

Donna DePamphilis

From: joe symons <joesymons@me.com>
Sent: Monday, August 7, 2017 7:18 PM
To: Donna DePamphilis
Cc: Linda Ann Kuller; Erika Shook; fred klein
Subject: Re: Comprehensive Plan Capital Facilities Inventory

On Aug 7, 2017, at 10:45 AM, Donna DePamphilis <donnad@sanjuanco.com> wrote:

Good Morning,

Thank you for your interest in the 2036 Comprehensive Plan update project. The preliminary draft of the Capital Facilities Inventory for the SJC Comprehensive Plan update is attached for your review and comment. Planning Commission and Council will be briefed on this draft soon.

thanks team. I write to confirm some guesses I am making based upon the first few pages of the briefing document (elements of which I cannot select because it is a pdf file that is somehow protected).

It appears that items in bold on pages one and two are the items that are being addressed in this document:

(see "BRIEFING PURPOSE:") "first step"

and/or "PER STATUTE...")

Where the **first** of the 5 bullets is in bold.

It also appears that the Commerce Dept checklist items in bold are to be done, but the capital facilities document only addresses item b. It also appears that since none of the 2nd column (unidentified but looks like a checkbox will be checked when the item is addressed) items is checked, the inventory document is unfinished. I am guessing that after sufficient public input and PC review, the check box for item b will be checked.

Thus the bold items in the memo (basically, the preliminary inventory only) are what this is about. I probably sound like a clutz, but the PER STATUE part got me confused since it shows all 5 steps (tho, yes, only step one, probably what is referenced as the "first step") is in bold.

Yes?

Perhaps in the future your cover letter could make whatever document(s) you are submitting for review super clear as to their place in the hierarchy of tasks.

I know. Picky picky picky.

What I wish all of these required documents had was context. Having an inventory of capital facilities is, like, ahh, duh. What is missing is evaluation. For example, at a low level, how old are these facilities? How close are they to needing to be replaced? What would be projected costs of this? How close to capacity are these currently (independent of future needs)? Is "everyone" happy with the level of service that these facilities provide? Bigger questions: Has anyone surveyed the resident population to inform and assess them what implications for new facilities will mean (NIMBY stuff, financing stuff, "vision" stuff), such "inform" to include the impact of visitors (which is not technically required by GMA) and who do not pay for the services that the capital facilities provide.

I understand that you have to march to the very strict beat of Dept of Commerce checklists, and that you are seriously understaffed. I write not to add to your load, but to encourage "out of the Dept of Commerce box" thinking about what is really the sub-text of all this update effort. I would like to imagine that as planners (as well as residents), you would want your work really understood by your audiences.

Only you can put skin blood and nerves on the skeleton of the checklists.

We all really need that.

Joe Symons
Olga, WA

carpe diem