

Public Spaces Master Plan Implementation Advisory Committee  
Written Public Comment- 04/17/2024

Entry Date	Comment
04/17/2024	<p>REGARDING SLIDE 5 (BRIEF UPDATES)</p> <p>The last item says: Review options and identify a preferred formal process for adding lights to athletic fields (Action Step 1.5.5., page 67). Schedule: TBD</p> <p>This has been such a difficult and contentious issue that it is essential that the public be involved. <u>The broad public should be involved with County staff in developing the process, and the local neighborhood public should be heavily involved in implementing at individual prospective sites the process that is developed.</u> After all, they are the people who will be most affected by whatever decisions are made and whatever implementation steps are taken. I would be pleased to participate in any such deliberations.</p> <p>REGARDING SLIDE 10 (FIELD AVAILABILITY &amp; UTILIZATION)</p> <p>A next step says: Pilot a Check-in process in Spring 2-24 to compare actual use versus scheduled use.</p> <p>As I have said numerous times in public comments to the PSMP-IAC, I think <u>it is vital that the County have a realistic picture of actual field usage rather than base its planning on scheduled usage,</u> since historic data shows huge discrepancies between planned and actual usage (see the "actual" data from the "roving monitors" years ago). <u>My hypothesis is that updated actual date on field usage</u> may significantly reduce the forecast of the County's field needs, which in turn <u>may dramatically reduce the capital needs for creating new fields or increasing field capacity</u> with conversion to turf or addition of lights. So I am pleased if there will now be a serious effort at determining actual field utilization.</p> <p><u>Please share the form and format of the Check-in process being piloted this Spring.</u> I would like to see it, as I'm sure others would. <u>It is important that the process have enough specificity to it that the County and public can understand the extent of the usage.</u> If a field is reserved for a game or for a practice of two teams and then in real life four students are kicking a ball around with little or no adult involvement, that should not count as the scheduled utilization taking place. So a simple "yes" or "no" should not suffice for whether scheduled usage is actually taking place. The Check-in process should allow for an indication of the extent of use that actually occurred.</p> <p>Thank you for considering these comments. I would be happy to discuss them with County staff if that might be helpful.</p>

04/17/2024	<p>1. <b>Zoning</b> — The presentation suggests that the Zoning Phase 3 process will be quite extensive, with the development of a “comprehensive report from the consultant team” on various standards for providing flexible zoning for public spaces. To date, there has been relatively little “public engagement” during the work of the zoning staff. (I note that the current County web-site for “zoning studies” says simply that the “page is under construction”). Does the County intend to develop a public engagement process for the proposed zoning study? If so, will it include the development of best practices, scoping, and similar matters?</p> <p>2. <b>Level of Service</b> — the PSMP Refresh page notes that, as the PSMP itself recommended, the Level of Service analysis and recommendations will be reviewed and updated. What kinds of public engagement can we expect during that process? Will there be a new or updated “statistically valid survey” of resident priorities? Will there be updated demographic data, benchmark data, national average data, or additional or different “peer localities?” The page notes that the factor of “equity consideration” will now be an explicit factor in LOS calculations. I don’t recall that in the original LOS formula, although it was perhaps implicit in the “access” factor. How will this factor be defined and applied?</p>
------------	--