

The following transcript is provided for your convenience, but does not represent the official record of this meeting. The transcript is provided by the firm that provides closed captioning services to the City. Because this service is created in real-time as the meeting progresses, it may contain errors and gaps, but is nevertheless very helpful in determining the gist of what occurred during this meeting.

>> Mayor Reed: Then I think we'll hear some discussion about how this fits in with the general plan and our long term vision that's being done there. But I do want to congratulate the staff and that's all the staff, city, redevelopment staff, and many, many departments that got involved in implementing the past Greenprint. And I know that as a councilmember I was happy to cut the ribbon on a couple of parks, and I've been happy as a mayor to go to ribbon cutting on some trail extensions. I think I've been on every foot of trail in this city, but I'm not sure. I know we have a long ways to go, and the Greenprint is the means to get in. So with that I want to turn it over to staff. Ed Shikada is sitting in for the City Manager, who is out of town. Ed.

>> Ed Shikada: Thank you, Mayor, members of the council. Appreciate your spending a little bit of time with us this morning, Labor Day week. As the mayor noted, the Greenprint is a significant implementation tool for the administration, and so -- as a matter of fact, it's been on the PRNS work plan, the to-do list for quite some time, perhaps in excess of two years. As you know, with the document in front of you, there has been significant staff effort as well as significant community input on this document to date, but it is very important to note that the document and the work effort is still at the formative stage. So this morning really provides an important opportunity for staff to get some feedback in an informal setting from councilmembers to ensure that we're on the right track. So with that, turn it over to Mr. Balagso.

>> Albert Balagso: Thank you, Mayor Reed, and members of the city council. I'm here with Matt Cano, division manager for Parks, Recreation, and Neighborhood Services, and he and his staff have been leading the development of this plan as we've advanced it to today's study session. I would like to step back a moment and talk a little bit about what is the Greenprint and why we are updating it. The Greenprint is our strategic plan. It's a document that we've utilized to set the framework how we proceed with our capital program and building these parks and amenities used by our residents here in San José. Now, that being said, back in 2000 when it was adopted there are many things that have occurred since that point in time. And we want to ensure that this continues to align with our CIP plan and align with the work that's being done with the general plan as well. This is not the general plan, however, it does serve as the base for the information that we are feeding into the service levels of the general plan itself. It does incorporate new documents or previous council documents that have been approved since 2000 that includes the Green Vision, the U.N. accords, the aquatics master plan, the sports field studies so on, those were not part of the original Greenprint. An example of how it incorporates the new item such as the Green Vision, is the 25 additional miles that we track towards the 100 miles, per the Green Vision adopted by council. I mentioned the previous documents that were adopted 50 city council as we advance forward and last year the council also approved the pricing and revenue strategy which enables us to set fees more commensurate with cost recovery. And that has brought a new word I believe to our department which is sustainability. How do we sustain ourselves both fiscally and environmentally as we move forward. And this is really setting a new fiscal reality on how we set our priorities and move forward in the future. Now, as the mayor mentioned earlier about park openings, what we've completed in the decade of investment, this was the document that was utilized to frame Measure P, and through that time we also had the decade of investment, other funds that were utilized to add park and park amenities. So since that time in 2000, 84 new acres were added, 30 new parks and 25 miles of trails. That does not account also for the improvements that we are making with Measure P, which include 9 new or renovated community centers and numerous improvements to our infrastructure, as well. Now, what we're going to do today is, we're going to bring this to you in three phases before I hand it off to Matt Cano to proceed here. And there are three key policy areas that we want to discuss today. So Matt will give you information, and then we'll break for discussion, and additional information, and these are the three items that we will be discussing. The first one is long term service levels. There had been one lone metric that was part of the Greenprint, and that was acres per thousand. We need to look at a balanced quality of park system. It's not just about the number, but rather, what are the amenities that serve the residents as well. In addition to that, we need to look at what are the near term priorities of how we proceed in the next five to ten years with our capital program, what is the expectation that we should set to ensure that this is again financially and environmentally sustainable and not building beyond our means. And the third item that we want to cover with you is the park trust fund, looking at the either expanding the mileage from two miles to three miles for community-serving amenities or further discussion of how we might utilize it within a planning area. And it will take further discussion with the attorney's office before we can even proceed with that. But we would like to hear your input back on that subject as well. And that would position us well for how we are utilizing that concept within North San José, which is probably the immediate area that we are working of expanding that range. So for the next portion of the presentation I'm going to hand that over to Matt Cano.

>> Thank you, Albert. A few more slides before we get into the first policy area. The slide in front of you talks about the alignment between the Greenprint and the general plan. These are two updates that are two parallel efforts that are going on simultaneously. As Albert mentioned, the Greenprint sets a short term strategic service level plan for our department that then can feed into the long range vision of the general plan update. That's working very well right now, since the general plan task force is having discussions about parks and recreation and open space service levels, and they're using a lot of the work that was developed out of the Greenprint process as the basis for that work, such as what is the acre service level per thousand, is that the proper service level. Those are current general plan policies that we're keeping in the Greenprint as I will discuss later, but will be addressed further in the general plan update. The Greenprint update process, as Albert mentioned, and as Ed Shikada mentioned, has been on the department work plan for a couple of years now. We've held a number of community meetings in order to first, before -- community meetings and surveys of the community before we develop the draft document. We wanted to take the old 2000 Greenprint, get community updates, feedback, make sure we're in line with today's community priorities, and that -- we use that to draft the document. So again, during our telephone surveys, there was about -- it identified 85% of the residents that actually use our facilities and the document before you today again is a draft, we're here today to get your preliminary input and feedback and we'll move to the final document later in the year. As part of the update process we needed to frame it. Starting at the top, before we got into the details of the Greenprint update, we took a look at the vision and mission for the department. We came up with a new vision that's on the screen and the paper before you being a national leader of parks and recreation in cultivating healthy communities, through quality programs and dynamic public spaces. I won't read the mission, it's in front of you. But what I wanted to mention is these all fold up into the strategy of the green print. Every strategy folds up. In my role for capital and advanced planning for the department I've been focusing, our team has been focusing in conversation with the councilmembers over the last year, in investing in sustainable projects. Projects that can be financially and environmentally sustainable and lead to productive partnerships. All of those capital projects can ultimately lead up to help us achieve this long range vision. In the next few slides we're going to talk about various metrics, service levels, ways to measure success of the parks system, of the future of San José. What it really comes down to and what we'll be stressing more in later slides though is a balanced park system. It's about quality of the system, not just the quantity. It's not just the quantity, it's not just about numbers, although numbers are an important factor. It's about access to various types of facilities. As you can see the slide in the picture shows dog parks, trails, skate parks, passive garden areas, playgrounds, and it's about not only providing these facilities for the area but providing access to these facilities through a comprehensive bicycle and trail network. As Albert mentioned, there's three key policy issues that we really want your feedback on today. The next several slides will present the first issue to you. Then we're going to pause to obtain your feedback and input which will help us guide our final document. This first policy issue is about what I just referenced. It's about the metrics. What are the service levels, what is the goal -- long term goals that we want each planning area to achieve through the Greenprint? Some of these metrics such as the three and a half acres per thousand service level have been approved by prior city councils. The 100 miles of trail Green Vision, some of them are new concepts, Greenprint is doing is bringing all of these together in one cohesive package. And on the next slide is the first metric which is part of that package which is the existing Jen service level of 3.5 acres per thousand of community and neighborhood parks per resident. That's the current general plan goal. We've kept that in the Greenprint update and the general plan is discussing whether or not that is an appropriate long term service level goal and that will continue to be a level -- topic of discussion in the general plan update. Right now, when we count schools which is allowed under the general plan, we have 3.0 acres per thousand of neighborhood and community serving facilities of the 3.5 acre goal. 1.6 of that, as shown on the slide, is city acres, and 1.4 of that is school acres. And again, numbers, this is a very important part of the service level goal for parks, but it is just a piece of the puzzle. And that's shown on this slide, where this is the balanced park system that's presented as part of the Greenprint process. This was actually conceptually approved, not in this exact format, but in concept as part of the North San José task force and council's approval of the parks plan for the North San José task force. We talked about in that task force meeting about having a balanced parks system, not just acres and acres of parks but also community centers and parks within reasonable access, access to a gym, access to sports field, making sure that that planning area was a balanced system. The next slide talks about an interconnected, numbers of times but, there's no way to put a park right next door to every resident. We do want to put parks together, but if we can get residents access, access to our destination, to the Guadalupe river park, to their neighborhood park even though it's a few miles from their house, making sure that we get an interconnected system, sorry, just South of Tully road, we have almost 53 miles of trails in our system, as mentioned in previous speakers, we had about 25 miles, as part of the previous Greenprint update, we look a lot different and we still have the goal and we're pushing for that in the green print, of having 100 miles by the year

2022. And the trails are also just one side note used for commuting as we all know in addition to recreating. Our recent survey showed that 58.1% of the survey users actually use the trail system for commuting. This next slide is another service level goal, metric that is used in the Greenprint that was not around during the previous Greenprint. This is the urban environmental accords. Per the urban environmental accords that were adopted by the city council a few years back, there is a goal of having a park recreational space within a third of a mile of every resident in the city. We did an analysis in the Greenprint and in the action plans of the Greenprint we've actually identified on the map there's 51 areas in the city that don't -- and we've taken into account freeways and other barriers. There's 51 areas that do not have access to a park or open space within a third of a mile.

However, I do want to point out that about 90%, over 90% of the households in the city actually do have a park or open space within a third of a mile, so the 51 is a big number, we want to make sure those folks are served but I want to point out over 90% do have a third. The question is how do we serve these residents? We need to make sure they're served through a balanced park system. So what the Greenprint discusses is, first and foremost, look to connect them to existing facilities. Is there a neighborhood park that is maybe a half a mile from where they live that we can expand that neighborhood park to fit their needs and we can also expand the bicycle and trail network to make it safe for them to get to that facility. If there's no way to get them access to that park would be to build a park in their neighborhood. One example of a park we recently opened was at 34th and San Antonio in council District 5 where it was really hard to serve those residents. We worked the councilmember, the developer, to build a small park there but what we used was environmentally sustainable design techniques so there's no grass on that park and nothing that we have to mow or water on that facility. It is recognizing that not all areas are the same and there is going to be a different strategy for every area. Another new concept is the Guadalupe park and gardens. Having the Guadalupe river park and gardens as a grand central of San José, having that destination, that everybody wants to go to on the weekend, that makes you proud to live here, this is not going to be the only grand park in the city but by its proximity, having it the central, center park for the City of San José, making sure that that interconnected trail work can get access to people, whether it's from East San José or West San José, from the Coyote creek trail, and also we can have community and neighborhood elements for residents that are in the vicinity of that park to serve them as well. The final concept in this first policy area of the long term service goals for the city are the park land area deficiency. We take a look at the acres per thousand of neighborhood and community serving parks in every planning area in the city. And we also took a look at the number of households that were in those underserved areas that didn't have a park or open space within a third of a mile and we looked at the density of those areas. And using that we categorized planning areas by high, medium or low in terms of parkland deficiency. I wanted to be clear that we are not using this as a primary tool in the Greenprint. It is one of the many tools in the Greenprint that we could use one day, if there is discretion. Most of our funding is tied to specific grants or park trust fund or distribution formulas, but if there are ever discretionary funding available, for new land, a new park land, this is a metric that we may want to use. What do all these slides mean? And I reference North San José earlier, and this is in front of you is a concept of the future, North San José planning area, and the green is the parks. And we don't have any of these new parks built yet into North San José but we plan on moving forward and pushing and doing so. And I'll just touch on it briefly now because I talked about it before. In here you have parks within walking distance in the future of all the new residents. East west connections either on the trail system or river oaks parkway and you have well sized parks. And that's what we mean when we talk about the balanced park system. Yes, acreage is a factor but it's much more than that. It's about connections and proximity to facilities. As a reminder, we want the Greenprint to have very clear long term objectives for our parks and our planning areas. We've included previous concepts, such as the three and a half acre per thousand service level and the balanced park system. We've added the concept of the Guadalupe River Park as a central park. Put this in all in one cohesive package, and so what I'd like to do now, if it's okay with the mayor and council, is pause and see if there is any feedback or discussion on this first issue.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, I'm sure that there will be, without a doubt. Everybody wants to talk about parks. I had a couple of comments. First, in terms of where we are, I think your recommended solutions are good ones and that's the right direction but I am interested in what data we have, what work we've done to figure out who uses what parks, specifically things like if we put in a pocket park in a neighborhood, will anybody actually use it, or should we be trying to get larger parks in areas that are deficient, rather than just settling for a pocket park? And do we have data of usage in facilities versus acreage?

>> We actually do not have data, although conjecturally, if larger parks already have sports fields and community centers and community centers and have multiple uses would definitely tend to attract a wider audience and wider range than pocket parks.

>> Mayor Reed: Well, pocket parks is one of those things we talked about and seemed like the only solution in some areas of the city, but if people aren't using them relative to the cost, then it is not necessarily the best solution. And on page -- your chart number -- page number 11, slide number 11 whatever you call it in PowerPoint, which is the balance park facilities for planning area. At some point I'd like to see the dollar amounts associated with each of these categories, operating dollars, not capital dollars. Because I know that you can have some major parks, and not have the operating costs of a single community center. And there's a tradeoff when we're talking about operating dollars, and I think that's important to factor in. Because there's plenty of demand for community centers but they're plenty expensive compared to more parks. Your slide 13, one-third mile access to recreational areas, is that one-third access under the urban environmental accords, is that to a park, or to a trail leading to a park?

>> It doesn't reference trails but we have included trails in our analysis.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay. I think it's important. Once you're on a trail, it's a good thing. And you said that 90% of our people have access within a third of a mile.

>> Correct. Of the households.

>> Mayor Reed: That's good, much better than I thought it was. Those are my comments. Councilmember Pyle.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I just had a quick question. You said that in 2005, we had about 25 miles of trails. And then you mentioned current day, and I didn't get it.

>> Sorry, in 2000 we had about 25 miles of trails.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Right.

>> In current day, we have almost 53 miles.

>> Councilmember Pyle: 53, okay, thank you. That's it.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember Liccardo.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thanks, mayor. Now, would this be an appropriate time to talk about priority areas, and underserved areas within the planning areas or I mean is that something you were going to get to or should I raise that now?

>> We weren't going to address that. So now would be as good a time as any.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay, great, thanks Matt. The concern I shared a bit with Albert and when we look at within the areas, the various planning areas where we see designations with circles and the number of households in those circles, designates planning areas where we believe populations are underserved. I found there to be a disconnect between the analysis in the document and what I was hearing out in the community. And to give you an example, just in my own community, in the downtown area, it would appear as though Naglee park would be -- which is the area just to the East of San Jose State -- an underserved area based on the designation in the central downtown planning area. I can't tell you I've heard many complaints about being underserved for parks in that neighborhood, partly because it is a neighborhood that has predominantly single-family housing, a lot of back yards, and a lot of walking access to parks like Williams Street and Olinder and so forth, and even Roosevelt, not to mention San José State. On the other hand, south of 280 I've got many neighborhoods that are high density where you have a lot of renters, where children don't have access to backyards and a huge concern about lack of park space. And there's no designation there that they're underserved in any way, and they're served primarily by two very small neighborhood parks that are each less than half an acre. Now, just to take an example Spartan Keyes which is south of 280 if you looked at a map you'd say well, they're near happy hollow park and spartan stadium and Muni stadium. Looks like they're well served. Challenge is that spartan stadium and Muni stadium aren't necessarily open for public use. And we have clear challenge for a child to get across Senter

road to get to happy hollow park and zoo. Not that neighborhood serving for those living to the West of Senter. What was raised for me is the metrics we're using, it is hard to get to a final level of detail, when we're looking at citywide approaches. But one concern I had about the urban environmental accord standard was that it was measuring distance and proximity based upon how the crow flies, and not how people walk. So that was one concern I had, because you have major impediments in getting people to, particularly children and seniors, getting people to parks in a way that's safe, and second concern that I had is that I appreciate the fact that you guys considered density as a demographic factor. But another demographic factor I think is relevant here is, not just the density overall but also the kind of housing that's there. And the access that people have to private amenities, I think a lot of single family neighborhoods with big backyards, generally you don't hear a lot of concerns or as many concerns about access to park space as you do from folks south of 280 who just don't have that. So again, I know that it's difficult for us to be too precise when we're looking at a citywide tool. But in terms of how I think my community would look at this map or many members of my community, they would say that the areas that are identified as being park-deficient aren't nearly as park-deficient as others. So I know we've had conversations about this and I don't pretend there's a secret answer here or simple answer, rather. But if you have any response I'd be interested.

>> Thank you. Again, don't have the -- we'll see. On page 108, of the Greenprint is the action plan for the central downtown planning area and that's where we've -- we may want to be stronger in the final Greenprint, and that's why I'm glad we're getting your feedback today. This is where we've addressed that disparity, and for example, all of those underserved areas we've put as unfunded priority 2 in the Yes. We realize through the community meetings and through our work with your neighborhood advisory group that those are not priorities for the council district and for the residents of the council district. The -- we have put projects such as Almaden apartments park site, Watson park, Buena Vista, Del Monte, Spartan Keyes and Tamien as high priorities on page 108, because we know through our work with the community that is a disconnect. I think that's one of the best ways we've addressed so far that disconnect.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: That's helpful, thanks Matt. When we look at the park inventory in the back, are there ways that we can suggest additional potential park sites to add to that park land inventory, because I know where with within the inventory it designates I believe it is future parks for development?

>> What we've done on the future parks, what we've done in the inventory is, we've -- since this is the number that we used to say how many acres are actually secured, what we've done is, we've only listed them here if we actually have full funding to develop them or through a planning entitlement there has actually been a formal designation of park land. I think the -- I think another -- I think the action plan, on page 108, would probably be our best way to incorporate other parks that may be missing from here but we can look into that.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay, so really the organize would be done through the capital action plan. What would be the best way to do that to send you a memo and the rest of council?

>> Yes.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay, thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember Nguyen.

>> Councilmember Nguyen: Thank you, Matt and Albert for the presentation. I have just two questions. The first one is, my understanding is, we have several neighborhood or community parks throughout the city that are fully funded in terms of the ability for them to be built and they are shovel-ready but because we have a bunch of constraints we don't have the operational cost once these parks are built. I didn't see it in here but what are our plans to address these type of issues? In my district, at least one park, the West Evergreen community park is shovel ready, to this day we only have weeds out there. I was wondering when are we going to address that?

>> Albert Balagso: We have not concluded our work on that. I sent out an info memo back in the summer advising council that we were looking at this as one of the options of trying to curb some of the costs that we would have coming onto the couple of years as the economic times are going to be difficult for us. We anticipate in the next month or so making that decision which way we would go.

>> Councilmember Nguyen: Okay, great! And then the second question has to do with, we recently had the grand opening of the Coyote creek trail out in District 7 which is great. And we have partnerships with the Bay Area ridge trail council as well as the Water District. I guess what I'm interested in knowing is how do this type of partnership played out or incorporated into our city's Greenprint?

>> Thank you, that was a good question. We have actually counted county facilities that are neighborhood and community-serving as part of the analysis. So when we looked at if areas were underserved or not, for example, there's a county park near Mayberry and Jackson, near Independence High School that's -- really, if you lived out there, you wouldn't know if it was a neighborhood -- county or a city facility. So we've counted it as serving that neighborhood. In addition, we have been working with the Bay Area ridge trail organization to make sure that our Greenprint is aligned with their trail system.

>> Councilmember Nguyen: Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember Constant.

>> Councilmember Constant: I wanted to follow up with where Sam started going with the accessibility of parks within the districts. When you look on page 68 of the Greenprint, it's the urban planning area statistics on table 5-2. One of the things that sticks out is in my side of town, the West valley area which was part of district 6 and all of district 1, a full 59.8% of the accessible park land is schools. And when you look at that, we've had situations over the years where the school district or board takes a vote and all of a sudden all the schools are locked 24 hours a day and they're no longer available for any use. In fact we still have one district that does that and it's something that's changed off and on. So I wonder how we can confidently count these numbers as park land, because if you can see it, but you can't use it, should we really be counting it? And kind of continuing along that area, if you look like at community gardens, when you calculate those in the percentage of accessible park land, when there's maybe 30 people or 30 families that can access that, but it's locked to everybody else. Or as Sam said, you know, in my neighborhood, for my kids to go to the neighborhood park, they have to cross San Tomas Expressway. And you know, the park is only maybe 4/10 of a mile from my doorway. But there's no way that I'm going to let my kids walk across San Tomas Expressway to get there. So that's what concerns me when we look at these numbers, because if you can't get there, should we really count it? Primarily I want to see what your feelings are on the schools. Because I know Albert and I have had a few discussions about some of our school districts. And just so people know, in my district, we happen to have five different school districts, which is the most of any council district, and that creates a lot of dynamics when one school district just develops a new set of rules that the other school districts don't have.

>> I think Albert is going to respond but before he does I want to provide some data. I want to clarify. Currently the general plan service level goes 3.5 acres per thousand of neighborhood and community-serving services. What we have done which is a little different than last time is we've only counted elementary schools, middle schools and then we've only -- and high schools but we've only counted the high schools when we've had a formal joint use agreement with them. There's only four or five high schools such as Leland high school that we count for park acreage. I want to turn it over to Albert for further input.

>> Albert Balagso: With respect to partnership with schools, that's one of the areas that wants further conversation with the school-city collaborative. I'm co-chair with superintendent Mark Liebman on a subcommittee which is having those types of discussions. What we found out in the last year, to your point, is that the budget challenges of state are challenging them to keep their facilities open and available. So this is what we believe is part of the next layer of conversation that we're going to have in this coming year. Likewise, we're looking at programs that we've traditionally provided in schools, of whether or not we can continue to provide those, as well, such as after-school programming. So we will look at this as we continue to go forward. One thing mentioned is formal agreements for use of properties helps. But that does not always, in the end, conclude that you're going to have open accessibility. It's nurturing that partnership along and maintaining that role, as well as the community involvement, I think, that's going to help make this work. In addition to your other question about accessibility and crossing major thoroughfares, that has to be taken into account. You can't just be as the crow flies. Because you're not going to cross a four-lane road or a natural barrier such as a creek or a river. So we would take those into consideration as we look at underserved areas, as well.

>> Councilmember Constant: Thank you. In the area of the schools, I think one thing. If we're going to count school land as park land in the long term planning goals of our city, then I think we should really look at what cities like San Ramon has done and I don't know how many of my colleagues are familiar but I went up and toured San Ramon with their mayor and went to almost every one of their schools. Where the City of San Ramon -- unfortunately, they only have one school district, so it's a little easier than what we have to deal with. But they have a joint use agreement on every single field. Every field -- every school you go to has a city park sign and accessibility from the street for the residents to use and it's very clear that those are city park land where we don't have that clarity here. Also, going back to what Sam said about the circles of the underserved areas, when I look at the areas like the Cadillac area that has absolutely no green space and no schools, yet it doesn't have a circle showing underserved, that concerns me. Because the Cadillac area is one of the densest areas on my side of town which has the highest crime and gang issues, but it still doesn't show as underserved, and there's no green space whatsoever around it. Then just a comment for usability of the print -- the Greenprint document. When we look at appendix C, in correlation with everything else, we have a lot of information on the various planning areas but a summary table that led into appendix C that had a side by side comparison of all three planning areas, would be helpful. Because I was funding myself with a calculator really trying to figure out how all these areas compared to each other. And I think that would be just very useful for users of the document in the public as well as us as we're trying to determine the exact path we're going on, thank you.

>> Albert Balagso: Councilmember Constant I didn't answer one of your questions. You had mentioned community gardens in there. And I'd like to just give you an idea that we've been exploring with a concept -- with an organization called Vegolution where you do -- utilizing that concept at Prusch Park, to go from -- the difference in the concept from community gardening to communal gardening, in which there aren't geographic plots that are given to any one individual, but rather, everyone farms the entire area, and everyone shares in the bounty. So if this is successful, we would look at perhaps proliferating this more throughout the city, as opposed to the traditional way we've done business in the past.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember Campos.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you, Albert. I'm glad you brought up Prusch park. If it's successful we'll change the way we're using our community gardens in the traditional way. More of a neighborhood community garden, where everyone has the ability to be able to farm. The question I wanted to go back to the park land, I know that this has come up before in the last I guess nine years that I've been here about how do we actually use this park in this particular document we're talking about open space. And I think what might be helpful, as you -- I don't know if you use it as an insert, because it will probably change as time goes on, but the agreement that you have with certain school districts, and the facilities that are in partnership with the city, and the term of the agreement I think would be helpful for us as councilmembers, as we move forward, in looking at the open space within our districts. I think that might be helpful for us. I don't have any agreements right now in my district, but I know that some of my other colleagues do. And that can be used in the concept that was previously discussed.

>> Albert Balagso: Thank you, we will add that.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you. The other thing I wanted to talk about was the trails. And I know that you had mentioned that the trails are not all connecting to communities right now. We know that we just had a grant that was given to the Water District, in partnership with the City of San José, for \$18 million, for Lower Silver Creek to continue that trail. I want to understand from your perspective as you continue to move forward in planning, and how we prioritize projects, if we have a huge lump of money that is coming from the federal government, how are we leveraging that, so that we're able to move forward in building out those trails in a timely manner and hopefully leveraging our funding?

>> Thank you for that question. We actually -- we have a council report of trail prioritization process. However, when there -- one thing about that prioritization process, where there is a project such as the Silver Creek trail, I think, where there is stimulus funding that another agency has, and we have priority to partner with them, that brings it right to the top of our priorities. And fortunately, what we need to do, and what we have been doing is getting all of our master plan work done along our trail system, so when those priorities present themselves we

can pounce on them. So we are working closely on that specific issue with the Water District to hopefully partner on that.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you. And the other thing I wanted to talk about is the pocket parks and about how we balance the amenities in the city as we move forward. I think one of the things that we're focused on, and we're maybe spending a lot of energy on, is making sure that we're developing parks where masses of people can use where there's fields. And I think as a mother who has a younger child, that we don't want to leave behind our younger children as they develop. And what I mean by that is, and I think Councilmember Constant will understand this, because he has several young children that are probably not in organized sports, is that we have to have amenities. And maybe that's what the small parks serve as. Because I'm thinking that as we have been developing the pocket parks in my district, that it's really to serve your zero to five age group, where the mothers and the fathers or the aunts and uncles or the grandma and grandpas can take their younger kids to develop their skills. I hope as we move forward in balancing the future in parks that we're not forgetting that younger generation. We know that first five has spent a lot of resources and money in that particular area. We know that when we can get children developing at zero to five that they're much more successful and we're addressing all these other issues that we have been talking about as far as keeping the City of San José safe. So your thoughts on that.

>> Albert Balagso: Certainly, the pocket park has been designed around a playground apparatus traditionally. The question was asked earlier, of who uses and who doesn't use and I think we also have to take into consideration the density around that area, whether or not they have a front yard and a backyard. Many a time, when a family is looking at having a family gathering, what they are looking for is a communal gathering place such as a barbecue area or picnic area where that event could occur. We take into consideration a playground apparatus, gathering area and what is the best fit for that immediate community or neighborhood. I can't say that one size is going to fit all but I think as part of the conversation that we need to have with the general community there about what best fits their need. So yes, that's one of the items that we take into consideration, that we look. But I think we need to look at also the density as well.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you. Those are all my questions.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember Oliverio.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Thank you, mayor. Looking here. So yeah, I would concur with some of the comments that have been made and you heard niece at the general plan about the school issue and that we should really consider them, if there's the agreement in place. And it may not have to be the formality of Leland High School, but something that says you'll keep this open. Because I think it's fair to have schools as parks, because that's certainly where I played as a kid, and I didn't consider it -- I just thought it was a place to play. On the topic of pocket parks in your assessment, you know, if you put a pocket park in a single family neighborhood versus a high density neighborhood, do you think you'd have more utility having that pocket parking a community garden, would there be more usage?

>> Albert Balagso: That's hard to say. It's dependent on each community. If there are large backyards they usually have their own little garden going and the community garden may not be the best thing they may be looking for. They may also have a gathering spot in their yard so perhaps a playground apparatus may be their first choice. So each one is going to be different, dependent on what they feel that their need is going to be.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: And if you'll remind me, what is the wait list for community gardens in San José, approximately?

>> Albert Balagso: It's in the hundreds.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: And then on the topic of underserved communities, I think there -- we have pockets all over the city, as you've identified them, and I think they're there because of poor planning. I think in the past, the councils in the past have put a lot of if affordability/dense housing in just these pockets and didn't build the parks. And I think we're recreating those today, every time we vote on affordable housing in the city, because they're not paying park fees or any land dedication. So I think this underserved area if we look at this ten years

from now, I think it's going to grow. And there will be other pockets of where we're not solving the problem, we'll propagate it forward so I'd just make that as a comment so thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember Liccardo.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I just wanted to follow up on some comments that were made. Pierluigi really alluded to it, but I was hoping to maybe ask the question more strongly. When it arose at the General Plan task force, I think there was, if not a consensus, a strong sentiment that we only should include primary and secondary schools, I understand we only include High high schools if we have a joint use agreements. We should only include elementary schools as central park sites if there is in fact a joint use agreement in place. And I'm wondering what your reaction is to that kind of policy.

>> Albert Balagso: Generally, by state law, schools are supposed to be open, with the exception of high schools. Those are considered closed campuses, is why we stated we would not count those. What we have found though is there has been limited access in instances. So I believe that we need to bring this forward to the school-city collaborative in greater discussion because the challenge that I have is, negotiating with 19 different school districts. And it's bringing them all to the table and getting a more general strategy and policy of how we work together would be beneficial to us as a city.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay, thanks, Albert. I understand we may not have the carrot of operations or maintenance money to be able to offer to these schools, but I can think of three downtown schools that are chained shut and I know many of my colleagues have many schools in their districts that are similarly situated. Last question I had maybe it's better addressed to Rick. Really that has to do with identifying other potential park sites and even railroads as trail conversion sites. If we were to identify in the capital action plan a particular site or railroad for conversion, for a park trail, does that set us up in any way to inverse condemnation for any other kinds of legal risk? The reason why I asked that, we are asking for potential submission to our parks department, I want to be mindful of that those things.

>> City Attorney Doyle: I think you need to be careful, that you don't trigger a claim from a property owner that the city has identified a site and that they're going to take the site. But when you -- mere identification without -- I mean, the funding is the key.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Right.

>> City Attorney Doyle: And right now we have a shortage of funds. So one thing to do general planning. It is another thing to -- it depends how far you go along the road in terms of your identification and steps. If you have a game plan as to how we're going to go forward with acquiring these sites and what developments are going to happen, those park fees will pay for the acquisition or C&C tax moneys, or a combination thereof. I think you just need to be careful. So you know, my staff works very closely with Albert's staff on this stuff, and we can work on that. But you always are concerned. It's not an easy answer, somebody can always make the claim but it really in the end it comes down to how far you've gone down the road to essentially set it up that you are going to take this property and therefore, reduce the ability of a private owner to sell his or her property.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thanks, Rick.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember Herrera.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Thank you, mayor. I have a couple of questions and I also agree with everything my colleagues have said before me. I'm also very grateful to be part of that project the Water District has brought in with federal funds and Lower Silver Creek and the first part of the project is actually going to occur in district 8. A million dollars is going to go into advancing the Lower Silver Creek trail. And I think Councilmember Campos raised some good points in terms of leveraging it. And I know we will be working going forward to leverage future grants for that. I think the trails are really critical. And I haven't personally walked every foot of it but I plan to. I think it's important to get a ground-level view of what our community will be dealing with when they're actually trying to use these trails. And I think connectivity is very important. One of the things I noted when I went on a tour with Councilmember Campos of Lower Silver Creek was the bridges that have been put in to connect

communities on other parts of the trail. So I think it's very important in district 8, we have the potential of really connecting our community for as you've already said, people are using it for commuting and for recreation and I think we really need to focus on making sure the trail can overcome some of the obstacles of major roadways and other things so that people really can -- these really can be recreational and useful spaces. I have a question, I really want to ask it publicly, because I think a lot of people have come to me with this question. What is the discrepancy if we're looking at the capital improvement program funding? I'd just like you to talk about the discrepancy in funding between Evergreen and other parts of the city. Because on the face of it, it looks like we're not receiving the fair share of it, if you wouldn't mind, Matt. Thank you.

>> Sure. Thank you. What we've done in the capital action plans there's a column titled 2009-2014. What we've done is, we've matched the numbers that are in in the proposed capital improvement program that was approved by council last spring. We'll be updating it to match the adopted for the final Greenprint. So that's how we developed that column. Because we didn't want to set set expectations beyond what we can deliver on the Greenprint. We want to be clear between what was funded and what was not. One of the reasons of the discrepancies is, for example, the trails. On the Thompson Creek trail, we do have funding for the design of the Thompson Creek trail from Tully to Aborn, but it's not showing in this because it was last year's funding. So that's just a technicality. But in addition, we did get substantial trail funding from the federal transportation dollars a few years back for the Coyote, Guadalupe and bay trail systems, which is why those action plans show much more funding for the trails program specifically. And then the money that is shown in the capital action plans is based on the construction and conveyance tax and the park trust funds for those districts, and in District 8 and Evergreen area there's been much less park trust funds coming in than in some other districts through less development over the past several years.

>> Councilmember Herrera: And so we currently have -- it's not showing, but we have \$471,000 for final improvement along -- along Thompson creek?

>> Correct, and through the design and construction so that will make it a shovel-ready project next year for construction grants.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Great, and that's not shown in the Greenprint right now. I guess I want to say one last thing on schools. I, like many others here, I think all of you have, when you were growing up as kids, played on the playgrounds at schools. When I was growing up there actually were recreation programs every summer. So schools I think are a natural place, a natural access point. We've been working -- I've been working with Albert's office to look at opportunities with joint access agreements with schools. I think we have to go that route, going forward, utilizing -- and just working and developing those relationships. So I strongly support doing that, and finding ways to work with the individual school districts, and they're all unique and they all have their own needs and we just have to find things that will be interesting to them as well as to the city. But I think the opportunity to have fee-based programs is certainly very interesting to the schools at this point. So I really, really support working with schools to add -- to really have them as not just listed on here as an opportunity, but really working with us to provide more opportunities for our residents. Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember Constant.

>> Councilmember Constant: I have a question on the financing and marketing portion strategies. Are we going to talk about that later or should I ask it now?

>> We're going to talk about that right after this.

>> Councilmember Constant: Okay, I'll hold it, then.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, I had a couple more questions on slide 15, the park land area deficiency. We talked about considering county parks. This says neighborhood and community parks. Where do regional parks fit into the walking distance calculation?

>> Thank you. For the regional and -- for the neighborhood and community portions of regional parks we have counted that into the walking distance. But for the large regional open spaces that are not -- don't have any neighborhood recreation amenities, we have not counted those.

>> Mayor Reed: If somebody's living next to Penitencia Creek Park, they might be in a park deficient area, even though they're living next to the park?

>> That is one park where we consider a neighborhood community serving. But the outer areas of Alum Rock, and the undeveloped areas, we are not considering those. We are considering Penitencia park, as neighborhood serving.

>> Mayor Reed: What about Guadalupe river park?

>> Greater portion of the Guadalupe park we are considering neighborhood serving such as the tennis courts and the playgrounds. But the undeveloped areas we are not considering neighborhood and community serving but there could be potential projects in the future where we can turn it into that.

>> Mayor Reed: Well I think it's important that we begin to make priority decisions to make sure we look around at the issues that Councilmember Constant and Councilmember Liccardo have raised about areas that really are underserved, even though they may be within a certain distance. There may also be areas that are served, that appear to be underserved, because they are closer to some of these regional facilities. But you got to do the work on the ground as we begin to make priority decisions in both directions without having any blinders on. Because if somebody's living next to park, I don't feel sorry for them about not being next to a community park or a neighborhood park if they're an regional park. Last question I had was for the City Attorney, I guess, on the outreach and update process, to date, slide 6. I know there's been some sort of a subcommittee formed that's advising the staff or something and I just wanted the City Attorney to comment on the noticing and open meeting requirements that might apply to any standing committees.

>> City Attorney Doyle: Well, I -- this committee, I'm not aware -- I wasn't aware of until Friday. I still don't know how it was established. If it was staff or commission --

>> If I could jump in. This is an ad hoc committee of the parks and rec commission. So it's on the standard monthly agenda for the parks and rec commission. This has been established as an ad hoc subcommittee of that commission, so there's monthly report-outs to that commission. Two commissioners, Mike Flower and Leslie Hamilton, parks commissioners, are members of this ad hoc subcommittee, and we have monthly meetings that are scheduled with this ad hoc subcommittee and those are posted on -- the meeting announcement is posted on our Website.

>> City Attorney Doyle: As I understand it though the subcommittee is made up of more than just parks commissioners?

>> Correct, there are other commissioners as well and there are members of the public that have come to the monthly meetings and are actively participating, as well.

>> City Attorney Doyle: Yeah, so I'd need to get more information, Mr. Mayor. Because if it's an advisory body to the commission established as more than just members of the commission, it's not an ad hoc meeting or a committee meeting, it's subject to our -- while it may not be subject to Brown Act requirements, it would be subject to public meeting and requirements that the meetings be held in the public. I don't know if they have been or not or if there's been any agenda posting. So we just need to work with staff to get that information.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, thank you. Councilmember Kalra.

>> Councilmember Kalra: Thank you, mayor. I appreciate all the comments. Mayor you talked about some of the county parks, I know that in and around my district there are some county parks, now county parks some have more accessible accessibility than others. Some have certain access point and some are pretty open. So I would just ask that any opportunities we have to create greater accessibility to those parks, they could be through

gateways. I know Albert and Matt, we were just at the Albertson Parkway, which serves as a nice little gateway and entryway into the parks and to the foothills of Santa Teresa. However, there are trails and trail systems in the area, in the Santa Teresa foothills, for example, where they're being used and being used quite heavily.

However, there may be areas of it that are not being legally used because there are issues regarding ownership. I think that's just one example of where it's a very straightforward way that the city can get involved and just create legal access that opens up as the mayor was saying parks right next door to many neighborhoods. And so I think that when we look at accessibility or we look at areas that are underserved, we have to look at practically if these parks are available and if they are then they should be included in terms of parks serving the neighborhood. And as Councilmember Liccardo and Constant and others were mentioning, there may be a park next door or near a residence, but it is not realistically accessible or practical. So I would include the county parks in that regard, particularly down in some southern portions of the city because there maybe areas that may look like open space, but they're you know fenced off or private open space or for some other reason not accessible to the public and there may be some that are accessible to the public but for some other reasons we're not creating those stunts. The opportunity we have to create those gateways knowing that we're going to have a shortage, and we do have a shortage of land to create any new open space, we should certainly take advantage of that, thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: I think it's sometime to move to the next part of the presentation.

>> Thank you very much. As we mentioned there are three key policy areas that we will be covering with you today. The next set of slides discusses the near term and the new priorities moving forward for projects that we're focusing on. And really focus on financially and environmentally sustainable projects. We're going to have a few slides to review with you and then we're going to pause again for your input and feedback on this topic. This slide shows the picture of the Lake Cunningham skate park and the artificial turf fields out at Leland High School in the Almaden area. First, on the Lake Cunningham skate park, this is a -- been various Websites and et cetera, shown as a world-class facility. Right now we're working on installing lights, that we didn't have enough funding when it originally went out to bid. But we're working on installing lights so that we can make it more of a financially sustainable project moving forward, and working on sponsorships as well. One side note, as I'm sure a lot of you read the U.S. News report a few weeks ago, about San José being one of the best places to live. And the skate parks, not just Lake Cunningham, but the neighborhood skate parks that were sprouted out of the last Greenprint update were quoted as one of the reasons for that. The Leland project is a sports field project. It's a partnership with the school, so we are counting that towards the school acreage, because we have a long-term joint use agreement with the school district. It's about site specific cost recovery at Leland High School. Since the field is in such premiere shape because it's artificial turf, residents are willing to pay higher fees. We can establish a sinking fund for future artificial turf conversion. In addition to sustainablable, environmentallily sustainable, there are a number of initiatives that are underway or have been underway. The development of the community parks foundation that we are moving forward with, that can help us provide outside private funding for parks and programs in the future. The ballot measure that was passed last year, Measure M, that allows us to enter into joint use agreements on park property for up to 25 years with private partners who are willing to help us build out and maintain our facilities. The private maintenance public-private partnerships on our existing city parks such as the agreement we have with Adobe to help maintain the McEnery park downtown, these efforts and others are going to help -- our focuses today which will help build a foundation for the future. Environmental sustainability is paramount is important as well. And the picture in front of you shows the Albertson parkway which Councilman Kalra referenced a few moments ago. This has all the elements of environmental sustainability. It has bioretention systems that are designed to catch the storm water before it flows into the bay, really minimizing the turf to help so we don't have to go out and mow it every week. It connects from the light rail station, provides connection to the county park team and the Santa Teresa foothills and it helps achieve the Green Vision of 100 miles of trails and converts an old PG&E easement into a nice, pleasant right-of-way. We are also working on -- under construction we have another easement like this, along Silverstone, along this lower Silver Creek trail. Again, what -- the Greenprint talks about setting realistic priorities and building a foundation for the future. And to that end, it talks about focusing on the advancement of the Green Vision of the 100 miles of trail, focusing on the infrastructure backlog, keeping what we have already in as good a shape as we possibly can, focusing on financially sustainable projects, focusing on land banking, not to say we will not move forward with new parks right now, but to always look to see if it would be more appropriate or better to just bank that land, buy it, and then build a park when we can sustain it better, or find a private pattern to help us maintain it. And sports field renovation,

whether it's on our own facilities or partnering with school districts, to make sure we have sports fields for our users, quality sports fields for our users. With that I'd like to pause and receive your feedback on that priority.

>> Mayor Reed: I had a question, first set of slides number 11 which is the cost of the various elements of the balanced park facilities for planning areas. I think it's hard to have a sustainable plan without knowing the price tag. And the fact that it costs maybe \$20,000 an acre for park maintenance, that may be an old number, back a few years ago, I'm not sure what it cost now. But at least we are sure what the cost is, compared to a community center which will be a million or \$2 million. And I think we have to have that on all of the elements so that as we decide to do something we know the tradeoffs because ultimately it's our General Fund that's going to be the issue in the stability, because all the other strategies you identified will not be enough, it's always going to be back to the General Fund. Which is, well, sometimes better than others. But usually not good in terms of expanding parks and being sustainable. Councilmember Oliverio.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Thank you, mayor. I just wanted to make the comment on land banking. I think that is the -- a priority. I know that in any council district there might be a group in saying, hey, you know, build out this small portion of the park today. But if I have X amount of funds and I could make that park larger, I would rather make it bigger. And then eventually it gets built. I think it's just you know, we're always doing this for the long term benefit of the city and sometimes a larger park, built out, is better than, you know, sometime down the road is better than having a spaller park. So it's my two cents for land banking.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember Constant.

>> Councilmember Constant: In regards to the financing and marketing strategies, on page 28, there's a section that talks about using the General Fund ending fund balance as one of our financing strategies. But I believe at the current time, and maybe Ed can help on this, I don't believe that this is one of the areas that we've identified in our use of ending fund balances for current budgeting practices. In fact, I don't think it has been for the last couple of fiscal years. My concern having something like this in a document that's going to last for ten years is when we Mo we are facing the infrastructure backlog and the streets and sewers and all those other things that we've talked about, and we know the price tag is near a billion dollars, and we know that we've said repeatedly that ending fund balances are going to go towards that and some other very limited uses. Is it appropriate to have this in this document when it's not a current practice?

>> Ed Shikada: Thank you, councilmember. I think that's a fair point, one we should take back among staff and discuss. As a point of reference, I think it's fair to say that parks facilities including open space, as well as the building facilities themselves, were incorporated to a point in the infrastructure backlog. It was an acknowledgment or perhaps an assumption that because construction and conveyance tax and certain other funds couldn't be used for the maintenance of those facilities, that that would be the primary funding source. Recognizing competing demands, obviously, it has its limitations. But it's certainly an issue that we should discuss and make sure that we're consistent in the way that we're describing the priorities.

>> Councilmember Constant: Yeah, I definitely think it's something we should talk about before this comes back in final form. Because I know when we had the infrastructure discussion one of the things we knew is that we hadn't even addressed the infrastructure of the parks yet. We knew that we needed to spend a couple million dollars just to find out what the infrastructure needs are. I just don't want to be holding out there a false hope to people well, if we just have a good year we're going to get the park in our neighborhood when, in fact, we may have this money committed for several years if not decades in front of us. Then I have a question I probably have asked in the previous section so I'm going to ask it now. We talked about accessibility, for instance, how close a park might be to a person's home. But we really didn't talk about accessibility for people with disabilities. And when I went through the Green the print it's mentioned tangentially two or three times. But there's not anything that specifically addresses what our goals are for accessible amenities within the park, and what our policies are very clear. I found, I think, two or three places, one of them was on -- in the section of targets on pages between 22 and 24 of the book. And I think number 29, you know, has one slight paragraph. But I think it's an area where we could use some clarity on, as we go forward. And I think it should be maybe a stronger statement in our Greenprint.

>> Thank you. We can definitely make it a stronger statement moving forward in the Greenprint. That's a good point. I did want to mention in the next few months we will be moving forward to our parks and recognize commission with an analysis on a discussion about going above and beyond accessibility in our playground designs in the future. So we will be setting some internal policies on what are our standards for which -- you know, much more, much higher than the typical ADA standards.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember Pyle.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Thank you, mayor. I wanted to speak first in reference to the -- or ask the question about the lighted softball complex and the soccer complex that was promised I think in 2000. Is that -- where is that?

>> Albert Balagso: With respect to the soccer complex, we were -- put together, we came to council with the San José earthquakes agreement, looking forward, or the MOU, rather, to explore the site over at the West airport. So we're currently looking at that as potential option working with the Office of Economic Development. We had been in discussion with east side union high school on another sports complex. I will have an implemental coming out to council. That one is challenged at this point in time as a result of the leadership change and the fiscal impacts that they're having from the state. I'm gathering more details to bring back to the city council.

>> Councilmember Pyle: I wanted to refer to number 7 which is on page 35 of the book. The revolving loan fund, revolving fund to loan money for park acquisition. That way we will be able to as Pierluigi said, buy it when it was a little less expensive and be able to purchase it and then fill -- backfill. I guess that would be more true of your market and community foundation, however. Any thoughts on how to develop those, or --

>> Sure. The parking community for that voundation is actually under development right now. The articles of incorporation have been filed with the government. So we're hopeful that that will be up and running soon. The revolving one at the park trust fund, we're not committing to doing that as part of this document. It's just an idea that we're floating out, it's something we would like to continue to pursue with the city attorney's office moving forward when and if it can work.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Great. So in the parks and community foundation, I wanted to refer to, that's number 11, my visit to Chi, where the people in the city with lots of money found this to be a very appealing project for them to get involved with. Several other councilmembers might have gone to that same trip. And it's just amazing how they pitched in. A park is something people can really love. They get to go there and see what they're doing. So I would heartily encourage that. And if I can help in any way, I'd be more than happy to do that. And the last one is, number 12, pursuing joint use projects. That would be the school districts. And you still are able to use the same prototype that we came up with San José unified for the other districts, which is great. And how many districts are we interacting with at this point out of the 19?

>> Albert Balagso: 19 school districts that we're still discussing.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Yeah.

>> Albert Balagso: But the formal agreement, we have different agreements with different capacities. So the point of identifying where there are joint use districts is well taken and we'll add those all together.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Great, thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Vice Mayor Chirco.

>> Councilmember Chirco: On page 35, number 5, I know one of the ways we got Camden park was to commit our trust funds, and for a number of years our funds have been going to pay back that loan from the city. This is regarding the open space, 20% program. And I was wondering if it would be possible to use that in the same way, where we -- I thought about this, I think it's the three creeks trail, where there was a private individual that had bought some property that we really needed for our trail system, to -- if there were funds available to use that and then use the open space money to pay back. Because I know one of the reasons is, we don't have money to

purchase these trails. But sometimes there's critical pieces you have to act on quickly. So I didn't know if this was a new strategy that was being discussed, or if it was possible to advance the money and then pay it back with the open authority -- open space authority with the interest of course which is what District 9 is doing with Camden Park.

>> Thank you for that comment. That's a good question and I'll explore that further at the open space authority. Right now we have about \$2 million of their funding for the Willow Glen spur three creeks trail. However, that -- the concept of maybe advancing even more of their funding and then having our allocation pay that back over a number of years is not something I've talked to them about it. We will talk to them about it and see if that's possible.

>> Councilmember Chirco: Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: How much money do we have in the parks trust fund? I can't remember seeing the budget number recently.

>> This is a guess, plus or minus number, including allocated funds that are moving forward on projects such as community centers, we have somewhere near \$70 million. But most of that is allocated and committed towards specific projects.

>> Mayor Reed: Is there something we can do with those funds while they're sitting there around this revolving loan fund or the trust fund or are we going to talk about that in the next section when we talk about nexus and the distance requirements? Because I know that we have lots of pots of small money that's never going to buy a park anywhere, waiting for some other large development to come through to generate enough funding to make it possible. But the money is sitting and sitting and sitting for a very long time and I wonder if that might be a source of some sort of a loan to do land-banking or the things that you're contemplating here, given all the restrictions on that I know that it will take some study. But it may be another possible source of funding.

>> Yes, thank you. One of the things that we did in the last budget cycle as well is we took some of those funds such as Santana park and solari park and we are working on investing those funds into conversion to artificial turf softball fields that can help be more sustainable, so we'll continue to work with the attorney's office on the possibility of a revolving fund.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember Herrera.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Thank you, mayor. I want to talk about the fee changes that have happened for some of the recreation programs. I've heard feedback from seniors about being very concerned about, I'm wondering about what kind of follow-up. Do we have any sense of the feedback or use of the programs or do we have any kind of feedback at that -- the other concern is that I know some of these programs are sign -- the individual user signs up through school districts and are there any other fees being raised by any other entities that would be part of this registration process?

>> Albert Balagso: We have not moved forward with increasing fees yet that's something we wanted further conversation on. We have initiated conversation with the county about the nutrition program and how we could potentially utilize those funds and movement of the funds. With respect to other folks who are utilizing our facilities, there are different groups such as vendors, and nonprofits, that are utilizing facilities, and are falling within a category which is given them great benefit or discount to use the facilities. So we're renegotiating those at this time. So I'm sure that we'll be coming back to council with some of the conversation on that. Or you'll be getting phone calls which is why I need to do a little bit more conversation before we advance with those. We are also having -- working through some of our after school components of doing the four feet fee of the nine sites that we identified in the budget process. I've also had conversations with a few superintendents including the county superintendents of schools, through a meet-and-greet process of the school-city collaborative and trying to seek interest of working with them to do a camp format summer school. We're talking about it now for next summer because that's how long it will take to get together. It's likely that there won't be summer schools in a lot of locations so how can we work together in a for-fee basis utilizing our school plans. When the schools cancel

many of their summer school components, our camp programs were filled. And we couldn't add any more capacity which is why we have to seek a partnership with the schools. So we'll explore that more as we advance.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Thank you, Albert. You jog my -- you made me think of something else that was -- it's related to what you're talking about with youth. The police academy out at Evergreen valley college is very interested in helping supplement summer school with specific programs for youth. So I think there's a lot of probably programs and-os out in the community that might want to step in and provide some help. They already have run a program on a smaller basis, I think they serve 40 to 80 youth. And they're really trying to reach out to underserved youth and do basic programming, so they're very interested on that. Back to the seniors for a second. Are you going to do any public outreach on that, then? I'm hearing that the fees that we talked about are not set in concrete and you're doing some more study on that. Is that the final is what I'm hearing.

>> Albert Balagso: Yes, we didn't come out the gate with changing any of the senior fees bought we knew we would need a lot of conversation and outreach with them.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Okay. I would hate to see people not go to classes that are really keeping them healthy and out of the hospital and out of the necessity of needing more expensive services because they felt they couldn't afford that. Thank you for taking more time on that. I want to go back, I forgot to mention something in the first section and that's regarding West Evergreen park. And to follow up on Councilmember Nguyen's concern about that being developed. It's also that portion of the planning area is not designated as underserved in district 8 and again, I think that's similar to what other councilmembers have already talked about, even though there are facilities near it, there's major road, King Road divides it so I just think we have to give attention to completing those kinds of facilities when we see that there's an underserved area and they've been waiting so long for it. I just wanted to mention that as well.

>> Absolutely, thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember Campos.

>> Councilmember Campos: Thank you. One thing I think is important we focus on for the next five years is making sure that we're advancing the trails. I heard in your opening comments about connecting the rest of the city to Guadalupe park, river park, and I think if we're not spending energy on the trails, the natural trails that kind of already have been developed but not formalized then we're losing an opportunity to be able to connect all the districts to the heart of San José, which is downtown. So I think that putting some of our energy there is very important, and I would really like to see us come back with something that's a little more concrete on how we're connecting all the districts to downtown. Whether it's a walking trail, first, or whether it's a bike trail and a walking trail, but I think that's real important. Because I think that a lot of those trails, not all of them, but a lot of them are connected to the creek. So there are many opportunities for families to be able to also enjoy the nature and the beauty of the trails, as well as the creeks. Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: I think it's time to move to the next section.

>> Thank you very much. Real quickly, I wanted to clarify an answer I gave to the mayor's question. For the underserved area in the urban accords, if somebody is close to a county wide facility, we are counting them as part of the metric I wanted to clarify that. Amentioned before there are three policy areas we wanted to cover with you today and obtain your feedback and this is the final area right now. We have been able to maintain a goal using our park trust funds, this is as flexibly as possible to make sure that we can get that balanced park system, get those trail connections, those community centers, those sports fields, while at the same time still making sure that we can serve the residents who actually paid the fees because per state law that is mandatory. So the mechanism is the park dedication and park ordinance in the prior Green the print we set standards which I'll discuss in a moment that restrict the use of those funds. The first standard that we set and on the slide in front of you is a graphic of the north San José planning area. And the first standard that we set in the prior Greenprint is to use the funds from developers on a neighborhood or -- neighborhood -- serving park such as a standard tot lot, open green space, no sports fields or anything like that just a small park, we have to spend it within three quarters of a mile of the developer who paid the fees. And we're not planning on changing that, we're not recommending changing that. The urban accords call for an even closer area. So we want to make sure we can get

neighborhood parks as close to neighborhoods as possible however we are recommending changing the Greenprint on the radius that we can spend for parks and facilities. Updated Greenprint in front of you we are recommending we expand that to within three miles or within the planning area or what Albert mentioned, within the planning area, something we need to talk to the city attorney's office about. Focusing on changing it to three miles, over 70% of the residents in our survey, in our telephone survey indicated that they would be willing to drive 10 miles to get to a large community-serving facility and our research shows that that's approximately three miles. And with the had you based community center that we've been moving forward with we've tried to build one major community center to serve planning areas. And this provides us also flexibility for the future. And the reason I put North San José up there is from the shape, you don't need to be looking at the details, but from the shape you can see how it's a linear planning area. And right now we're working with Novellus development to build soccer, artificial turf lit soccer field at First Street and Vista Montana. That is one area -- that is a soccer facility and a community center we're hoping to place somewhere up there, we don't know where, that will serve most of the planning area and we want the flexibility to help serve the residents again per state law we always still need to make sure that the facility that we're spending the money on serves the residents who paid the fees. And so even if we expand from two miles to three miles we will still always have to do that litmus test before we spend the money but this does provide us more flexibility moving forward in areas like North San José that are yet to be built out especially. And will allow us to build that balanced community serving park system for our residents. And again, so the goal is to provide -- be more flexible with the use of our funds for community serving residents to help build those community serving elements and we'd like council feedback on this policy. And after council feedback we have two more quick slides that Albert and I will cover to close the presentation. Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember Constant.

>> Councilmember Constant: Thank you. First, I do think for the community serving, that the three-mile radius is reasonable. I think that when you look at most districts only have one community-serving facility, and people from throughout the district use it. So I think it is a very reasonable expectation. The one thing I'd like to point out, though, is we get our maps with the little circles on them that show these nexus areas. But where I see there's a conflict is, those maps are prepared by district but we plan our parks by planning areas. And you have big developments that occur right on the borders of districts. And the money always tends to gravitate to the side that that project just happens to be in. I'll pick on Pierluigi, because we've been talking about using some of his money in my district. But when you get a development like Santana Row, that's 20 feet from the edge of my district, and that money is generally spent on the District 6 side when you have underserved population to the West of it. And we've been working to maybe do something at our community center. But I'm sure that's occurring in other parts of the city as well. If we're going to be setting our Green the print we're talking about planning areas. And we should actually evolve discussions how we use that nexus area in planning areas and when planning areas involve more than one county district, they should get together and talk about how they serve that planning area, and I think that's a disconnect we've had over the years ago. If that's something you've had discussion on, that's my comment. .

>> That's a good point. We've had annual discussions with every council area, with this Greenprint we can have that discussion moving forward.

>> Mayor Reed: I have a question about the assessment process. It's not clear to me whether or not we go to the parks and ask people how far away they lived. I know we have the telephone survey about people and their habits. I wondered if part of the assessment element was actually going out in the parks and asking people, you have the actual users giving you data. Because I think people come from much further distances away, than we comment with our half-mile, three-quarter-mile nexus stuff. If we're going to change the nexus distance that we could probably have some data to justify that. I assume there are limits on what we can do, has to meet nexus requirements but if people come from a long distance away it's much easier to justify the change.

>> We have not done anything other than the telephone survey and anything official other than the telephone survey at this time. But one thing we can look into since these are community serving facilities we're talking about we can see if there's any data from other sports field leagues or community center registration that can help us moving forward.

>> Mayor Reed: Okay, Councilmember Liccardo.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I just -- to the original question I wanted to express general support for widening the area in which we consider for regional uses. I think the mayor's point is well taken. I'm constantly surprised when I counterfolks at various amenities we have in our parks that are from all over the city and it's really apparent to me that people go wherever they're familiar with a particular use and not necessarily to the closest possible site.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember Oliverio.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Yeah, just to concur with the comments I've been hearing, we keep track of each call that comes in the office or e-mail regarding parks and park maintenance, equipment, et cetera. And anecdotally, since I don't keep those ones that are outside of my district but we get a lot of calls about parks in our district from people who are from outlying areas even from city of Campbell, et cetera. So I think doing a survey in the parks to find out where people come would be great and I don't think we have to spend any staff time on it. I think it could purely be a low level internship thing that we do with students where somebody just goes out with a clip board and asks where people are from, and that will provide us more data than we have today. And on the question on the survey for a thousand people, remind me is that just a thousand people that were the general makeup of San José's population?

>> Yes, we hired a consulting firm to do a statistically valid survey.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Okay, thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Any other comments on this section? Okay, you want to move to whatever answer next?

>> Thank you, two remaining slides. Real quickly, I just wanted to talk about the next steps on the Greenprint process. We do have two meetings, one on September 12th and one on September 16th. They've been advertised citywide. Neighborhood service and education committee, and council final approval on this document before the end of 2009. Before I turn it over to Albert, I want to thank Dave Mitchell and Rafael Gomez and my staff who did most of this work on the Greenprint leading it through the process. And then turn it over to Albert for the final slide.

>> Albert Balagso: Thank you, Matt. Just to summarize, a lot of what we've discussed today brings together many of the policies that have been approved by the council, you know, post the approval of the original Greenprint in 2000. The accords, aquatic study the sports field study, et cetera. And wanting to update this document to prepare us for the next ten years. Again, this is not the general plan. The general plan will take us beyond the Greenprint but we wanted to look at how we approach the next ten years being both financially and environmentally sustainable as we navigate through the challenges ahead of us. The work that -- by creating this cohesive document will help us focus our investments to ensure that these projects are aligned to our capital program and puts our expectations in perspective. You will hear, as we advance the document, the passions of the community regarding items such as the Willow Glen spur. We do have this in the document that requires further study to -- we do want to make that East-West connection but it will be challenging as we move forward. We have not taken that off the list. It is on our list to do but we will continue to do. The three enhanced acres per thousand is another one and council has also given us some insights how we count schools and how we incorporate as well the county programming of facilities as well. We have hundreds of acres that are going to come on line on the marshal Cottle property and we do incorporate that into our park system as well. We cannot kind of drive by and say this doesn't count because our residents will indeed use it. There will also be working, doing the further work as we just discussed of how can we increase the reach of the or the nexus of our park trusts, as we utilize that concept or those strategies in development in the North San José area and continue to build out our park system throughout the city. And finally, the underserved areas. There are many I think pieces that we have to put into there of how do we work towards the funding aspects of it, filling those needs, whether it's by connection initially, enhancement and then finally, by acquisition and building a park in those areas. And as been mentioned and we've heard this from the community as well, that it just can't be a one size fits all as the crow flies. We need to take into consideration the obstacles that would prevent our residents from reaching these parks. So this document is our update to bring all these things into perspective. And with that being said, this

concludes our presentation. We will be, as Matt said, conducting the next steps, taking the input that we've taken from council today, and amending the document to have those comments included.

>> Mayor Reed: Thank you. I think we have some additional questions or comments before we wrap up. I had one just on the format of the report, in the table of contents. Section regarding figures and tables. It would be level if those had page numbers or section numbers or something so you could track them down. And then on one of those figures, figure 6 which is community assessment section appendix A which shows what people use our parks for. I think it's important going back to I think where I started looking at the cost of the facilities, where people use them and how we get the most bang for the buck. where you look at the use of the parks, it's fairly simple, most people use them for very simple things, playgrounds for children, walking, outdoor or running exercises, the number of people that are using them for our most expensive options are relatively low. Maybe that's because we don't have many of the most expensive options but I think we have to be cautious about spending a lot of money for example on aquatic facilities for swimming. I know we don't have very many aquatic facilities but yet it's a very small percentage of the population that is using them and they are very expensive. We have to factor that into how we spend our money in terms of operating money, I'm speaking about operating cost not capital cost. Councilmember Oliverio .

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Thank you, mayor. Wanted to make the comments, I think we made progress, as you put up the items in the beginning of things we've been able to do but then there's always you know the will and desire to do more. And the way we finance parks today through either developer fees or construction and conveyance doesn't do it, to grow to where you want to grow so with that said I'm thinking that inevitably, we have to try to find that money since we're chasing land. And so I think the question I have is we did Measure P which enabled us to do some good things. And I think there's the potential for that again so I guess I have a couple of questions. Some for you and some for the City Attorney. So what do you put the price tag on, if we were for the 100 miles of trails, if you wanted to lay it out where you can envision it, how much would you need to actually go procure that land? So I'll start with that one. And you can give us a range, would be fine.

>> I apologize, I don't have the number right now. i apologize I don't have it, couple hundred million dollar range I'm sure for the development of the trench. But we can get back to you on the details.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: I would be curious, how much would it be to procure all the right-of-way, just to buy it then the second thing I'd be interested in is if San José wanted to create two, I don't know, five or ten acre parks in the city, and identify, you probably played the game to try to figure out where those go, how much would that cost just to buy the land? And then as school populations change, and finances change for school districts, sometimes they're going to want to sell a school. And we have the first right of priority based on nailer rights but if we don't have the money then it goes, and it becomes developed. So we have the Kirk Community Center, which is a former school, the willows center which was a former school and those are great assets. But I'm thinking it would be nice to find out how much it would cost to buy two elementary schools within the City of San José based upon the parcel acreage. And I think once we have that price tag then I think we consider as a council whether or not that's something that goes on the ballot for citizens to pay for. And then I turn to the City Attorney to go ask, you know, what are the different options whether it's parcel, utility, you know, G.O. bonds, I don't remember it being a vote of the people to buy the golf courses so kind of throw out some options for me.

>> City Attorney Doyle: Well, typically if you want to follow the measure P model it is G.O. bonds to go out and acquire property for park improvements. You have to the extent that you have funds available and we're woking with staff on the park trust fund issues and particular, depending on nexus requirements and other requirements, I don't know what's available there but there maybe a partial source. Taxes, again, you can always go out there. You need two-thirds vote of the people for special taxes. So that's always an undertaking to say the least. And you know unfortunately in California your public finance options are limited. I think in the case of golf courses I believe we did lease revenue bonds to fund those, those are again, really something the finance department would have to address. It's becoming increasingly more difficult given the financial realities at least today. The options today, sort of like the usual suspects but it's a question of getting voter approval or coming up with putting together different sources.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: And the G.O. bonds would be just a 50%?

>> City Attorney Doyle: It's a two-thirds requirement. You have to get two-thirds, measure P was two-thirds.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: With that said, that's something we should consider when we start going down the road, of course we do our polling as to what resonates. Because as Councilmember Constant said, people have major concerns just simply about streets. But I think in the end if we really wanted, and I think that's where you have to put it on the ballot. Because if the community really wants it then they'll vote for it and if the support's not there then we kind of have to decide between the community and us Wassa core service. Clearly the at the end of the day, you have to balance that against what the residents want so I wanted that out. .

>> Mayor Reed: Is there a way we could get operating dollars with one of those operating measures? We have operating dollars under the libraries under Measure F I think the last time.

>> City Attorney Doyle: I think the -- you can't with the G.O. bonds but one of the things we've talked about in the past is whether you impose a new tax or increase the C & C articulate and allow it to be used for operation and maintenance. Right now there are severe limitations on that to create some new tax moneys that would allow it to be used for O&M as well.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: I believe some of it goes to salaries.

>> Albert Balagso: I believe some of it is used foster replacement of the collection as well.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: Funded out of the parcel tax.

>> City Attorney Doyle: I have to ask Jane specifically. I think there's flexibility but exactly what it is I don't know.

>> Mayor Reed: My point is even though we have capitol dollars we can't afford to build everything as we've seen over the last decade. \$600 million of capital dollars authorized by the voters but not a single dollar for operating. And it makes it difficult, even if we have the money to build something, we have to take the money out of the general fund to operate it. Councilmember Herrera.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Thank you, mayor. I just wanted to add to the questions, that the mayor posed, who uses the facility? How is it used? And how do people get to the facility? So I support the three-mile radius but I'm concerned about people betting in their cars and driving ten minutes. And I would like to see those facilities as we build them take into account that they're near a trail head, they're near a trail so they would encourage walking to them and near transit opportunities and that we should definitely be thinking about transportation as a part of planning these facilities since we're not looking at having them necessarily very, very close to somebody's home. We need to figure out the best way for them to get there and encourage people to get out of their cars and not be driving there.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember Pyle.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Thank you. I wanted to ask about San José family camp. 3800 people this year? That's a lot. It says that, I mean, I'm sorry, there were 1700 participants, in '08. That seems like a lot!

>> Albert Balagso: We have -- it's been doing well.

>> Councilmember Pyle: So San José family camp is pretty much self-sustaining?

>> Albert Balagso: It's very close to self-sustaining. We are working on the master plan in assessing the physical assets, so again, that could be cost associated with preparing that for our renewal of our agreement with the Department of -- U.S. forestry department.

>> Councilmember Pyle: And that doesn't have a foundation but it has a very loosely structured group of people that tend to go up there and help pull things together?

>> Albert Balagso: It is primarily staff run. We do have a volunteer base but we take it more towards staff oriented as far as the operations.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Uh-huh. Well, thank you. I'm really impressed with these figures. That's excellent. Because you only have 65 -- just a second. During the 2000 camp season, over 3500 people participated. I was right the first time. That's a lot, considering you only have 65 tents. So that's really cranking them in and out. Primarily because that was a cheaper vacation for so many people. Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Councilmember Oliverio.

>> Councilmember Oliverio: One last comment. I know we're forming the foundation but Palo Alto Parks Foundation, that they raised a \$450,000 over a couple years, and that's a pretty affluent community. I'm excited what the foundation can do but I don't think it is going to be purchasing \$20 million worth of land any time soon. Thanks.

>> Mayor Reed: At this time I would like to stay some public comments. We have three speakers, Bonnie Mace, Paul Dresden and Helen Chaplin.

>> Hi, Bonnie Mace, district 8 community round table. I want to thank you all for doing this project and especially to Matt who came out to our community meeting a few weeks ago to talk about this Greenprint update. Five quick comments. First interconnectedness. Pete was talking about this a bit. You have council districts, you have planning areas and you have things done in discrete units. I would like to see interconnectedness, a holistic knit east and west north and south. Very important to us. Second is if you don't have these schools you shouldn't count the schools. Every school should have as Pete was saying a joint use agreement, perhaps as San Ramon model. It's fine in temporary terms but in the long term, you should make sure that all the acreage you count in terms of school acreage is acreage that's usable and that's accessible. The third is functionality. This gets to the mayor's thought about use data. If you have a park and no one's using it, it's not a good park it's not just numbers, it's also who uses the park, what typings of parks you have. Sometimes skate parks are the most used parks and yet we don't think of those as conventional type parks. Use data is very important. Public-private partnerships are important but we should also have an idea of the roles and responsibilities. I know there's always a question of whether it's going to usurp labor or whether it's going to help labor. So before we get into the whole public-private partnership the public and the private and how they work in unison with each other. I don't want antagonism and the last thing is trails policy and riparian corridor policy. As you all know from last week I'm very interested in riparian corridor policy and I notice in this document, there is incorporate clearly stated in the document if possible and I hope this is a recommendation, that the riparian corridor policy is looked at as important and that a trails policy is looked at and I would encourage you all to have perhaps a study session on trails policy which I don't think you've ever had to form a holistic trails policy and I hope this moves forward in a good form and thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Jean Dresden.

>> Also I have a few comments short comments about this I don't think we should be counting them in the Green the print analysis unless we have a signed agreement and around the country took a look at about 60 general plans and strategic plans, the only I could find that did was the city of Sacramento and the city of mountain view. They all have joint operating agreements or try to get them but they don't include them in their numbers or their analysis of park land until they do have a joint operating agreement. We should go back and reanalyze our cities without schools with particular emphasis in those areas where we know that we don't have access to the schools where the gates are locked, Who would we come up with a different set of priorities with different numbers of under served areas. And also in response to Councilmember Liccardo's comment, about some very tiny parks getting a lot of pressure with a lot of density, that's called a catchment analysis. How many people nearby are going to this one little facility. What are we expecting it to serve. And we need to be doing that particularly in our higher dense areas where people don't have parks, you know, back yards to be able to take that pressure. What are we expecting our parks and parks capacity to be doing? And we might be looking for different priority as a result as a result of that analysis. Finally my final comments is we should be looking at other source of funding. I believe we are probably looking at bond issue parcel tax something. The trust for public lands did an analysis of the last ten years and 78% of measures passed. Now, I know we're in a different economic time but I

think we can put together a very good story to our community, and we can go out there and communicate how we will serve them and what they will get. People vote for that which is concrete. Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Helen Chapman is the last speaker.

>> I love to be the closer, thank you. Good morning Mayor Reed and members of the city council, my name is Helen Chapman, i'd like to commend parks staff for their hard work to produce a document that tries to carefully balance a vision with priorities for parks and trails, and services that will take us through the year 2020. I especially want to thank Matt Cano Raphael Gomez and' take a lot of abuse, and I can tell you the subcommittee means for subcommittee sometimes very contentious as we tried to discuss policy and how we can go forward. There seems to be I think and maybe it's a clarity that maybe you as leaders of the council can help provide, where the general plan policies are for parks I think the community needs that clarity, to know where they need to be speaking to. So we're not wasting our time at these meetings. I also want to tell you a quick story. I just came back from Vancouver after taking a cruise to Alaska. I had the opportunity to walk around downtown Vancouver for the day. Walk. I parked my car in the garage and I walked the streets of Vancouver for six hours. My husband and I did five miles in 90 degree weather but we didn't mind because it was shaded, there was public art to look at, the trails were connect, there were green spaces everywhere. I was in Vancouver five years ago. That wasn't there. In five years they have managed to take their city, they've densified the city but they've managed to integrate their city and the parks and the trails into that densification seamlessly, interconnectivity. That is something San José should be doing. If we can do it in five years we can be doing it. We have opportunities. One special thought was, they were building one particular building, and we happened to see that the sidewalks and trees were actually in place around the building as they had dug down. Not using the park as a staging area but as something that was going to be there in place when the building came forward. Thank you very much for your time, this has been a great discussion.

>> Mayor Reed: Thank you. I had a couple of questions on -- or comments on next steps. One is, whether or not we could get an information memo to the council with bullet points of areas that you think we need to make adjustments based on today's study session. Not the language or anything like that but just the areas that need to be modified in some way. And then second, I just want to make sure that the subcommittee on Greenprint doesn't meet again until it has been cleared by the City Attorney for whatever noticing and open meeting requirements depending on what kind of a committee it is so we at least get that straightened out. Anything else from the council? Staff? Anything else we left undone that you still need us to deal with? Okay, we're going to conclude this meeting. Okay, we're adjourned.