

1573 Ms. Fiore: We did look at them when we were initially drafting these. I haven't done it
1574 more recently than that, but we could do so.
1575

1576 Mr. de Geus: That's where the focus of areas largely came from. All of those 11, 12
1577 different sources of data.
1578

1579 Commissioner Crommie: I was at that first meeting too. I believe Daren Anderson was
1580 the one who wrote up the notes. Is that right? He gave everyone who was at that meeting
1581 an electronic copy. Is that correct?
1582

1583 Mr. de Geus: It was one of the meetings. I don't remember which one.
1584

1585 Ms. Fiore: You're jogging my memory. We have a summary of that, and I believe Daren
1586 did augment those notes. It's been a while though. Yeah, that was one of the things we
1587 looked at when drafting these categories, if you will.
1588

1589 Chair Reckdahl: We don't need the survey results by the time we have the stakeholders
1590 meeting.

1591
1592 Ms. Fiore: Right.

1593
1594 Chair Reckdahl: We can schedule them independently.

1595
1596 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, we can. Although, it would be helpful for us as the organizers and
1597 maybe the Commission to have some of that information when we have the meeting with
1598 the stakeholders, even if we're not presenting the results. Maybe we ask a little more
1599 thoughtful questions than we would otherwise, if we have that data.

1600
1601 Chair Reckdahl; That's a good point.

1602
1603 Commissioner Crommie: I'm trying to think from the point of view of the stakeholders.
1604 They'll know we've done the survey, because they're getting notified.

1605
1606 Mr. de Geus: They can participate in the survey.

1607
1608 Commissioner Crommie: They want to participate, and they want to advertise it to their
1609 constituency to participate. They're going to be well aware of this survey when they
1610 show up at a meeting, whether we give them results or not.

1611
1612 Ms. Fiore: Correct.

1613
1614 Commissioner Crommie: What is it we're asking them at that meeting? We're not going
1615 to be asking them, "Do you think we did a good job on this survey?" They're going to
1616 have opinions. When they see this survey, all of our stakeholders are going to have
1617 opinions on how well we captured their thoughts. I do think Commissioner Hetterly has
1618 a good point that ideally you would potentially allow them to see this before we send it
1619 out. I don't know if that's too ...

1620
1621 Commissioner Ashlund: It's a big group, right?

1622
1623 Mr. de Geus: It's a big group.

1624
1625 Commissioner Crommie: It might be too messy. We need to capture whether they
1626 thought we did a good job on this, after the fact even. They should be able to give their
1627 viewpoints on that.

1628
1629 Commissioner Ashlund: Ellie can review it. You go down the list of stakeholders and
1630 you have somebody on their for sports fields and somebody on there for dogs, and you're

1631 going to be able to cross check it. If you do find an omission, I don't think you are. It's
1632 more straightforward to have you do a cross check than to open this up to review by 60 or
1633 whatever people it was with all the wordsmithing and all the preferences.
1634

1635 Commissioner Hetterly: I agree. It would be a disaster to have them design the survey
1636 with us.
1637

1638 Commissioner Ashlund: Right. We can ...
1639

1640 Commissioner Hetterly: My point is only that they're going to want to have something at
1641 a (crosstalk) level, more in-depth level than what the regular workshop is going to have.
1642 We should be sure to provide them that and give them opportunities to weigh in in
1643 different ways.
1644

1645 Chair Reckdahl: I'm going to go through some schedule. We're planning to open it on
1646 8/26; that's our target date. How long are we keeping that open?
1647

1648 Ms. Fiore: Through end of September, the 30th.
1649

1650 Chair Reckdahl: 9/30. The workshop, do we have a rough idea of when that's going to
1651 be?
1652

1653 Mr. de Geus: September 21st is the tentative date.
1654

1655 Vice Chair Markevitch: Which one?
1656

1657 Ms. Fiore: September 21st.
1658

1659 Mr. de Geus: By the way, that's a Monday. That's not a good day.
1660

1661 Ms. Fiore: That's not generally a good day.
1662

1663 Chair Reckdahl: The stakeholder meeting, we think now is going to be after that. That
1664 would be mid-October?
1665

1666 Mr. de Geus: I don't know if it needs to be that far out. Within a week or two of the
1667 workshop would be fine.
1668

1669 Ms. Fiore: Well ...
1670

1671 Mr. de Geus: No?
1672

1673 Ms. Fiore: The survey results will take us a little bit of time.
1674

1675 Chair Reckdahl: If you wanted the staff to be able to look at the survey results, then it
1676 would have to be after 9/30.
1677

1678 Mr. de Geus: Right, because the survey is still open the week after the workshop.
1679

1680 Chair Reckdahl: Early October for the stakeholder?
1681

1682 Mr. de Geus: Mm-hmm.
1683

1684 Chair Reckdahl. Early October. The draft report, what are we shooting for for that?
1685

1686 Mr. de Geus: It's end of the year, end of the calendar year.
1687

1688 Chair Reckdahl: End of the calendar year, okay. In January we would have another
1689 stakeholder review of that draft?
1690

1691 Mr. de Geus: Yeah.
1692

1693 Ms. Fiore: We have a broad review of that draft.
1694

1695 Mr. de Geus: January or February.
1696

1697 Ms. Fiore: And then go to the other Commissions.
1698

1699 Mr. de Geus: That'll be our two-year mark working on this.
1700

1701 Chair Reckdahl: Are there any other hoops? We have the draft. Obviously there's a lot
1702 of work to do. Is there any more community interaction? Are you meeting with other
1703 groups at all?
1704

1705 Ms. Fiore: There's a Council work session on August 31st.
1706

1707 Commissioner Crommie: Which date?
1708

1709 Ms. Fiore: August 31st.
1710

1711 Commissioner Lauing: Which year?
1712

1713 Ms. Fiore: In two weeks.
1714

1715 Commissioner Crommie: That's a Monday, August 31st.

1716
1717 Ms. Fiore: That's a big one.

1718
1719 Commissioner Hetterly: What is going to be covered there? That's a pretty ...

1720
1721 Ms. Fiore: It is an update to the process, since it's been a while since we were in front of
1722 that group. I'm focusing largely on the principles and policy level direction setting and
1723 getting their buy-in on those, and then a preview of the community workshop
1724 prioritization exercise and the criteria. Rob and Ryan and Peter and I have all been
1725 working on what that looks like.

1726
1727 Mr. de Geus: It's an update report for the Council which will go out next week. It'd be
1728 great if some of the Commissioners could be there.

1729
1730 Vice Chair Markevitch: That's also a good time to put up a nice big slide, "here's where
1731 you go to do the survey," so people who are watching at home can see that, people in the
1732 audience. You could even put little fliers where the agenda items are, on that table. Take
1733 one home and this is where you can log in.

1734
1735 Ms. Fiore: That's a great idea.

1736
1737 Chair Reckdahl: Any more questions? Thank you. We made a lot of progress. It's
1738 coming along.

1739
1740 Ms. Fiore: Thank you all.

1741
1742 **3. Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates.**

1743
1744 Chair Reckdahl: Does anyone have any input? We had community gardens penciled in
1745 for next month.

1746
1747 Commissioner Crommie: I have a question on that. We're holding off on community
1748 gardens because Daren Anderson is having a meeting on some of the questions that have
1749 come up. Does anyone know when that meeting is taking place?

1750
1751 Catherine Bourquin: August 26th.

1752
1753 Commissioner Crommie: It's taking place on August 26th.

1754
1755 Chair Reckdahl: Is that a public meeting?

1756

APPROVED

1757 Commissioner Crommie: No, it's not. Our ad hoc should meet with Daren after that
1758 meeting, but before we present to our Commission. Someone has to consider what report
1759 we're using.

1760
1761 Commissioner Ashlund: Are you back for the regular September meeting?
1762

1763 Commissioner Crommie: Yeah. I get back on August 31st. I'd like to schedule that
1764 meeting with Daren. I'll talk to Commissioner Ashlund. She'll help out to make sure we
1765 get that after that August 26th meeting.
1766

1767 Chair Reckdahl: It's possible that there will be more work to do after that?
1768

1769 Commissioner Crommie; Exactly. We need to get it done in time for the packet for the
1770 September meeting.
1771

1772 Chair Reckdahl: I'm reluctant to commit to having it on next month. We'll have to
1773 evaluate how the meeting goes and if Daren wants more time.
1774

1775 Commissioner Crommie: That will give us a full month. Since he's having the meeting
1776 on August 26th, at least we have a full month until the following meeting.
1777

1778 Chair Reckdahl: Our goal is to get it in, but be careful that there may be other issues
1779 going on.
1780

1781 Rob de Geus: Other ad hoc committee updates or is that all?
1782

1783 Commissioner Hetterly: We don't have any update on the website, but we may want to
1784 be presenting next month. That's an agenda item. The dog ad hoc, we did have a
1785 community meeting. There were 80 to 100 people there; it was a big turnout. It was very
1786 civilized. Daren did a great job soliciting a lot of comments. We'll update on that as
1787 well, maybe next month, maybe the month after. We have a meeting with Daren next
1788 week to circle back around on some other issues.
1789

1790 Commissioner Ashlund: Did you have all pro dog participants or did you have some
1791 anti?
1792

1793 Commissioner Hetterly: We had a pretty balanced group.
1794

1795 Vice Chair Markevitch: The dog owners were encouraged to bring their animals. I
1796 checked, and dogs are not allowed other than service dogs in the Lucie Stern ballroom.
1797 They had to leave their little friends at home sadly.
1798

1799 Commissioner Hetterly: The child owners also showed up to express their position.
1800

1801 Commissioner Crommie: Can you talk a little bit more about next steps? Where is this
1802 going?
1803

1804 Commissioner Hetterly: We're going to do that next month when we have it on the
1805 agenda.
1806

1807 Commissioner Crommie: You will get it on next month is what you're saying.
1808

1809 Commissioner Hetterly: We're meeting with Daren next week, and we'll determine then
1810 whether we'll be able to do all this or go back in order to present it. Abbie's been
1811 traveling quite a bit, so it's challenging to schedule.
1812

1813 Chair Reckdahl: How about the budget process? Last year, when did we start meetings?
1814

1815 Commissioner Lauing: CIP budgets, not operating budget?
1816

1817 Chair Reckdahl: Yeah, CIPs. I'm sorry.
1818

1819 Commissioner Lauing: I think it was July, as I recall.
1820

1821 Mr. de Geus: We're probably at the point of coming together again on the capital budget.
1822 That would be good to do.
1823

1824 Chair Reckdahl: Do you know when that has to be submitted?
1825

1826 Mr. de Geus: We haven't received a request yet from the Office of Management and
1827 Budget. Typically we submit things in November, that time range. We got a head start
1828 on it, and it was helpful last year to do that.
1829

1830 Commissioner Lauing: We'll have a similar problem in that we're still prioritizing for
1831 parks and rec.
1832

1833 Mr. de Geus: I'm happy to set up that meeting. Is it still the same ad hoc committee?
1834

1835 Chair Reckdahl: I'm happy to still do it.
1836

1837 Commissioner Lauing: It can be, unless somebody else wants on it.
1838

1839 Mr. de Geus: I'll initiate a meeting then.
1840

1841 Chair Reckdahl: What is the timeline for the new members? When do the outgoing
1842 members end?

1843
1844 Vice Chair Markevitch: December.

1845
1846 Commissioner Hetterly: October.

1847
1848 Commissioner Crommie: No, it's October. We got an email.

1849
1850 Commissioner Hetterly: Next year it's December. This year it's October.

1851
1852 Vice Chair Markevitch: I checked with the City Clerk about a month ago, and she said
1853 December.

1854
1855 Commissioner Hetterly: David Carnahan says it's October.

1856
1857 Commissioner Crommie: I got an email from Carnahan saying October.

1858
1859 Commissioner Ashlund: October 31st, yeah.

1860
1861 Mr. de Geus: The Council has scheduled on their longer term schedule interviews for
1862 new Commissioners in September.

1863
1864 Commissioner Crommie: Someone told me the deadline for submission of applications
1865 might be August 26th. Is that right?

1866
1867 Commissioner Lauing: That sounds about right.

1868
1869 Commissioner Crommie: Does that mean that those of us who are coming up to term and
1870 not reapplying, do we plan to attend the October Commission meeting?

1871
1872 Mr. de Geus: Yes.

1873
1874 Chair Reckdahl: What happens if the Council is slow at selecting? Do they get bridged?

1875
1876 Mr. de Geus: We ask if they will continue to attend until someone's appointed.

1877
1878 Chair Reckdahl: They still have full authority and voting rights then? Okay. Any other
1879 comments, questions? Okay.

1880

V. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Reckdahl: Rob, do you have any comments or announcements?

Rob de Geus: The Council is back in session. I'm surprised to see Council Member Filseth here, because they had a long marathon meeting.

Council Member Filseth: We met only today.

Mr. de Geus: They went late into the night last night. They're back. They had a lot on the agenda. We had a lot of things on the consent calendar too. We had some Park Improvements Ordinances for the batting cages and Monroe Park and Byxbee Park. All went through last night with Council approval. That's exciting. The 31st is the next meeting where we have things on the agenda for Council. We have the study session and also the discussion of the 7.7 acres at Foothills Park. The Commission spent a lot of time on that. The Staff recommendation is that we hold off on doing anything significant until the hydrology study is complete. That's the primary recommendation. We have the background of the Commission work and the community meetings around that. That's an action discussion item on the 31st. You may be interested in participating. It would be good to have a Commissioner there, not necessarily to speak to it but because the staff report references the Commission and the Commission's point of view. Council might have questions for the Commission. The Chair can decide who can be there.

Chair Reckdahl: You or Daren ...

Mr. de Geus: Daren and I will be there presenting. The Council will be discussing the item.

Chair Reckdahl: My guess is that if you and Daren are presenting it, they will not have any questions for us. You'll be able to handle anything.

Mr. de Geus: Probably not. I don't know. There is some different opinions on Council about the 7.7 acres. The last time they did talk about it, there seemed like there was some interest to open it up and allow people to get in there. Staff's not recommending that. It'll be interesting to see how they respond. I would find it helpful if you could be there, Keith, or have someone there.

Chair Reckdahl: I certainly will try to be there. I would recommend that if people are interested, they should come.

Vice Chair Markevitch: Which day is it?

1923 Chair Reckdahl: August 31st, the Council meeting for the 7.7 acres.
1924

1925 Vice Chair Markevitch: That's also the same as the ...
1926

1927 Commissioner Hetterly: Master Plan.
1928

1929 Vice Chair Markevitch: Yeah, Master Plan.
1930

1931 Chair Reckdahl: We'll have two things to talk about.
1932

1933 Mr. de Geus: Other than that ...
1934

1935 Chair Reckdahl: Daren talked a few months ago about water conservation. How's the
1936 city doing? Are we meeting our goals?
1937

1938 Mr. de Geus: Yeah. That's a good question. We're spending a lot of time on that. We've
1939 got data for one month, July. We narrowly reached the target of 34 percent reduction.
1940 We're happy with it.
1941

1942 Chair Reckdahl: That's for the city government or is that for the city as a whole?
1943

1944 Mr. de Geus: City as a whole.
1945

1946 Chair Reckdahl: How is city government doing? The parks.
1947

1948 Mr. de Geus: Very well.
1949

1950 Vice Chair Markevitch: I went to that meeting, the water conservation meeting that was
1951 at Mitchell Park. It was very well run. They gave a lot of information to the 30 of us that
1952 were in the room. It was good.
1953

1954 Mr. de Geus: We're working closely with Utilities and Public Works on that plan. You'll
1955 start to see the impacts, if you haven't already, that some of the grass is going brown or
1956 dying off a little bit in those areas that are not heavily used. You'll see more of that as we
1957 go on. As we get further along in the year and have better data about how we're doing,
1958 we may have more flexibility in terms of the water use and adjust the plan a little bit here
1959 and there. At this point, we have one month of data.
1960

1961 Commissioner Lauing: Is the city going to start enforcement soon?
1962

1963 Mr. de Geus: I don't know a lot about the enforcement strategy and plan for people that
1964 are not doing their part.

1965
1966 Commissioner Lauing: You wouldn't have to walk far from your office to see problems.
1967 I drove by there yesterday. That house across the street was spraying about noon on their
1968 lawn.

1969
1970 Vice Chair Markevitch: They have a phone number you can call and rat them out.

1971
1972 Mr. de Geus: I did hear that a lot of people are doing that. People care a lot, and they
1973 make the calls. We're not going out and ticketing people at this point.

1974
1975 **VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR SEPTEMBER 22, 2015 MEETING**

1976
1977 Chair Reckdahl: The agenda for next month, what do we have on that?

1978
1979 Rob de Geus: The Junior Museum and Zoo may come back. We're not sure yet. The
1980 team is working hard on the feedback they received the last time they were here. I'm not
1981 sure they'll be ready in September, but they said they might be. We'll have the Parks,
1982 Trails, Open Space Master Plan, and then the two additional that we know of, the
1983 community gardens ad hoc and perhaps the dog exercise area ad hoc committee.

1984
1985 Commissioner Hetterly: And the website ad hoc.

1986
1987 Catherine Bourquin: I think the Interpretive Center too.

1988
1989 Mr. de Geus: Are they read for September? I have to remember that.

1990
1991 Ms. Bourquin: (crosstalk)

1992
1993 Mr. de Geus: It's starting to get a little busy.

1994
1995 Chair Reckdahl: Is it the signage? Deirdre and Stacey, you're still on that ad hoc or has
1996 that disbanded?

1997
1998 Commissioner Crommie: I'm a little confused about what we're supposed to be doing.
1999 We thought that John Aiken was going to present to us on this. It had to do with a CIP
2000 for signs at the Interpretive Center. The idea of expanding it into the whole open space
2001 area was his vision. We haven't been able to hear about that yet, so it'd be ...

2002
2003 Mr. de Geus: I'm not sure that he's made much progress on that. I think it is the right
2004 way to do signage at the Baylands. Not to think about it piecemeal, but think about the
2005 whole preserve.



2007 Commissioner Crommie: It relates to finances. The CIP right now is not large enough to
2008 allow for that. We have to understand where that is in the pipeline.

2009
2010 Mr. de Geus: I'll check in with John on that, and maybe this comes up with our CIP ad
2011 hoc committee as well. It's underfunded. The money in there is sufficient to replace the
2012 existing signage around the Interpretive Center only. That's not the way we want to do
2013 this.

2014
2015 Commissioner Crommie: Will you handle talking to John Aiken?

2016
2017 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, I will. I did want to mention one thing back on announcements.
2018 The Council, I think on the 31st, is also taking up the Comprehensive Plan goals
2019 discussion. The Community Services and Facilities Element is one of the two elements
2020 being discussed that evening. The study session on the Parks Master Plan, the 7.7 acres
2021 plus the ...

2022
2023 Vice Chair Markevitch: That's nice of them to combine them all for us on that one night.

2024
2025 Mr. de Geus: The Commission's done a lot of work on that Element and provided a lot of
2026 feedback. That might be of interest too.

2027
2028 Chair Reckdahl: We had talked about getting a presentation about the Cost of Service
2029 Study. Is anyone working on that?

2030
2031 Commissioner Hetterly: We can't fit it in next month anyway.

2032
2033 Chair Reckdahl: That's probably going to take some time anyway, so I'm trying to feed
2034 the pipeline. If you want it, you have to ask for it two months ahead. Eventually I want
2035 that to come back. That is fertile ground for us to talk about that.

2036
2037 Mr. de Geus: The City Auditor reports to the Council directly. One of their audits
2038 they're doing this year is on fees. Not just CSD fees, but fees generally. It just got
2039 started, so I don't know a whole lot about that. I suspect it's going to relate to the Cost of
2040 Service Study and the policy the Council adopted in the spring. That might be of interest
2041 to the Commission too. If we have them both come together.

2042
2043 Chair Reckdahl: Any other comments, suggestions, things?

2044
2045 **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

2046
2047 Meeting adjourned on motion by Commissioner Crommie and second by Vice Chair
2048 Markevitch at 8:55 p.m.