

RESPONSES TO COUNCIL QUESTIONS RE: 5/19/15 AGENDA

PUBLIC HEARING/GENERAL BUSINESS:

Item #2:

Is there a tentative date when the Sustainability Commission will consider the Peery Park Specific Plan?

Staff Response: Staff is working with the consultant on a revised schedule for the Peery Park Specific Plan that will involve an additional community workshop before the draft plan and DEIR are released for public review. Along with presenting the plan to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Commission and Planning Commission, these meetings will occur this summer with formal public hearings in the fall. A tentative date of September 2015 has been set to present the Draft Peery Park Specific Plan to the Sustainability Commission. Council and commissions will be informed of the meeting schedule once it has been set. The revised date for adoption of the Specific Plan is January 2016.

Item #3:

I received a report is that a board/commission applicant is missing from the list.

Staff Response: Narendra Pathak served two consecutive four-year terms on the Board of Library Trustees, July 1, 2006 - June 30, 2014. Per Council Policy 7.2.19 Section 2.B. (V), Mr. Pathak is not eligible to serve on the Board of Library Trustees for two years following June 30, 2014, or until July 2016.

Mr. Pathak applied for the Planning Commission (first preference) and later the Housing and Human Services Commission (second preference) in 2014. He was interviewed on January 28, 2014 and considered during the February and May 2014 appointments (February 11 and May 20) and was not appointed. Staff spoke with Mr. Pathak on May 21, 2014 and let him know his application would be kept on file for 12 months. On April 7, 2015, staff left a voice mail message for Mr. Pathak to inquire if he was still interested in being considered for either commission during the 2015 recruitment period, but staff has no record of a returned call.

Staff will contact Mr. Pathak to determine his interest in being included in the next quarterly recruitment cycle for any board and commission vacancies (interviews August 25, appointments September 15).

Item #5:

With alternative 3, how is the timeline for the rest of the Civic Center engagement process affected?

Staff Response: Approving Alternative 3 would not affect the overall project timeline. Additional outreach conducted on the draft Vision Statement, Success

Criteria, and Needs Assessment would be in parallel with other elements of the project that would continue to proceed. A final Vision Statement, Success Criteria, and Needs Assessment would be brought back to Council for approval at a future meeting already scheduled for Civic Center topics.

Under Needs Assessment, why is "Inadequate Parking" worded as a negative? All other Needs Assessments describe positives that a modern facility should strive to have. Is staff trying to say that having inadequate parking for peak use is actually a goal? Or is a mis-worded failing to be avoided?

Staff Response: This item was stated as a finding rather than a need so it is inconsistent with the other items. Staff suggests rewording this to, "Adequate Parking to Meet Peak Demand Periods."

Under Vision, it states that we want the Civic Center to offer "a full range of indoor and outdoor services". Isn't it unrealistic to expect "a full range", particularly "a full range of outdoor services" at the Civic Center? We're unlikely to build sports features or other similar amenities there.

Staff Response: Staff agrees that this could create unrealistic expectations. Staff suggests this be resolved by deleting the word, "full."