Kelly Anne Brown
Chair, PACS Commission

Overall considerations

Language
I think it's important to be specific about how we're thinking about values versus principles or priorities, and want to make sure that whatever we create for City Council acknowledges that these aspects are not interchangeable.

For me, when we talk about "values," we're talking about those aspects of the park priorities, for example, that are the most important. Drawing upon some standard dictionary definitions of "values," our PACS values should be as "permanent" and "central" as anything can be for a body composed of appointed residents. They should represent broad consensus if possible, and if not, a clear majority of PACS members. Our values should not be open to change based upon the city's financial situation, for example. They are the foundation or bedrock of our decision making. They stay as constant as possible.

Priorities, however, change according to the situation–which could be financial or related to new opportunities unforeseen in earlier situations, etc. Priorities should always be guided by the Commission's values, but may fluctuate according to a variety of factors and needs (unlike values, which stay constant).

Multiple languages
I'd really love for a document like this to be translated into Spanish as early as possible into the process, so that residents who don't read English can participate in any feedback sessions that we may organize. Is there another language that's widely spoken in Costa Mesa other than English and Spanish?

Organization of document
Need for an introduction. The document needs an introduction of some kind. This introduction might speak briefly to how the document came about (brief background on process), and could also provide a bit of context for how to provide feedback (for earlier stages of the document). I do think it's important for the document to be clear as to why it exists, and this could use some attention from PACS.

Ordering. I'd encourage us to think carefully about how we order the various categories in the document. What's the logic of our ordering system? That should be clear.

Need for narrative descriptions. I think that when discussing the higher level concerns of values or priorities, we should try to give concise but descriptive narratives as a part of the document. For example, categories of priorities like sustainability or innovation should have these 3-5 sentence descriptions as part of the document, so that most anyone from the community could pick up the document and have a decent sense of what we're discussing, and why. These

descriptions serve almost like headings, and help provide context for the priorities.

Specific Edits

Values. I would argue that from our conversations, there is broad consensus that "community-centered planning" (this term might need some revision) is a core value for PACS, and should be listed as such. Is there consensus around "equity and access" as a core value as well? I'm not sure, though it has risen to the top of our discussions. If it's not a core value, I'd argue that it represents a critical priority. We may need a discussion around this.

Listing of projects. Is there a way to make our ultimate document even more tangible as a tool for decision makers? What will the document ultimately look like? Is it part cover sheet (discussion of values and priorities) and part checklist (how to think about making the decisions)? For real-time decisions, I'd urge us to consider how this document will be attached to specific recommendations for CIP projects, for example. And in these rough budgetary times, annotating or referencing projects in this way might be both expedient and a helpful way to explain why we're making the recommendations we're making (for the upcoming CIP).

Community-Centered Planning. I'd like to see this value built out in some innovative ways so that it acts as something that we can also aspire to, as a city.