

**PROS Plan Preliminary Draft Suggested Changes/Edits  
Updated 12-30-21**

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
1	0		PRC Struck	Yes	The KCLS partnership for Library services requires an investment by the community (in the form of property taxes collected for KCLS) of over \$5mm annually. That figure is larger than the current operating budget for all of the park system. There should be a bit more attention paid to that activity. Granted, the operation of the Library is outsourced to KCLS, but oversight and community engagement probably needs to reach a higher level to ensure the community is receiving the benefits it wants.	Library operations are outside the scope of the PROS Plan. Staff does not recommend adding library matters to the plan.  The PRC may consider a future engagement with the City Council (separate from the PROS process) to discuss and confirm direction/areas of focus for the PRC on matters related to the library.	Jessi	Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.  12/09/21: PRC Struck requested to be included in hand-off memo. To be reviewed by group preparing revised memo.
2	0		PRC Struck	Yes	Another underlying theme is funding. Although not the direct purview of this Plan, clearly projects do not get completed without funding (from a variety of sources). While there is ample reference to the availability (and scarcity) of grants, a more transparent picture of the “state of funding” or the potential thereof provides benefits to the community. First, it demonstrates that our City staff is focused and on top of the issue. Second, it can provide the forum for further discussion about how the community can be engaged and assist. Third, it can amply demonstrate the gap between want and need, as applicable, i.e., the funding gap. And finally, further clarify the need for setting community priorities.	Staff is unclear about the recommendation. Let’s discuss with the PRC.  The staff will be adding the preliminary revenue assumptions related to the 2023-2038 CIP to Chapter 11.	Jessi	Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.  Revenue table added to Chapter 11. Reference to revenue needs and “gap” added to hand-off letter.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
3	0		PRC Struck	Yes	There is a theme that runs through this plan, perhaps not explicitly noted, that the City's Parks & Open Space infrastructure is aging, and in (desperate) need of repair/replacement. Yet, there is no forthright discussion as to why the City is in this position. Is it due to explicitly (or implicitly) deferring maintenance, higher priorities for non-park projects, poor planning, a backlog due to COVID, a combination of the above or other reasons? I believe an honest and open discussion serves two purposes – first, it lays out why we are where we are, and if necessary, points to not making the same mistakes (if that is appropriate). Second, if one wants to ask the community for more tax dollars, it should be held accountable for the prudent use of those resources.	Staff is unclear about the recommendation. Let's discuss with the PRC.	Jessi	Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.  PRC Struck suggests narrative be included in the hand-off memo that speaks to why and how Parks infrastructure got to a place of desperate need of repair/replacement. To be reviewed by group preparing revised memo.
4	0		PRC Struck	Yes	Stepping back, I ask, "How will the community know or be able to conclude if this strategic plan was successful?" I believe there needs to be a discussion, perhaps in Chapter 4, of outcomes, etc. The community has invested quite a substantial amount in outside consulting fees, staff time and community resources, and it should require an evaluation. For example, if one reviews the previous 6-yr PROS plan, 2014-2019, how would one evaluate that? Was it successful in guiding the City, and if so in what ways?	Chapter 11 was finalized after this comment was received. This chapter is intended to conclude the plan. Rather than draft an additional Chapter or Section, a suggestion or recommendation from the PRC could be to review "progress" annually as part of the ongoing PRC work plan.  Staff are open to other suggested revisions or another approach.  See also next section.	Jessi	Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.  Hand-off memo includes a recommendation to provide an annual update on PROS Plan implementation.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
5	0		PRC Struck	Yes	As noted before, I still don't know how one assesses whether this PROS Plan can be judged successful or not. A well-known management guideline of "it's difficult to manage what you can't measure" sums up the sentiment quite well.	The plan includes a robust CIP, goals and objectives, and suggested work plan items. The PROS Plan, updated approximately every 6 years, establishes the framework that allows the City to respond to existing challenges and future or new opportunities.  Keep in mind, this plan is strategic in nature, so the City Council will need to take these recommendations and determine what items are prioritized and included in future budgets, work pans, etc.	Jessi	Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.  Hand-off memo includes a recommendation to provide an annual update on PROS Plan implementation.
6	01		PRC Struck	Yes	Do we wish to mention, if appropriate, that those two groups have a representative attend P&R Comm meetings to suggest more coordination (?)	Probably better suited for Chapter 3 or the Hand-Off Memo to City Council.	Jessi	Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.  No additional change needed. Acknowledgments included in hand-off memo.
7	01	9 7	PRC Struck	Yes	Under "Current Challenges", "Balancing passive & active uses", add a sentence that speaks to being very aware of the impervious footprint in our parks & open spaces.	Staff request more specificity on the suggested revision. Discuss with PRC.	Jessi	Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.  Discussed as part of #165. Under consideration for inclusion as part of hand-off memo.
8	02	<del>13</del> 11	PRC Struck	Yes	Observation - the "Race & Ethnicity" data should be a subject of discussion for the Commission, and how additional data on the usage of programs and activities can better inform the Commission.	Staff is unclear about the recommendation for the PROS Plan. Let's discuss with the PRC.	Jessi	Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.  PRC discussed. Data in this plan is contextual and should be used to inform future planning.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
9	06	44 42	PRC Cohen	Yes	In the 5 <sup>th</sup> bullet, I think the statement about the community supporting system-wide signage and wayfinding improvements may be stronger than the survey results on this point, at least without any caveats. I have more to say on this below, but for this one, at very least consider inserting "appropriate" after "supports"	Several comments submitted by Commissioner Cohen about signage and quantify of signage. Discuss with PRC.	Jessi	Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.  Changes made through plan to reflect "signage as appropriate"
10	06	51 49	PRC Cohen	Yes	In the paragraph after the bullets that summarizes the maps, please consider additional explanation of what the maps are intended to portray. I found the maps difficult to understand, and there are a lot of them.	Let's discuss with the PRC so that the staff and consultant can better understand the information that is needed.	Steve/ Jessi	Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.  Language added to define travelsheds and add context to how maps are created.
11	06	73 71	PRC Cohen	Yes	I have the same reaction to the material under Wayfinding that I mentioned in my first comment on page 48. Please see my comments above.	Noted. Added to discussion for PRC meeting on 12/09/21.	Jessi	Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.  References to wayfinding revised.
12	07	40 74	PRC Struck	Yes	The section, "Recreation and Arts Trends" cites several national sources are cited. While valuable, my suggestion is to have a stronger statement than "may frame future considerations in program and activity development." If not, then I would reduce the list. For example, these national trends inform us and allow us to survey if our community mimics those same trends.	Staff is unclear about the recommendation for the PROS Plan. Let's discuss with the PRC.	Jessi	Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.  Change to "...will help" instead of "may" frame...

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
13	08	<del>83</del> 81	PRC Struck	Yes	The section, Benefits of Trails, accurately outlines the many benefits. After reading the section, I wondered what is an appropriate metric to establish a standard for our trail system – usage, proximity or ease of access, size (length of trails), type, etc. On p. 89 (third paragraph) there is a discussion of trail length vs. connectivity with the suggestion that connectivity be the driving attribute. If so, how to measure or communicate easily progress on that front?	At one point in time, number of trail miles was the LOS standard most commonly used. Most entities have moved away from this.  This version of the PROS Plan is in its infancy in terms of trail LOS standards. Establishing LOS trail standards is not something we can accomplish on our current timeline.  Building out trail LOS standards would be best suited for the update to the Bikes and Peds Plan. Once that is done, those standards will be included in the next PROS Plan and/or appended to the City’s Comprehensive Plan.  Let’s talk about this item with our consultant at the PRC meeting.	Jess/ Steve	Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.  Suggest emphasizing connectivity as metric as opposed to miles. Consultant will revise.
14	08	<del>89</del> 87	PRC Struck	Yes	How is the term, “reasonable access”, in the second paragraph defined (“Approximately 65% of the city has reasonable access to recreational trails”). Is the ½ mile walkshed threshold? It’s not abundantly clear what the standard is.	Let’s review with the consultant at the PRC meeting.  Staff recommends adding clarifying language to this section to strengthen the current approach, and then working on developing a true Trail LOS standard as part of the Bike and Peds Plan Update.	Jessi/ Steve	Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.  Suggest emphasizing connectivity as metric as opposed to miles. Consultant will revise
15	09	<del>57</del> 98	PRC Struck	Yes	In the list of partners I would suggest including Concerned Citizens for MI Parks, the leading community advocacy group for parks. Their members have volunteered hundreds of hours plus provided support in terms of education and communication to the community regarding parks & open spaces.	The staff have discussed and are recommending taking the list of organizations out of the plan. There are no other areas of the PROS Plan where volunteer groups were referenced and by including them here we run the risk of overlooking others who have contributed.	Jessi	Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.  PRC agreed and list will be removed.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
16	10	<del>106</del> 104	PRC Struck	Yes	In Figure 10.3, sample labor cost metrics for the Mercer Island system are provided. A comparison with NRPA or other data would be helpful. (Technical Note: In the prior paragraph, the figure is referred to as “Figure 10.5” – it should be 10.3 – correct?)	<p>We tried to compare the data with NRPA data and were not able to do so. The 2020 date is not useful due to the pandemic. The 2021 data is also problematic for the same reasons. Going back to 2019 is also not useful given that much has changed since then.</p> <p>We made the call not to include a comparison in this plan, but this type of analysis could be done in a future plan update. 2023 would be a good year to consider this analysis.</p>	Jessi	<p>Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.</p> <p>PRC discussed, no change made. Consider for future analysis or next PROS Plan update.</p>
17	10	<del>108</del> 106	PRC Struck	Yes	The section, Future Initiatives, as well as other sections should be cross-referenced with projects in the 6-yr CIP and the 20-yr CFP as evidence of action items.	<p>The CIP projects were not initially included because it became duplicative. The bulk of Chapter 11 is dedicated to capital projects.</p> <p>The staff would like to talk with the PRC about this a bit more and evaluate what CIP cross-references could be added to the various chapters to strengthen the plan.</p>	Jessi	<p>Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.</p> <p>PRC discussed, no change made.</p>
18	11	<del>113</del> 112	PRC Cohen	Yes	Maybe it’s just me, but I still have trouble understanding the weighting chart/concept without a little more explanation right at the outset. This carries over, of course, to the 20-year project list understanding.	Staff would appreciate more specific feedback on this item as we are unclear what changes are needed. Discuss with PRC.	Jessi	<p>Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.</p> <p>PRC discussed, no change made.</p>
19	11	<del>120</del> 119	PRC Struck	Yes	One source that’s not explicitly identified, but perhaps is included in either Parkland Donations	Staff are unclear about the recommendation. Donation signs are already	Jessi	Discuss at PRC Meeting on 12/09/21.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
					& Dedications or Public-Private Partnerships is sponsorships. An assertive program to allow local (and non-local?) businesses and organizations to provide support in return for recognition is a well-recognized fund development strategy. While overt naming rights may not be contemplated, simple recognition signs that would say “generous support provided by XYZ”, etc. Also, could there be a small “parks surcharge” added to the current fees that would go exclusively towards CIP investments.	<p>deployed for grants and donations and the City currently uses the described funding strategy. Discuss with PRC.</p> <p>Parks surcharge fees are challenging given that the base fee is not likely covering the full M&amp;O cost.</p> <p>It’s something to consider as a future policy item as fees are set and adjusted. As it stands, the synthetic turf replacement fund (aka sinking fund), for example, is not fully covering costs and needs to be analyzed.</p>		PRC discussed, no change made.
20	11	122	PRC Westberg	Yes	Suggest rewording the bullet statement on the Bike Skills area as follows: Complete the evaluation and assessment of the viability of the Bike Skills Area in Upper Luther Burbank Park. Determine if this is an amenity the City will continue to offer, given its popularity among youth and teens, and if so, in what location, and under what conditions.	<p>Staff recommends keeping the language as drafted. Should the PRC request a different evaluation be completed, including finding an alternative location for this amenity, staff recommendation would be to add it as a future PRC Work Plan item to be discussed with the City Council.</p> <p><b>Proposed Staff Revision:</b>The Bike Skills Area at Upper Luther Burbank Park is a popular recreational amenity among youth and teens. During the development of this PROS Plan, the area was temporarily closed to allow for an assessment of the site and public input in developing recommendations on improving the site for riders while minimizing environmental impacts. Outcomes of this assessment will guide future site planning and operations.</p>	Jessi	<p>No changes made.</p> <p>PRC discussed, Bike Skills Area is now covered in the hand-off memo. Consideration of a future project to assess other potential sites for biking amenities is referenced.</p> <p>Changes to text made in PROS Plan.</p>
21	0		PRC Struck	No	Stylist Comment – Throughout the document the treatment of the word “and” is inconsistent. Sometimes it’s written out and sometimes it’s a	Staff is scanning the entire document and trying to catch the instances where “&” should be switched to “and.”	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
					symbol (“&”). Not sure what is intended, but I couldn’t figure out the formatting procedure.			
22	0		PRC Cohen	No	As I read further, the sentences seem to becoming less and less “Hemingway-ish” and more “Henry James-ish”. Many, many of them have multiple parts and lists, and some references are a bit duplicative. I understand it may not be possible to use more crisp, simple statements in this kind of document that addresses many points, but I would opt for simplicity of phrasing more, if that’s something you’d be willing to consider at this point.	This is a really broad request and a revision is not something that could be accomplished on our current project timeline.  Staff are happy to consider specific revisions to sentences as they are presented.	Jessi	No changes made.
23	0		PRC Struck	No	In looking at the additional chapters, there appears to be quite a bit of variance between chapters in terms of information and data that helped form the narrative, and strategy. Some chapters have in-depth analysis, and others are somewhat lacking and thus have to rely more on a qualitative discussion.	There are some areas of the plan where data is needed to meet the needs of RCO. Park classifications are one example.  Some of the chapters are added at the City’s discretion to simply round out the contents of the plan.  At this juncture, staff does not recommend a change in the plan approach, but this is something that could be evaluated at the next plan update.	Jessi	No changes made.
24	0		PRC Westberg	No	At several places in the document the word "culture" is used as an adjective e.g. "culture activities" on page 2 of the introduction. Culture should be changed to "cultural." "Culture" can	We’re going back through and attempting to catch these changes.	Jest/ Steve/ Merrill	Revisions submitted 12/06/21.



Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
					be used as a noun or verb but isn't an adjective. I did not catalog every instance of this in the document but found other examples in the Introduction on page 8 and 9, and Chapter 4, Goals and Objectives, pages 21 and 29. and Chapter 7, page 42. I suspect there are others that I didn't flag.	One of the nuances is that the Arts Council does not want to use the reference "cultural arts." The PROS Plan was changed in an earlier draft to say "arts and culture" to align with the approach used in the "Arts and Culture Plan, but as you pointed out, this is not correct. We'll be changing it to "cultural" in the next draft.		
25	01	6-7	PRC Cohen	No	These pages appear missing/mislabeled	The page numbering will be corrected in the final draft. There are no missing pages, just a numbering error.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
26	01	TOC	Jessi	No	Correct the list of chapters and update the titles. Change TOC and check references on page 9, chapter 1.	Change submitted.	Steve/ Merrill	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
27	01	3	PRC Cohen	No	Under Guided by Values, I had a question: How can education be the key (and to what) and livability also be paramount?	These are taken directly from the City's Comprehensive Plan. No staff change recommended.	Jessi	No changes made.
28	01	3	PRC Cohen	No	Under Planning Process, in the 2nd paragraph, delete second colon at end of lead in.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
29	01	3	PRC Cohen	No	Under Planning Process, in the 2nd bullet, delete 2nd period at end		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
30	01	3	PRC Struck	No	Under "Dept Overview", I would have a subheading entitled "COVID Response" or something along those lines. It's important to highlight that aspect as its been the principal focus for two years.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
31	01	3	PRC Westberg	No	On page 3 of the introduction the list of VALUES on page 3 offers a curious mix of statements, some of which PRC Cohen't appear of be values (e.g. Residential community?) We should discuss these in the commission meeting, unless	These are taken verbatim from the City's Comprehensive Plan.  No change recommended.	Jessi	No changes made.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
					they are taken verbatim from another document that is already in circulation.			
32	01	4	PRC Struck	No	In the “Economic Benefits” section, State of WA statistics are cited. I would recommend either more granular stats that are more meaningful or relevant or just make the point from a qualitative perspective.	Staff recommends keeping the section as-is. The economic benefits of parks have been studied at the State level, but granular data for Mercer Island is not readily available.  This is something that could be explore and further analyzed in the next updated to the PROS Plan.	Jessi	No changes made.
33	01	4	PRC Cohen	No	In the 3rd bullet at the upper right, is it ‘physiological’ or ‘psychological’?	Should be psychological, change submitted.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
34	01	5	PRC Struck	No	Two suggestions – create a table rather than a listing for the accomplishments and add a caption to the photo that ties back to the list (I believe it’s the ICP-North field turf?)	For formatting purposes we may keep this as a list.  Staff are going back through the Plan to add captions to photos where possible. And yes, this is ICP.	Merrill	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
35	01	8 6	PRC Struck	No	Under the “Arts Council” heading, the last sentence states the P&R Comm supports the Art Council. It would be helpful to the reader to understand what is the form of that support?	Added the word “staff” to the end of the sentence.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
36	01	8 6	PRC Struck	No	Same comment for the Open Space Conservancy Trust	Added the word “staff” to the end of the sentence.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
37	01	8 6	PRC Cohen	No	Under Open Space Conservancy Trust at bottom left, 3rd line, delete extra “t” at beginning of line		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
38	01	9 7	PRC Cohen	No	Under Balancing passive and active uses in the first column, 2nd par., first line—the wording seems to give the impression that we currently have splash pads	Strike the words “to splashpads.”	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
39	01	9 7	PRC Cohen	No	In the final bullet in the right column, in the 1st and 2nd lines, Change “Provides” “Provide” and “includes” to “include”	Do not change. Wording is correct as-is.	Steve	No changes made.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
40	01	9 7	PRC Struck	No	Under "Guiding Documents", "Site Specific Master Plans, I would add the date of those listed to be consistent with the prior treatment as well as to communicate to the reader when those plans were developed.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21
41	02	<del>10</del> 8	PRC Struck	No	In the 3rd paragraph, last sentence, do we wish to add the value of open space as a means for residents to commune with nature in addition to the environmental aspects already mentioned.	This is pretty well covered in Chapter 9. This chapter is more about quantifying "what we have." Staff does not recommend this addition.	Jessi	No changes made.
42	02	<del>10</del> 8	PRC Struck	No	Re-phrase the first sentence of the second paragraph as follows: "Mercer Island, nestled between the large population centers of Seattle and Bellevue, has its own distinct identity."		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
43	02	<del>11</del> 12	PRC Struck	No	Under "Household Characteristics", the average household size for Mercer Island should be shown as "2.50" (not 2.5) to be consistent for presentation purposes (using 2 decimals).		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
44	02	<del>11</del> 9	PRC Struck	No	Under Population, we should cite a source (or footnote) the statement, "Annual population growth has averaged over the past 40 years but is expected to slow to less than 0.25% per year over the coming decades." To make such a statement requires an assumption on population density which may be tenuous at best.	The source of the population forecasts is the Puget Sound Regional Council. We'll add a reference to the paragraphs indicating as such.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
45	02	<del>11</del> 9	PRC Westberg	No	Chapter 2, page 11, 1st paragraph, the word "many" should be inserted in the phrase ...and have higher incomes than "many" other county and state residents. Page 12, 5th bullet: suggest edit to read... "and are users of fitness and athletic programs, and park facilities."		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
46	02	<del>12</del> 10	PRC Cohen	No	In the 1st line under Age Group Distribution, insert a comma after (2019)		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
47	02	<del>12</del> 10	PRC Cohen	No	In the last bullet on the right side, last line, delete extra period at the end		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
48	02	<del>13</del> 11	PRC Cohen	No	I'm having trouble following some of the percentages. --How does the 1.2% for African American in the text relate to the 4.3% on the right side? --Where does the 1.4% come from and how does it relate to the numbers on the right side?	This is an error. Will be corrected.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
49	02	<del>13</del> 11	PRC Cohen	No	is there a typo in "other some other race alone"?	Yes, typo.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
50	02	<del>13</del> 11	PRC Cohen	No	On the right side, top paragraph, where it says "other than English" two times, is that exclusively, or is it in addition to English? Or maybe it doesn't matter? Or we didn't ask it in that granular a way?	It usually means the household is speaking a language in addition to English, but the data is not presented that way. I'll keep it as-is for now.	Jessi	No changes made.
51	02	<del>14</del> 12	PRC Westberg	No	Chapter 2, page 14 under "Persons with Disabilities" and throughout other chapters of the document there is a statement that reads "Mercer Island should...." or "the City should...." Since this is the City's Plan shouldn't such statements be changed to "Mercer island will..." or the "City will..." The plan should express a statement of intent. Is it appropriate for the City's plan to include recommendations to itself?	The sentence referenced here is being taken out.  The references can be changed to "The City..." instead of Mercer Island. Staff will try to capture other instances where this occurred.  Changing "should" to "will" is problematic. This is a strategic plan that requires the City Council, for example, to authorize funding to implement components of the plan. The plan recommends a course of action but does not compel it to happen.	Steve	Partial revision submitted 12/06/21.
52	02	<del>14</del> 12	PRC Cohen	No	Under Persons with Disabilities, 2nd paragraph, final sentence---I agree with this point, but it seems out of place as a recommendation within the Community Profile material, which is predominantly factual data.	Staff agree, the sentence is removed. This is well covered in subsequent chapters of the plan.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
53	02	<del>14</del> 12	PRC Cohen	No	Under Employment and Education, 2nd line, delete extra spacing after "Island"		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
54	02	<del>14</del> 12	PRC Struck	No	Under "Household Characteristics", the last sentence that begins, "The number of households on MI is anticipated to grow to approximately 11,106 by 2044, increasing to 1,239," needs to have a source cited. Also, a more succinct manner to phrase the increase is "The number of households on MI is anticipated to grow by 1,239 to approximately 11,106 by 2044," OR keep the original sentence, but change the last phrase to "an increase of 1,239".	Source is the Puget Sound Regional Council and a reference will be added. Sentence will also be revised.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
55	02	<del>14</del> 12	PRC Struck	No	Under "Employment & Education", make two sentences of this one. "Over seven in ten employed residents work ..... or arts occupations. Of those, one in two work in either ..... industries." I believe by splitting the two ideas, it's easier for the reader to comprehend.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
56	02	<del>14</del> 12	PRC Struck	No	Suggest the following wording for the first sentence of the last paragraph, "Generally, lower-income residents may face barriers to ...		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
57	02	<del>15</del> 13	PRC Struck	No	Should there be, based on the Community Profile information, a summary or take-aways that will better inform the PROS Plan??	You would not normally see a "Future Initiatives" component of Chapter 2. This is a data section. If a goal, objective or future initiative should be added, let's include in another chapter.	Jessi	Discuss with PRC on 12/09/21.
58	02	<del>15</del> 13	PRC Struck	No	Add a caption to the photo identifying the location and activity, e.g., Skate Park located at Mercerdale Park.	Staff will add captions to the photos.	Merrill	Revision submitted 12/06/21.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
59	03	<del>16</del> 14	PRC Struck	No	In the Community Survey sections, we should mention which surveys were designed to produce “statistically significant” results that are free of sampling bias.	Added two references to the mail version of the surveys being statistically valid.  Although the companion online surveys were not statistically valid, the findings aligned with the mail surveys. Given this outcome, we did not spend a lot of time explaining the difference between the two in the text of the PROS Plan.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21
60	03	<del>16</del> 14	Jessi	No	Swap out cover photo for chapter 3.	Change in final draft.	Merrill	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
61	03	<del>18</del> 16	PRC Cohen	No	Under the first bullet under Major Survey Findings, 3rd line, delete “that” at beginning of line		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
62	03	<del>18</del> 16	PRC Cohen	No	Under the 3rd bullet under Major Survey Findings, 3rd line, “of” should be “or”		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
63	03	<del>19</del> 17	Jessi	No	Remove reference to Planning Commission in the “Other Public Sessions” section. The Planning Commission will not engage on this document until post-2022 when the Comprehensive Plan Amendment is considered.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
64	05	30	PRC Struck	No	In the opening paragraph, does it make sense just to note that there are private recreational facilities available (e.g., swimming & tennis clubs, gyms and exercise clubs, horse club). My thought this section is a community inventory, and there should be made mention of such venues available to residents.	Added a new sentence on the opening page referencing the availability of private recreation facilities.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
65	05	31	PRC Cohen	No	--In the left column in the first sentence under Community Parks, it might be a little confusing to a first-time reader for 2 reasons: --It begins with “Community parks are larger sites ....” But larger than what? At	Took out the reference to “larger than” and “wide array of uses.” Combined the first and second sentences.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.  PRC discussed reference to

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
					<p>first I thought it might refer to larger than Regional Parks, but that's not right, of course. Maybe consider restating as "Community Parks are the next largest sites ...."</p> <p>--Same thing with "wider array of facilities" and "appealing to a more diverse group of users" in the 3rd line. Wider array and more diverse than what? Than regional parks? Assuming that's what you intend (although some may question whether it's a correct statement in comparison to the 2 regional parks in any event), maybe be explicit.</p> <p>--In the right column under Neighborhood Parks, first sentence—Do you think the view is widespread that neighborhood parks are the backbone of the local park system? Maybe I'm not understanding what you mean by "local".</p> <p>--In the right column under Mini Parks, in the 2nd line it says they serve a "limited radius". That may be true for some people, but not all, I'd guess. Maybe revise to "a more limited radius [than what???]. I guess I personally consider the street end types of mini parks in a different way from some people. They're unique, with less dense use, water access at some, opportunities for fishing at some, etc.</p>	Added the word "more" to the section on mini parks.		"backbone," narrative removed as it is not needed.
66	05	32	PRC Struck	No	In the first sentence of "Parkland Inventory" the statement is made that the City has 481 acres of parkland (and corroborated in Figure 5/1 on p. 33). Yet in this chapter's overview paragraph (p.30) and in other sections of the Plan, the acreage figure given is 479 with the difference, I assume, as to whether one counts the Community Center parcel. For clarity and consistency, I would use the 481 figure throughout the document. (Having two numbers creates confusion and doubt.)	Staff caught the discrepancy as well. The correct acreage is 481. We're making the correction throughout the plan.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
67	05	34	PRC Cohen	No	In the second paragraph in the first column under Facilities, at the end, the term "reunification location" isn't clear in meaning to me. Is it where to meet after a windstorm? Or after a multi-location walk? Or what?	This is a pretty standard term for emergencies. We'll add, "...during an emergency." To the end of the sentence to clarify.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
68	05	37	PRC Westberg	No	Shouldn't the table on Chapter 5, Page 37 reflect the fact that Luther Burbank Park has 3 pickle ball courts since the tennis courts were lined for pickle ball to permit outdoor play?		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
69	06	42-40	PRC Struck	No	Grammatical edit – in the 3rd paragraph, I believe the sentence should read, "Survey respondents were generally satisfied ..... or about the correct number of amenities".		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
70	06	44-48 42-46	PRC Westberg	No	the tables and discussion of the Park System Condition Assessment are confusing. The "Ratings Approach" introduces a 3-color classification system. The table on the following page shows multiple colors which were not introduced, and the "dial" graphs on pages 47-48 show yet a third set of colors. I found it difficult for a reader to track through this material.	This has been noted and will be corrected.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
71	06	40 38	PRC Cohen	No	In the right column in the first full paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> line, insert "help" between "may" and "frame"		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
72	06	40 38	PRC Cohen	No	In the right column, first bullet, 2 <sup>nd</sup> line, insert a comma after "essential"		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
73	06	40 38	PRC Cohen	No	In the right column, 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet, in the first line, insert "those" before "survey" to clarify what survey respondents are being referenced		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
74	06	41 38	PRC Cohen	No	In the right column, under the bulleted material, 6 <sup>th</sup> line, instead of "aspire to", consider substituting something like "participate in"		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
75	06	41 39	PRC Cohen	No	In the right column, identify what organization the first 3 Sources come from.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
76	06	42 40	PRC Cohen	No	In the right column, some of the %'s don't seem consistent with some in Figure 6.2, or I'm having	Good catch – copy and paste error. These will be corrected in the Final Draft.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.



Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
					trouble tracking them. See, for example, the 86%, 78%, 75%, 31%, 29%, and 29% in the text.	References will also be added to the text for both exhibits.		
77	06	42 40	PRC Cohen	No	In the right column, first full paragraph, 6 <sup>th</sup> line, delete extra space after “there is”		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
78	06	42 40	PRC Cohen	No	In the left column at the bottom, 8 <sup>th</sup> line, change “includes” to “included”		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
79	06	42 40	PRC Struck	No	Grammatical edit – in the same paragraph, there is an extra space (“86% think there is an....”).		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
80	06	43 41	PRC Cohen	No	In the left column, 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 7 <sup>th</sup> line, delete the comma after “repairing”		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
81	06	44 42	PRC Struck	No	In the section, Park System Conditions Assessment, should it be noted that the City contracted with an expert to assist in the Assessment? I believe it lends credence to the effort of being comprehensive, etc.	Added a reference to “outside consultant.”	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
82	06	44 42	PRC Struck	No	For the last paragraph on the page, would it be more impactful to create a table that would show the general action based on the condition. For example, a “fair” rating would trigger corrective action, etc.	Suggestion submitted to consider reformatting as a table.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21. No change made, kept in paragraph form.
83	06	45 43	PRC Cohen	No	For easier/quicker understanding, consider stating (maybe at bottom of page) which colors go with what Rating from page 44. For me, this would help, even though the numbers are on the colored boxes.	We’ll add a key at the bottom and also change the dark black/green color to something else so that it is easier to read.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
84	06	47 45	PRC Cohen	No	-In the 1 <sup>st</sup> line, is the 1.34 condition rating for the whole park system or just for Developed Parks? It wasn’t clear to me. --In the 2 <sup>nd</sup> line, delete “as”	Overall. Noted on the title and in the first word of the section.	Jessi	No change submitted.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
85	06	<del>48</del> 46	PRC Cohen	No	In the 2 <sup>nd</sup> full paragraph, I continue to question a blanket policy that requires all different trails and loops, and all trail junctions, to have navigation aids identifying trails, connections, and destination options. I'm concerned that signage proliferation, without moderation, can adversely impact the overall experience in some of the trail areas. Perhaps consider modifiers like "appropriate as to type, scale, and number" or something like appears on page 89 as to design that reads "sensitive and low impact". Or consider using both of those modifiers. This subject may merit further policy discussion because it's easy for people to say they would like better wayfinding, without fully considering the risk of diluting the experience.	Staff agrees that this section likely overstates the need for trail signage.  The last two sentences will be revised to read, "Parks with complex trail networks will benefit from signage <u>appropriate as to type, scale, and number</u> , that identifies the different trails or loops within the park. All <u>Most</u> trail junctions should provide <u>low-impact</u> navigation aids that identify trails, connections, and destination options.	Steve	Submit change with second round of edits.  PRC discussed, agreed to replace "most" with "as appropriate"
86	06	<del>48</del> 46	PRC Cohen	No	Under Pavement Conditions, last line, insert a comma after "appear"		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
87	06	<del>48</del> 46	PRC Cohen	No	Under Sport Courts & Amenities, the first sentence reads a little awkwardly to me because the word "surfacing" is singular, but the verbs "show" and "affect" go with plural forms. Could "surfacing" be changed to "surfaces" to mitigate that?	Made plural.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
88	06	<del>49</del> 47	PRC Cohen	No	In the left column under Universal Access and Parks & Recreation, 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, the wording of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> to last sentence that reads "Suppose a local government..." seemed a little casual sounding. Consider substituting "If" for "Suppose" and combining the two final sentences by deleting "In that case" – leaving the comma that was right after that phrase	Changes made.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
89	06	<del>50</del> 48	PRC Cohen	No	The material under Site Furnishings reminded me that I wanted to mention something I noticed the last time I was at Calkins Point at LBP. The picnic tables did have a space for a wheel chair, but in both instances, the disabled person would not be facing the water. I don't know if that resulted from an access issue, but it seemed a little unfair.	Thank you. Can't say for a sure if there was a reason for that, but it will be passed along to the staff.	Jessi	No changes made.
90	06	<del>50</del> 48	PRC Cohen	No	Under Playgrounds, should the work at the Merceddale Park play area be mentioned?	Will add a sentence to this section on the Merceddale Park Playground.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
91	06	<del>51</del> 49	PRC Cohen	No	In the bullet points, if what these different types of parks, etc. aren't previously defined, consider defining them. If they're defined earlier in the draft, considering referring back to that.	These are taken from Chapter 5 – Classifications. We'll add a reference.  This was tough because we didn't give the chapters to you in order.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
92	06	<del>51</del> 49	PRC Cohen	No	In the 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph after the bullets, 3 <sup>rd</sup> line, insert a comma after "local park" for clarity.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
93	06	<del>53</del> 51	PRC Cohen	No	(and all of the other maps) The Legend uses the term "Walkshed". I don't think that term was used previously, as opposed to "travelsheds" on page 51. Some orientation on that terminology might help.	The correct term is "travelshed" and it was defined on page 51. Will make the correction throughout the plan for consistency.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
94	06	<del>69</del> 67	PRC Cohen	No	--In the 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> to last line, change "their" to "its" --In the 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> line, unless NRPA is previously defined, maybe put a parenthetical for what it is. If it's previously defined, refer back. --In the 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 3 <sup>rd</sup> line, the term "per capita" is used. Consider using a more easily understandable term. Is it "per resident"??		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
95	06	<del>70</del> 68	PRC Cohen	No	In the 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> to last line, delete the comma after "provides"		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
96	06	<del>70</del> 68	PRC Cohen	No	In Figure 6.7, same issue as on the maps as to the term "walkshed" both in the Distribution Criteria and in the *Note.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
97	06	<del>71</del> 69	PRC Cohen	No	In the first line, the term “parkshed” is now used. If that’s different from walkshed or travelshed, consider defining.	Changed to “travelshed.”	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
98	06	<del>71</del> 69	PRC Cohen	No	In the bullet at the bottom of the page, 1 <sup>st</sup> line, delete extra space after “include”		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
99	06	<del>72</del> 70	PRC Cohen	No	Under Splash Pads/Spray Parks, maybe I just don’t understand what the difference is between these two types of amenities. I can’t tell if they’re intended to be interchangeable terms here or not, and whether the bullet means one type but not the other.	They are used interchangeably. We’ll use “spray parks” and delete “splash pads.”	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
100	06	<del>72</del> 70	PRC Cohen	No	Under Bike Skills, 4 <sup>th</sup> line in the bullet material, consider simply defining “pump track” and “connecting flow track” so those who don’t do this activity know what the Plan is referring to.	This section was revised and the references to “pump track” and “connecting flow track” were taken out. This section was written before the closure of the Bike Skills Area.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
101	06	<del>74</del> 72	PRC Cohen	No	Under Sustainability, should we mention that the City has a Sustainability Director, or whatever the title is?	We have not referenced any staff positions in the plan, so we do not recommend adding the Sustainability Analyst.	Jessi	No changes made.
102	06	<del>75</del> 73	PRC Cohen	No	--In the 9 <sup>th</sup> line from the top, revise the last word to “pets” --In the first full paragraph, last line, insert “adversely” before “impact” for clarity.		Jessi	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
103	07	40 74	Merrill	No	Re-title Chapter 7 to “Recreation, Arts & Culture” on cover page. Confirm TOC is correct and other references are correct.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
104	07	40 74	PRC Cohen	No	In the gray background summary statements in the middle of the page, in the 4th line, I personally would insert a comma after “forms”.	Copy editor did not concur.	Jessi	No changes made.
105	07	40 74	PRC Struck	No	In the first paragraph, the term, “critical” is used to describe the Community Center. A bit dramatic in my view, I would suggest “principal” or “primary” instead.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
106	07	42 76	PRC Struck	No	In the description of “Business Sustainability Core Services” under the Reset Strategy, I believe there needs to be a greater emphasis that these programs are still meeting community needs (by in large) in addition to the financial aspect.	The words, “...meet community needs...” were added.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
107	07	42 76	PRC Struck	No	In the “Recreation and Arts Programs” section, should there be made mention of the KCLS Library partnership. (I don’t have the statistics handy, but I would estimate that the Library is most likely the second most used facility on MI – behind the community center).	There were no other references in this section to partners, so Library was not added.  Added a reference to the Library as a facility partner on page 43.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
108	07	43 77	PRC Struck	No	Similarly, the “Recreation Facilities” section should include the Library.	Added a reference to the Library as a facility partner on page 43.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
109	07	43 77	PRC Cohen	No	In the first two lines, “engagement with the outdoors”—Maybe include a couple of examples so people know what you’re talking about??	Sentenced revised.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
110	07	44 78	PRC Cohen	No	--In the left column, last paragraph, first line, the term “embrace life” seems a little odd to me in this kind of document. It sounds almost like a religious leader or inspirational speaker commenting on it. The term embrace is then used again in the first line of the 2nd column, so I was prompted to look back at “embrace life” again, and it still struck me as perhaps out of place again. I know what you mean, but I wonder if there’s a different phrase to consider.  --In the right column, in the last full paragraph, 2nd line, I think “is” should be “are” since the subject of the sentence is plural [“surveys”]	Took the first reference to “embrace” out.  Revised the second sentence.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
111	07	45 79	PRC Cohen	No	In the right column, the “cost recovery and resource allocation philosophy is mentioned in the first and second paragraphs, but I think that’s the first time it’s mentioned in those terms in this document [unless I missed it]. If I’m correct, consider mentioning it by that reference earlier, maybe on page 42 (in the left column in the paragraph after the 3 bullets).	Deleted the sentence entirely. It is misplaced in this plan, the details are included in the Reset Strategy itself.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
112	07	45 79	PRC Struck	No	In the section, “Future Programming Directions”, the first sentence states the “Recreation Reset Strategy will take a few years...”. I would suggest something along the lines of the “Recreation Reset Strategy, began offering programs and activities in mid-2021, and is expected to be fully rolled out by 2023/24 with a focus on speeding up the process, as feasible.” Perhaps add an appendix with the current 3-phase schedule.	The sentence has been revised. The entire Reset Strategy is included as Appendix F.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
113	08	83 81	PRC Cohen	No	At the bottom of the middle blue column, 2 <sup>nd</sup> to last sentence re signage, I have the same reaction as I did in my page 48 comments. If we are going to strive for signage through multiple channels showing trail length, width, grade, and surfacing, we will have either a proliferation of signage within some of our most pristine trail areas and/or we will need very big signs at each trailhead with all of this information for each trail. Again, this subject may merit further policy discussion.	Sentence will be revised as follows:  These trail choices would be clearly communicated through multiple channels, including <u>low-impact</u> site signage <u>where appropriate</u> with key information on trail length, width, grade, and surfacing.	Jessi/ Steve	Submit change with second round of edits.  PRC discussed, no change made.
114	08	83 81	PRC Cohen	No	In the last line of the right blue column, delete extra period after “health”		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
115	08	<del>84</del> 82	PRC Cohen	No	In the left column, 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph from the bottom, in the 5 <sup>th</sup> line, delete the comma before “open space” and substitute “and”		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
116	08	<del>84</del> 82	PRC Struck	No	In the Local Insights section, Figure 8.1 should be explicitly referenced in the narrative so the reader can then easily understand where the numbers/percentages are coming from.	We missed a number of references to the figures in the Plan. We are going back through the entire plan and adding the references in the text.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
117	08	<del>86</del> 84	PRC Struck	No	Figure 8.2 should have an additional column that identifies the “type” of trail based on the “trail classification” outlined on pages 84-85.	Staff evaluated the suggestion and it was not practical to add the classifications given that the summary table is a “roll-up” of trail distances by site. To add the classifications, the trails would need to be broken down by segment. This type of analysis is probably best pursued in the update to the Peds and Bikes Plan.	Steve	No changes made.
118	08	<del>89</del> 87	PRC Cohen	No	In the 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 5 <sup>th</sup> line, delete extra space in “shared-use”		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
119	08	<del>89</del> 87	PRC Cohen	No	The term walksheds is used 3 times in the 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph. See above comments.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
120	08	<del>89</del> 87	PRC Struck	No	Is the “Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Plan (2010)” included in an appendix or sufficiently referenced for reader access?	We feel it is sufficiently referenced and don’t recommend adding it as an appendix.  The Ped and Bike Plan will be updated at some point in the next 5 years or so and will likely be added as an appendix to the comp plan at that time.	Jessi	No changes made.
121	08	<del>89</del> 87	PRC Struck	No	Technical Edit – in the second paragraph there is reference made to “Map 11”. Yet, Map 11 is on p.97 and should be so referenced for the ease of the reader.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
122	08	<del>89</del> 87	PRC Struck	No	Technical Edit – in the section, Access & Trailheads, second paragraph, I would use “East and West Mercer Way” rather than the term, “along the Mercer Ways”. It’s more precise, and better conforms to maps, etc.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
123	08	90 88	PRC Cohen	No	See my comments above regarding Trail Signs and Wayfinding. I'll say again that some trails may appropriately contain all these types of signage, but some would not. Again, further policy discussion may be useful.	Revisions made to various sections on signage.	Jessi	N/A  PRC discussed, removed the words "consistently applied"
124	08	90 88	PRC Struck	No	In the Ongoing Maintenance section, there is a 2018 Trail Structure & Maintenance Inventory Report. First, is the report to be in an appendix or reference library? Second, how, if at all, was this report incorporated into the PROS Plan. Not clear that it was or wasn't?	We only appended the Arts and Culture Plan and the Recreation Reset Strategy to the Plan. A summary of the other plans is included in Appendix H. There are far too many plans to add them all to an appendix.  Chapter 11 and the CIP are consistent with the findings of the 2018 report. Some of the goals and objectives in Chapter 4 are also aligned.	Jessi	No changes made.
125	08	90 88	PRC Struck	No	The section, Trail Signs & Wayfinding, lays out a strategy for various criteria and signage types, etc. It would be helpful to the community to understand if this is an "ongoing" strategy or a new vision, and what is the "state of the signage" effort. Are we essentially complete, need to do an inventory to understand where we are. A bit of data and/or discussion on actual implementation would be quite helpful.	The signage status varies greatly based on the park or facility. Appendix II identifies missing signage at each facility and/or recommended signage for each facility.  The City does not have a master parks signage plan (yet), but that is something that could be considered down the road.	Jessi	No changes made.
126	09		PRC Cohen	No	I found it odd that in all the info. regarding sustainability, maintenance, etc., I didn't see one reference to the use of chemicals. I think that omission might be viewed by some as intentional and improper.	The integrated pest management system is included in Objective 3.6 in Chapter 4. Also listed on page 123 of Chapter 11 (see Integrated Pest Management).	Jessi	No changes made.
127	09	50 92	PRC Struck	No	Under the "Open Space" section, the second paragraph looks to distinguish and delineate "open space" areas from "park" areas. The question I pose is for those land parcels that	The portion of park property designated as open space is managed as open space. Even though these open spaces are adjacent to and/or within a developed park, that does	Jessi	No changes made.  Revision made to Final Draft.



Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
					<p>have both types of areas designated, e.g., Luther Burbank, does one designation take priority (based on relative acreage or some other attribute) such that one could see park amenities being sited in an open space and vice versa. Or put another way, does the designations essentially put an invisible shield around them in terms of usage/development, etc.</p>	<p>not mean that open space may be used for active recreation purposes. A Master Plan or other act by City Council would be needed to change the usage of an area, and would need to align with deed restrictions, acquisition funding agreements, City Code, etc.</p> <p><b>Suggested revision:</b>  The “open space” classification distinguishes natural lands from parks developed for active recreation and other highly managed landscapes. Open space may refer to public properties that are exclusively natural areas or portions of larger parks that are managed as natural areas. They may include trails, interpretive signs, or artwork, along with modest support amenities such as parking or restrooms. These open space lands are managed to conserve and restore ecosystem functions, native vegetation, and wildlife habitat. Since 2004, the system-wide management of these lands has been guided by adopted vegetation management plans, which established long term goals that prioritize ecosystem processes and health over aesthetic values. These goals differentiate the maintenance priorities and methods from those prescribed for developed parks.</p>		
128	09	50 92	PRC Struck	No	In the opening statement for the chapter, the word, “critical” is used twice in the same sentence. I would suggest replacing the first “critical” with “significant”.	Sentence will be revised.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
129	09	50 92	PRC Struck	No	Under the "Open Space" section, the first sentence I would re-word as follows: "Thanks to the foresight of former City leaders, the Mercer Island community .....". We should give praise when well deserved!!		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
130	09	50 92	PRC Struck	No	Under the "Open Space" section, the last sentence of the second paragraph that begins, "However, open space .... or unobtrusive artwork, ....".	Staff does not recommend adding the word "unobtrusive," it feels out of context here. Certainly open to other recommendations.	Jessi	No changes made.
131	09	51 93	PRC Cohen	No	In the final sentence, are these really "interpretive" signs, or are they "wayfinding" or "directional" signs. I personally don't want a proliferation of "interpretive" signage.	They are interpretive sign and there are two or three of them. We believe they were done by a Boy Scout many years ago.	Jessi	No changes made.
132	09	51 93	PRC Struck	No	In the section, "Pioneer Park and Engstrom Open Space," in the second paragraph there is a discussion of park uses, and a comment about equestrian usage being limited to certain areas. Is there any formal designation between leashed and off-leash dogs in certain areas, or is that more of an informal perspective that I have heard??	The off-leash dog designations in Pioneer Park are formalized in City Code.	Jessi	No changes made.
133	09	52 94	PRC Cohen	No	--In the 4 line in the left column, there is an extra space after the hyphen in "second-growth" --Under Large Open Space Properties, the second sentence seems a little awkward. Is the 10 acres a reference to the total of those properties? Whether or not, in the 4th line, I think "is" should be "are".		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
134	09	53 95	PRC Struck	No	In Figure 9.3, I would suggest to be consistent with Figure 5.1, Upper Luther Burbank should be separated from Luther Burbank. I believe due to	If the change is made in one place, it should be made in the entire plan.	Jessi	No changes made.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
					geographic considerations that most community members view these as two different parcels.	The staff discussed this recommendation, and this change would necessitate changing all of the maps and tables in the plan. This is not something that can be done at this juncture, but could be considered as part of a future plan update.		
135	09	<del>53</del> 95	PRC Cohen	No	In the last line in the left column, there's an extra space before the hyphen.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
136	09	<del>53</del> 95	PRC Struck	No	In the section, "Conservation of High-Value Ecosystems" the first sentence needs a space deleted in the term "high-value". Same with "high-quality shorelines".		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
137	09	<del>53</del> 95	PRC Struck	No	Under the section, "Shorelines", the Shoreline Master Program is mentioned. Is that (or should that) be an appendix to this document? Perhaps, just a listing of all related documents, master plans, etc. that are mentioned should listed in a table as an appendix?	The Shoreline Master Program is a chapter of the City's Comprehensive Plan. Staff doesn't recommend adding this as an appendix to the PROS Plan, given that the PROS Plan will also become an appendix to the Comprehensive Plan.  The list of plans is included in Appendix H and I.	Jessi	No changes made.
138	09	54 96	PRC Struck	No	Under the section, "Land Acquisition", there should be made mention of a land acquisition strategy/practice of re-claiming or removing impervious surfaces that no longer serve their intended purpose.	This is covered under objective 3.15 in Chapter 4. Staff does not recommend adding it here given the high-level nature of this section.	Jessi	No changes made.
139	09	54 96	PRC Cohen	No	--first line has extra space after the hyphen	Staff recommended keeping the term hydric soils. It is a technical term, but there is no	Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
					<p>--In the second line under Wetlands, I don't know what "hydric" soils are? Should you use a different term or explain?</p> <p>--Under Land Acquisition, in the 3rd line, insert "a" between "developed" and "park".</p>	shorthand for this as it describes the type of soil you find in a wetland environment.		PRC discussed, added "hydric soils is a term to denote soil found in a wetland environment"
140	09	55 97	PRC Cohen	No	In the 3rd line on the page, substitute different punctuation for the semicolon after "alike". I don't think a semicolon is correct.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
141	09	57 99	PRC Cohen	No	--In the right column under Plant Selection, 3rd line, there's an extra space before the hyphen		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
142	09	58 100	PRC Struck	No	In the second column, I believe "Stormwater Management" needs to have the correct font size and color to reflect its appropriate header.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
143	09	59 101	PRC Cohen	No	In the 2nd column, first bullet, first line, extra space after hyphen.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
144	10	105 103	PRC Struck	No	<p>Figure 10.1 provides data comparisons using national data as provided by NRPA. I wonder if there are any other metrics that would be useful. For example,</p> <p>In the NRPA database, under the Budget section, there is a metric "Operating Expenditures per Capita" that would be a useful comparison, especially as we think about potential levies. Are there metrics where the NRPA comparison would show Mercer Island as a "needs improvement"?</p> <p>In previous PROS plans, there has been included comparisons with local (primarily Eastside cities) jurisdictions to better understand how Mercer Island compares. For most residents and potential residents, this local data is probably</p>	<p>The data that is included from NRPA is the data that staff felt confident in using.</p> <p>The NRPA data on "operating expenditures per capita" was not a good comparable given the variability in how the data was collected and the differences in parks systems around the nation.</p> <p>In addition, the pandemic impacted organization budgets and makes it nearly impossible to do a meaningful comparison in 2020. Going back to 2019 also did not make sense because so much has changed since then.</p>	Jessi	No changes made.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
					more useful, or at the very least an excellent companion to the national data.	The staff recommend leaving this comparison out of this plan, but revisiting the comparisons in a future plan update.		
145	10	<del>106</del> 104	PRC Cohen	No	In the right column, last paragraph, 6 <sup>th</sup> line, change “their” to “its”		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
146	10	<del>106</del> 104	PRC Struck	No	The section, Maintenance & Operations Standards, does a wonderful job of explaining the benefits of establishing standards, but then doesn’t reference any that are currently in use. Perhaps, some need to be proposed.	The City has not updated park maintenance standards (aka park maintenance LOS standards) in over twenty years (AB 3487).  The existing standards do not reflect current operations. It’s on our list to formalize the standards, which is why it was included here. There, are standard practices, however. For example, frequency of lawn mowing, litter pick up, and other typical maintenance activities. For context, the Big 6 Parks (LBP, ICP, HF, MD, SMP, ADP) receive higher level of care then other parks (Slater Park, Groveland, Clarke, Street Ends).	Jessi	No changes made.
147	10	<del>107</del> 105	PRC Struck	No	The section, Operational & Service Challenges Due to the COVID-19 Response, cites a 2020 WA State survey on challenges. Given that we are now (almost) in 2022 a more productive approach would be to highlight what are the lessons learned from the COVID experience, and how is the City emerging from the pandemic. The section, Asset Management, should be written in a more definitive tense by replacing “should” or “could” with “will” or “can”. The document makes the case for asset management, and it’s doubtful that many would disagree, so why not conclude it will be PRC Cohene. If it’s not going to be PRC Cohene, perhaps better to drop the topic.	This request entails a re-write of several sections of the plan where the pandemic was referenced, which is likely beyond the capacity of the project team at this point. The next plan update would be timely for a lessons learned analysis post-pandemic.  “Should” is the correct term for a strategic plan. The City Council will determine which of the priorities move forward to work plans.  Much of what is referenced in the “Asset Management” section requires funding/staff time to be appropriated.	Jessi	No changes made.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
148	10	<del>107</del> 105	PRC Cohen	No	In the left column, 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 1 <sup>st</sup> line, change “its” to “their”		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21
149	10	<del>108</del> 106	PRC Struck	No	The section, Volunteer Resources, should include a comment about reducing “red tape” or barriers for volunteers to become involved. I have heard from many community members that the paperwork, etc. is just not worth the effort. While I understand there is always a balance, the focus should be how to make it as easy as possible to volunteer!!	This suggestion feels out of context for the plan. The current paperwork (background check requirements) are part of the City’s risk management program and a requirement of the City’s insurance carrier.  The implementation of a new software system in 2022/2023 will streamline this process.  And just for reassurance, the staff are committed to process improvements and making it easier to volunteer.	Jessi	No changes made.
150	10	<del>108</del> 106	PRC Westberg	No	Future Initiatives, the last bullet statement is an complete sentence.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/06/21.
151	11		PRC Westberg	No	This chapter is replete with wording that the City “should” do something, “should” consider something, etc. Per my comment on Chapters 1-10 I think all these statements should be changed to “the City will...” It is the City's plan!	Everything in this plan is contingent on prioritization of funding and resources. In that regard, the term “should” is more appropriate. Use of the word “will” is potentially misleading to the community as they may presume it will get done.	Jessi	No changes made.
152	11		PRC Westberg	No	Does the color coding in the last column of the Capital Facilities Plan serve a purpose? If so that purpose should be explained in the text or the colors removed. (Is this supposed to link back to page 45?)	Yes, it links back to the earlier chapter. We’ll add a “key.”	Steve	Revision submitted 12/07/21.
153	11		PRC Cohen	No	PA0156—In the project description, would it be appropriate to include something like “and evaluate the appropriateness and impacts of the	The entire dock structure, including the breakwaters will be evaluated as part of the project. It’s assumed as part of the project and the additional text is not needed.	Jessi	No changes made.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
					breakwater structure to be retained or replaced”?			
154	11	<del>110</del> 108	PRC Cohen	No	left column, 6th line—The word “urgent” strikes me as an overstatement. To me, urgent implies a safety concern requiring immediate attention. Maybe you can come up with a word that captures the high importance without seeming to overstate it.	Deleted the latter half of the sentence.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/07/21.
155	11	<del>110</del> 108	PRC Struck	No	In the second sentence of the first paragraph, drop the phrase, “with project expenditures totaling \$41.7M.” The add a 3rd sentence that states, “It has estimated project expenditures of \$41.7M with identified funding sources of \$17.4M which leaves an expected funding gap of \$24.3M. I believe it’s valuable to the community to show two things – what is the backlog of infrastructure projects AND the City has already been working to establish funding sources. It may also be beneficial to state that some portion (\$XXM?) of the project expenditures is due to COVID restrictions and protocols in ’20-’21 hindering work on them (a backlog).	The sentence will be revised.  The staff do not recommend adding a statement about COVID as many of these projects are not on the current CIP and cannot be attributed to COVID delays.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/07/21.
156	11	<del>110</del> 108	PRC Struck	No	In the second paragraph, second sentence, where the selection criteria are listed, I would add the CFP project prioritization tool; on p.112 it is noted that the tool helped inform what projects made it on to the CIP. There should be a consistency.	Sentence added.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/07/21.
157	11	<del>110</del> 108	PRC Struck	No	Prior to the last paragraph, I would suggest that a new table be provided that summarizes the Project list. As an example, here’s my suggestion: (see Word doc)	Staff evaluated this recommendation and did not create the table. The table is included in the hand-off memo.	Steve	No changes made.
158	11	<del>112</del> 110	PRC Struck	No	The 20-yr project list has two projects without a cost estimate – PA0191 (Expansion of the Native Garden) and PA0192 (Spray Park). I would	The staff do not recommend developing a cost estimate for a project that has not been scoped. There are too many variables.	Jessi	No changes made.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
					strongly encourage an estimate for completeness of the document. Certain citizen groups have researched PA0191 and a \$150,000 price tag is not unreasonable. Similarly, looking at estimates for playground replacements, etc. an estimate of \$500,000 is in the ballpark. Clearly, a number of variables at play here that could move the estimates up or down.	Both projects, by being included in the CFP, will merit consideration as part of a future master plan process. Cost Estimates will be established once an agreed Scope of Work is developed as part of the site-specific master plan.		
159	11	<del>112</del> 110	PRC Struck	No	I would include a table similar to above that summarizes the 20-yr project list using the same criteria (90 projects listed). While the listing of the individual projects is important for inventory and planning purposes, for many readers just a summary is sufficient. Moreover, it allows the reader to easily compare the 6-yr and 20-yr lists to see where the urgency lies, etc.	Staff evaluated the possibility of developing a table, but decided against it given the time constraints. As the 20-year list is further developed, the staff will work on methods to better sort and summarize the project list.	Jessi/ Steve/ Merrill	No changes made.
160	11	<del>115</del> 113	PRC Struck	No	In the "Preserving Natural Character & Open Space Areas," the term "Natural character" areas is introduced without a definition for the reader. It would be instructive to inform as to what is being discussed, or perhaps the title should read, "Preserving the Natural Character of Open Space Areas?"  In the second paragraph of this section, the second sentence refers to a "baseline investment." Again, it would be helpful to the reader to define and quantify. I assume we are referring to other projects that are listed as "ongoing maintenance" and if so, please confirm and quantify so the community understands what that is.  Of the four bullets on capital recommendations in this "Natural Character" section, I'd put the	Changed the title of the section.  Moved the bullet up.  Added a reference to CIP estimate for open space maintenance.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/07/21.



Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
					fourth one (“develop strategies”) FIRST as I believe that’s most important, and maintain the order of the remaining three.			
161	11	<del>115</del> 113	PRC Struck	No	Grammatical Edit – Under the ADA section, the second paragraph, the last sentence should be reworded along the lines of: For example, should the local government....., and if more than one facility is available ....., only some facilities may need to be accessible. As currently worded, that sentence is awkward to read. In the next paragraph, it states a 2019 assessment of non-compliance. To put a better transition to the next paragraph, I would suggest, “To help address those issues of non-compliance, most of the 2023-2028 Parks CIP projects .....”	Took out the awkward sentence.  Revised the other sentence.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/07/21
162	11	<del>115</del> 113	PRC Westberg	No	Third paragraph, right column: .....access to amenities such as trails and parking modifications and constructing new access where appropriate. Delete the word "modifications."		Steve	Revision submitted 12/07/21.
163	11	<del>116</del> 114	PRC Cohen	No	--1st column, 2nd bullet, 1st line—The word “immediately” strikes me as an overstatement (like “urgent” earlier) and seems like an unrealistic recommendation in any event, given other City tasks. I would either delete “immediately” or tone it down with a different word or phrase. Something like “as soon as reasonably possible” is better, but still seems to imply too much urgency.  --1st column, 2nd bullet—If a reference to evaluating the breakwater situation is going to be added, this may be a better place than in the project description earlier	The staff <u>did</u> intend to convey that this was an immediate request. Upon adoption of the PROS Plan the staff will immediately seek an appropriation to fund the Master Plan.  The entire dock structure and shoreline will be evaluated. It is not necessary to call out individual amenities.  As an example, biking is an alternative transportation option to access this site.	Jessi	No changes made.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
					--2nd column, at the top—I don't have a problem conceptually with improved access via alternative transportation modes, but since South Park is in the 6 year Plan, I'm having trouble visualizing what that alternative mode might be, given the steepness going down plus vehicle traffic. The same may be true of some of the other steep access landings.			
164	11	<del>116</del> 114	PRC Westberg	No	First paragraph under Beaches and Shorelines add the word "public" between "recent" and "engagement"		Steve	Revision submitted 12/07/21.
165	11	<del>117</del> 115	PRC Struck	No	In the "Athletic Fields" section, there is discussion about the use of synthetic turf usage/replacement. As I understand, the current versions of such turf is permeable, and if that is correct, I would make a comment to that point. It reduces the arguments around impervious surfaces.	While the synthetic turf is permeable, it is still considered an impervious surface. Staff do not recommend adding this language.	Jessi	No changes made.  PRC small group did not include in hand-off memo
166	11	<del>118</del> 116	PRC Westberg	No	I suggest the following rewording in the first sentence, left column: "...project, first identified in the Luther Burbank Master Plan, will repurpose the Boiler building....." Delete the sentence beginning "Given the significant funding..." It isn't necessary.		Steve	Revision submitted 12/07/21.
167	11	<del>118</del> 116	PRC Cohen	No	1st column, under Property Acquisition Reserve, 2nd paragraph, 3rd line—Consider substituting a different word for "small". Maybe "modest"?	Change made.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/07/21.
168	11	119	PRC Struck	No	In the "Parks CIP Implementation" section, I believe there should be a table something along the lines of the example below (see Word doc). A reference is made to Appendix K (which is not available yet) providing a comprehensive review so perhaps something is already provided.	Appendix K was published with the Preliminary Draft. Staff do not recommend adding a separate table.  We will instead add the revenue projections to Figure 11.1 or as a separate figure.	Jessi	No changes made.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
169	11	119	PRC Westberg	No	First paragraph left column, delete the comma in the first sentence		Steve	Revision submitted 12/07/21.
170	11	120	PRC Cohen	No	-- left column, under Enhanced Local Funding— For the reader’s sake, consider a quick description of “councilmanic” bonds. I’m pretty sure it’s not a bond approved by a manic Council member, but .....	All of the revenues are spelled out in detail in Appendix K. There are just too many to cover in detail in this chapter.	Jessi	No changes made.  Reference to Appendix K included.
171	11	120	PRC Cohen	No	--left column, under Parkland donations & Dedications, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence—Park dedication in lieu of impact fees is something the Planning Commission, Design Commission, and Council have grappled with for years, either directly or by implication. I’m not sure I’m yet educated enough on this subject to make this statement in a recommended PROS Plan. Maybe it’s just the wording—as opposed to saying this concept is something the City may want to evaluate.	The code already allows for property to be dedicated in lieu of a fee payment. The tool isn’t used often, but it is currently available.	Jessi	No changes made.
172	11	121	PRC Struck	No	In the Volunteer & Community-based Action is a comment that volunteer coordination requires a substantial amount of staff time. The flip side of that statement is that there is a burden placed on the volunteers as well, and it behooves the City to streamline the process from both perspectives!	Duplicate comment, see previous response.	Jessi	No changes made.
173	11	122	PRC Cohen	No	right column, 4th full bullet—I’ve already commented multiple times on my concerns regarding a comprehensive wayfinding and signage plan. Some wording suggested earlier in the draft could be added to mitigate my concern a little with this specific reference. Or maybe add something like: “Such a plan should recognize the differences among various parks and trails and consider the appropriateness and importance of signage in a particular area	Revised to read, “Develop a comprehensive wayfinding and signage plan to include consistency in branding and design. <u>The plan will identify recommendations as to type, scale, and number of signs and consider a low-impact approach to system-wide signage.</u> ”	Jessi	Revision submitted 12/07/21.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
					weighed against potentially adverse experience impacts of signage proliferation.” [I’m sure that sentence could be condensed!]			
174	11	122	PRC Struck	No	As an observation of the section, “Future Work Plan Items and Other Considerations” the section reads like a laundry list of “to do’s”. Nothing wrong with that. What I found wanting is how does one determine what’s first, etc. I suggest providing a narrative that better helps the reader understand the methodology and process to bring these to fruition. Given that resources are scarce, should there a cost-benefit analysis, etc. similar to what the Commission did for the CFP.	To be candid, it is a laundry list. Many of these items originated from the earlier version of Chapter 4 (Goals) when we took out items that were too specific for that chapter.  It will be up to the City Council to set work plan priorities and fund the various projects.  The staff and boards and commissions will make recommendations to advance work plan priorities ahead of each biennial budget cycle.  Many, many things can change over the next several years, including a change in planning and project needs. Staff does not recommend a deep dive on this list at this time.	Jessi	No changes made.
175	11	122	PRC Struck	No	In the “Future CIP Funding” section, the fourth bullet references the Interlocal Agreement between the City and MISD. One point of interest is the School District’s ability to limit access to facilities (during non-school hours) compared to the City’s open door policy.	Staff did not make a change to this section. It’s generally understood that MISD campuses are closed to the public during the school day.	Jessi	No changes made.
176	11	122	PRC Struck	No	In the “Future Facilities” section, a water spray park is mentioned with a comment that it doesn’t need lifeguards. Since the City no longer employs lifeguards, I think that point is moot. Similarly, the last idea presented relates to E-bikes/shared mobility. Are we suggesting that the park space should have different rules for	Lifeguards reference is removed.  The reference to E-bikes and E-scooters is simply that they are here and we do have a plan as to how to address their use in parks facilities. This item is moved to the “Future Policies” section.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/07/21.

Item #	Chapter	Page	From:	PRC Review Needed:	Suggestion	Staff Comments:	Assigned To:	Status:
					shared mobility than non-park space? Not sure if this topic is truly germane or separate for parks?			
177	11	123	PRC Cohen	No	left column, 1st bullet, 2nd line—I don't know what "natural play features" that would be installed means. Please consider defining or using a real-world example.	Additional sentence added.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/07/21.
178	11	123	PRC Struck	No	In the "Future Operations & Best Practices" section, the first bullet refers to the establishment of park maintenance standards. This statement implies that the City has no standards?? If true, then this should be a high priority; if not, I would modify the bullet to say enhance park maintenance standards. In the "Future Operations & Best Practices" section, revise the last sentence of the fourth bullet to read, "Evaluate, and if feasible, pursue pilot programs to field...."	The City has not updated park maintenance standards (aka park maintenance LOS standards) in over twenty years (AB 3487). The existing standards do not reflect current operations. It's on our list to formalize the standards, which is why it was included here. There, are standard practices, however. For example, frequency of lawn mowing, litter pick up, and other typical maintenance activities. For context, the Big 6 Parks (LBP, ICP, HF, MD, SMP, ADP) receive higher level of care than other parks (Slater Park, Groveland, Clarke, Street Ends).  Other change made.	Steve	Revision submitted 12/07/21.
179	11	123	PRC Struck	No	In the "Future Recreation Programming & Cultural Arts" section, the first bullet should have added the following, "As the recovery ..... recreation staff should evaluate and pilot new programs...."	Added	Steve	Revision submitted 12/07/21.