

Mayor’s Blue-Ribbon Committee on Prescott Park Phase 1 Improvements
October 5, 2021, 3 – 4:30 pm
City Hall Chambers and Online / Zoom Meeting

Meeting Minutes

ATTENDEES

- Beth Margeson (BM)
- Councilor Petra Huda (PH)
- Robin Lurie-Meyerkopf (RLM)
- Genevieve Aichele (GA) (by zoom)
- Tom Watson (TW)
- Peter Rice, City of Portsmouth (PR)
- Joe Almeida, City of Portsmouth (JA)
- Ted Touloukian, Touloukian Touloukian (TT) (by zoom)
- Carlos Guzman, Touloukian Touloukian (TT) (by zoom)
- Cheri Ruane, Weston & Sampson (CR)
- Cassie Bethoney, Weston & Sampson (CB)

SUMMARY OF PRESENTATION AND COMMENTS

TW	Roll call. Approval of previous meeting minutes. Page 3 Reinforced Concrete Pipe correction approved. Review of agenda.
PR	Provided a brief overview of the last five months since the Committee met. Scope of work is finalized, and the contract has been executed. We began surveying and doing some of the investigatory work for construction documentation. We now need input from Committee on elements of the design and present a draft schedule for review.
JA	Reminder that we are focused solely on Phase 1 of the Master Plan.
CB	<p>Provided an overview of the schedule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kicked off Phase 1 work in mid-July. • Updating limits as we figure out how we will tie-in to other Phases and the existing park. • Design milestones take 2 months + 2-week review + 2-week cost estimating. The schedule identifies 30%, 60%, 90%, and 100% deliverables running one after another as a best-case scenario (no delays), through to Nov 2022. • Environmental permitting can take 3 months for the state level and 6 months for the federal level, totaling 9 months. Permitting would not begin until design hits 60-75% milestone. Schedule for permitting constitutes the worst-case scenario. • Geotechnical borings were completed in late August. Lab information from those borings is just coming back and Weston & Sampson will submit report from this information shortly. • Stormwater test pits were held off until the Arts Festival moved out their trailers. They will be completed in mid-October of this year. • Once test pits are done, 30% drawings will be completed and submitted to the city at the end of October.
RLM	Do the results of the geotechnical borings affect the design or the schedule?
CB	The borings tell us what is going on underneath the ground and guides the design of the foundation for the Shaw. The report findings will not hold up the schedule.
PR	We will not make an assumption on the foundation because the geotechnical report has not been submitted yet.
RLM	And the estimated cost will follow the geotechnical report?

CB	A cost estimate will be completed after each milestone (30%, 60%, etc). Once we submit the 30% plans, we will estimate costs based on those plans. Investigatory work (borings, test pits) informs the evolution of the plans.
TW	What type of issues would cause the schedule to slow down?
CB	There could be any number of environmental permitting queries. For example, historical resource notification will have an above ground reviewer and a below ground reviewer, so an archeologist will be involved in that process. We will know after the pre-application meetings that we are scheduling now. Those meetings will help us respond early so we can anticipate any issues in our permitting applications and keep to the schedule as best as possible.
TW	Is there a sense that there will be issues with moving the Shaw?
CB	It is a historic building, which is certainly challenging.
JA	We have had structural engineers out to assess the building to make sure it would survive a move. Any modifications that would need to be done to move it will be documented. They are opening up small spaces beneath the shingles to find out what kind of wood was used. Plywood may have to be added for stability. It is a complicated process, but I have done it many times in my career.
PH	Can we talk to the state off the record and find out anything?
CB	Yes, that is exactly what the pre-application meetings are intended to accomplish.
PH	Is there a chance they will not allow the building to be moved?
JA	No, there is always a way; it is just a matter of what needs to be done.
TW	Next item on the agenda are design options for the reconfiguration of Water Street.
CB	Here is a two-page presentation with options A and B. Note the limits of Phase 1, so the formal gardens are not included. Do we like a parallel parking option (A) or a head in perpendicular parking option (B)? Both keep two-way traffic as well as a pedestrian walk along the back of the Shaw. Both are slightly bigger than the parking area now, and right now there is no pedestrian walk between the Shaw such that the driveway and building edge meet, which is not ideal.
JA	Also, part of the difference is that these surfaces will be 3.5 to 4 feet higher in elevation than they are now, tying back into Marcy Street.
RLW	And this helps with flooding.
CB	Yes. The benefit of Option B is that we have more length for the rise in elevation, making it a gentle slope of just over 2%: imperceptible and ADA compliant. We can have 1 or 2 handicap spaces. The parallel spaces, as they are now, are not ADA compliant. We can lift the parking lot with the grade and the Shaw and maintain the tree allée, infilling with a few trees to fill in the gap.
RLM	Is there a place in the parking for musician trailers or buses to park or drop people off?
TW	The green space near the entrance.
PH	Great. Right now, there is no allocation of space for bus parking.
CB	There are two dark green spaces show on the plan indicating reinforced turf, to maintain fire access to the Sheafe without the need for pavement. This is something we are working through: these two different parking alignments create different opportunities for trailers to be sitting behind these buildings. We are talking with Prescott Park Arts Festival (PPAF) to gain a full understanding of their needs for trailers outside the building vs. what can be moved inside.
BM	I like Option B because it seems to provide more spaces. I like the walkway. Also handicap parking spaces are being eliminated from the lot on the other side. I think we must have some handicap spaces. This needs to be handicap compliant, otherwise there is no way anyone with accessibility issues can access this park.
CB	The other benefit is that, in Phase 2 and 3, the parking will be tucked behind the buildings and

	trailers will be hidden.
RLM	Can you talk about the difference in width between Option A and B.? The bump out on Option B is how wide, and how much green space is absorbed into parking?
CB	The width of the drive, in both cases, is 24 feet wide. The width of the parallel spaces is 10 feet. Option A is 34 feet. In Option A, there is a turnaround space so that if all the spaces are taken, you have a way to get out. In Option B, the length of those spots are 19 feet, so 24+19 = 43 feet.
TW	An additional 8 feet if we do the head-in parking. And the additional green space. Those are the width of a legal parking space, so it is 11 feet.
CB	Yes.
JA	A lot of that is already paved now because there is a sidewalk there.
PR	And there is pavement all the way up to the Sheafe building right now, so you are going to regain some green space.
GA	Echo what Beth said about the handicap spaces being very important for the public but also the stage. As a nonprofit, they must be ADA compliant.
TW	Are you looking for a vote?
CB	I think we would like a recommendation on which option the Committee would like to pursue.
TW	Could the backstage area end up requiring some use of the parking spaces?
CB	It could. We just do not know yet. With the schematic design of the moveable stage and conversations with PPAF underway, we are learning what can be fit inside vs. what will need to sit behind the stage.
TW	But if it was to be, even if it was transitional for a couple of years, it would almost have to be the head-in parking because trailers are too wide for parallel parking.
JA	That is right.
PH	Unless they take up a few spaces and park that way.
TW	What I am saying is: you could put a temporary trailer into the head-in parking. You could not do that with the parallel parking.
PH	I see.
CB	I think we can be creative about a temporary condition where the trailers sit. Maybe we take up one of the paths of travel and park trailers along that edge.
BM	Just to note the festival has permitted parking here from May 1 to October 1. It would probably be up to them to decide how they want to use that permitted space.
PR	That is the Artists and Arts Association of New Hampshire.
TW	I assume some of these licensing agreements are going to have to be amended if the stage is going to be moved.
BM	They are not up for renewal for another two years.
PH	It might take two years.
TW	However, if the stage is moved, those licensing agreements will need to be amended anyway.
RLM	We are talking the section from the walkway down to Marcy in Option B? And the same place on Option A? When TW said something about putting the trailers in, where were you thinking on that?
TW	Once the stage is relocated closer to the present location of the Shaw, there will be a lot of trailers that are going to have to be condensed and located somewhere behind it. I know that is what TT has been working on and what is coming up in the next section. My thinking is that there is probably going to have to be a transition until we have the new addition to the Shaw. Current uses of contemporary trailers are going to have to be incorporated into this somewhere. We may need to use some of the parking spaces for those temporary trailers until we can figure out the backstage activity.

PR	The trailers would be perpendicular to the building and be more compact than if they were strung out along parallel to the building. I like Option B just because it gets the cars farther away from the roadway and it is screened a little bit better.
PH	And there is more handicapped parking available.
TW	With parallel parking there may be no handicapped parking available.
Vote	Unanimous consensus for Option B.
RLM	It is easy to transition to the next stage if we select B?
TW	That is the next item on the agenda.
PR	There will be a period between the raising of the Shaw and the configuring of the stage. What will the Arts Festival look like in that time, and what can that tell us about the stage configuration?
PH	Sometimes when people see construction work being done, they speculate about the future. Articulating this interim gives us a chance to communicate with people clearly.
CB	TT will walk through what it looks like when the Shaw is moved, but also what the park will look like during the interim period between phases.
TT	We are going to be retaining the Shaw building and demolishing the Lean-To and Garage. We will be refinishing the exterior, but also picking up the building, and raising the grade to provide direct accessibility and prevent flooding. Once the Lean-To and Garage are removed, there will still be some Arts Festival programming needs. We looked at the stage size of a typical event with the Charlie Brown event this past summer as an example. The question is what do we do with the storage trailers for the event, and how could they be relocated? We took measurements and spoke to the staff of the Arts Festival. Trailers are taking a lot of the sightlines to the Shaw and minimizing the park-first experience. Once we demolish the Lean-To and Garage, we will have to consolidate some of the programming storage inside the Shaw. Then once we pick up and move the Shaw, it allows the stage to be relocated. The Water Street parking area will certainly benefit from less impact, but there will still be trailers. During Phase 2, what amount can be brought into the existing building? What could be brought into a Phase 2 Addition (probably utilities would help improve the function)? That leads us to build a portable set of trailers that could expand and contract based on the size of events. We are still concentrating on Phase 1, to restore and move the Shaw, and will come back with a further report. We still must discuss how the site should be used after Phase 1, and the right amount of square footage that represents a middle ground. Will some trailers be left on site? Or is there an option that stores all the contents of the trailers in the building? This is the feedback we are looking for.
BM	Phase 2: the Addition takes the place of the Lean-To and the Garage?
PR	This just shows a placeholder; there is no design. The Addition will have to be code compliant; an elevator is needed in there. The Addition will also make the Shaw building code compliant. TT is asking: do we just go with code compliant with the Addition, or do we include some or all the trailer functions? It does not all need to be decided now, but a general direction would be helpful for the design goals.
BM	I thought there were going to be offices in there as well?
PR	There could be. It comes down to what we want to do. We are thinking about Phase 2, but also in the interim, how will everything function for PPAF.
BM	You cannot eliminate all trailers. We also need to think about how it is going to function for the park. We do not want a wall in the middle of the park. I sense that we will not want to add a lot of building there.
TW	What do you mean by not a lot of building there?
BM	I do not know. It is very preliminary right now and I would need time to assess. I remember that

	we were going to put an Addition on the Shaw for compliance, but we were not going to interfere with the internal structure.
TT	It was pointed out to us that although each trailer has a specific use and each floor of the Shaw has a use, there was a great opportunity for consolidation by PPAF. It is possible that an Addition that is two or three floors could accommodate a large amount of storage. The question is how you make those uses adaptable in the off-season so that the building can be fully functioning throughout the year as a civic / public use.
RLM	I guess I would agree with BM. I am surprised we are already considering questions about Phase 2 when we are not halfway through Phase 1. This is the first time we are seeing this and I am trying to figure out what is on page 5. There is a lot of office space there and I do not know if we have discussed whether that is what we will have. We do not know from PPAF what kind of opportunities there are for trailer consolidation. I think it is a little premature to start talking about any of this now. I need a lot more information.
PH	Or more time.
PH	I am not as concerned because Phase 1 informs Phase 2. I would like to hear from PPAF or invite them to tell us how much consolidation they really could do. This is an opportunity for them to do that, and how many trailers might they need for space issues.
JA	We did have two or three meetings already with Courtney and PPAF staff to discuss that very issue. Not to say that more is not warranted, but we did bring them to the table to talk about their needs.
TW	Historically, the backstage trailer area is something that has been growing over two decades. Fifteen years ago, it was just three trailers. Now we have a fenced in area with ten trailers. To move forward, we need to have a down-and-dirty conversation with PPAF about what they really need. To be consistent with the park-first theme of the master plan, any activities that are not essential to putting on performances should not be in the park. I realize that puts a burden on PPAF and requires conversation. The master plan envisioned buildings would have multiple uses during the season. We need to either put the burden back on you, TT, to drill down and do this, or bring them in to have a meeting with this committee. I think if we were to move the Shaw and have an Addition to make it handicap accessible and then still have a half-dozen trailers, that would be inconsistent with the original vision of the master plan. We cannot plan for having enough space for the largest show. We may just have to define that this is the amount of space available to PPAF and then plan programming around it. A lot of it has to do with the size of each performance, not so much the size of the audience or the nature of the play.
PH	This year they had to spread out a lot more because of COVID. I have spoken to Courtney, and I think she has been very careful about having the space between everything and having people be spaced apart. Hopefully, in the future, we will not have to spread out as far.
GA	I was having a good laugh thinking about performing at Prescott Park in the 1980s when there was nothing backstage. As TW and RLM said, I think it is important to have a conversation with PPAF about what they absolutely need during the summer. Some of these things, for example costumes and sewing machines, could be off site. Why do we need them on site? Well, costumes may need repair during the run of a show if you have more than one show running at the same time. Some of those things are important. Personally, I would love to see as few trailers as possible. If some of these things could be incorporated into that new building, it would be so much more professional and cleaner for the whole park to not see trailers. In terms of size of the Addition, is there a size we do not want it to exceed?
JA	I want us to remember to give Shaw the full respect of the historic structure. It would be wonderful for the Addition to not only accommodate the elevator, but all the bathrooms,

	electrical rooms, and mechanical rooms. The more of the modern amenities that can be removed from the Shaw and put into the Addition the better; we do not want to start hacking the building apart to fit in very demanding modern amenities where the code is not flexible.
TT	That is a great point. The more utilitarian pieces of the Shaw can be relocated, which allows the Shaw to perform at a higher and better use. Maybe the first floor can be enjoyed for civic engagement. Yet, it is an old building and we do not want to put it under undue wear and tear, placing equipment in it that was not meant to perform in that way. A new Addition can help clean up the building and let it operate at its highest level.
JA	It would be wonderful to put the public restrooms in the Addition for compliance, as well.
PR	We are not expecting you to make decisions right now, but the reason we are bringing this forward now is because we felt it was important to start the dialogue. Some of these Phase 2 decisions impact the location of items in Phase 1 (utility conduits, foundation, tie ins, etc). We do not want to waste money or do false work that has to be torn up. We just want to think about where Phase 2 could go to help set us up for that next step. We are not locked into a design or locked into any function, but it helps us think through how things could work.
BM	I do not mean to be resistant; it is just that we just got this. It is one thing to do the parking.
BM	On page 5, this is for the Sheafe. Do you mean Gundalow ticket booth or bungalow ticket booth?
CB	We will fix that.
BM	My thinking on the trailers has evolved from when we were going through the master plan. Being on this committee has changed my thinking a little bit. We certainly want to clean up the backstage area, but maybe not at the expense of a permanent structure.
TW	What TT has laid out involves one additional permanent structure. You do not think that that would be necessary?
BM	No. I am saying that I have come to appreciate the fact that the trailers are temporary. I do not like the way they look, but they are temporary. I have not made any decisions yet but noting that my thinking has evolved. Part of the reason the trailers are there is that the festival has grown and changed since the 1980s. I am in favor of not breaking into the Shaw and I am in favor of more uses. Once you are constructing a building, adding a little more square footage does not add a lot and you probably get a lot of function.
PR	No decisions are being made about this right now. It is just to plant the seed, to start thinking about it, and develop one concept about PPAF could function in the interim.
CB	We are still in conversation with PPAF; we can ask them to consolidate their needs to the best of their ability. They provided us some feedback today which we must digest and build into our planning.
RLM	If I take into consideration what JA and PR said and look at the diagrams on page 11, I think the top 5 are necessary. Obviously, we need the stage, sound booth, band and electrical. Can we discuss the storage and the lounge with PPAF? I am sure changing rooms are going to be a necessity. If we plan to add restrooms on the back of the Shaw, can we consolidate PPAF restroom needs there? Can we consolidate #10? I understand that costume storage is needed during the time the festival is active, but in the off season, is a whole other building needed just for storage? What would be the minimum amount of space PPAF needs? Does new electrical need to be expanded to for the purposed of supporting PPAF?
PR	You have captured exactly the exercise that needs to be done.
RLM	If we could get more information from PPAF, that would be very helpful
TT	It goes back to priorities: how to phase this and the what-if questions around the number of trailers. We are continuing to work with PPAF to understand the square foot needs and how they can best consolidate. We will be pairing that square foot analysis with the needs for the city for

	public bathrooms, electric, etc. We have had these conversations before, where we have strong programs that are active for four or five months. How can we design the building so that it can be very simply adaptable and perform multiple uses throughout the year? It really comes down to getting the highest value out of the building and isolating the appropriate level of uses that we want in the Addition and the existing building. One example would be the costume storage on the 3 rd floor. It is overloading the structure; it is not the right place for it. Those are the kinds of things we would want to come back to and make decisions about what is most appropriate.
CB	The flexible use of each space has really been the core of much discussion. Changing rooms have a certain use that cannot necessarily be adapted the rest of the year, but there are other spaces like their green room that could become flexible office space or conference room space. Just looking at what those uses are and how they can be accessed for the rest of the year is important.
TW	I understand that the Shaw is subject to some grandfathering right now in terms of its ADA status. If the Shaw is moved, does it lose that grandfathering?
JA	Likely, yes.
TW	There is a certain advantage to not having permanent buildings once the Arts Festival breaks down for the season and you have more open park. But we should be considering a second permanent building, as something that would help bring the Shaw up to code. I also, frankly, see it as an opportunity to restore the Shaw to its former glory (not carved up). In many ways it becomes a non-functional building without having the Addition on it (i.e., without the bathrooms, elevator, etc.) I do not think we have to make decisions today, but the original master plan envisioned that we would keep all three structures: Shaw, Lean-to, and Addition. With the water table rising, I am not sure how we can get away without having a second permanent structure adjacent to Shaw.
JA	TT and I have talked about this interim period where you move Shaw; there are additional accessibility issues just because it is raised. And then you are trying to occupy it before Phase 2, but you still must make it code compliant. We have started to shine a light on those issues. It is going to be a design challenge for TT for sure. We do not want to strand a lot of money in something that will be temporary. It is very real design issue, and it is a puzzle.
TW	TT, in terms of relocating the movable stage, what kind of infrastructure is going to be required in terms of footing etc. that is not moveable?
TT	There are varying amounts that can be considered: electrical, underground conduits, utilities, the tiebacks, vertical posts, lateral support, for example. The question will be how Phase 2 can construction take on those components so the temporary stage can be more plug and play with less burdensome requirements. How the stage is set up and taken down may lower costs long term.
TW	Will there be a period between the relocation of the Shaw and the construction of a second permanent building when the stage could be further away from that access? Even 15 feet would allow for more elements until Phase 2 was put in play.
TT	This is another important topic. One of the core requirements between Phase 1 and 2 is the site logistics. I always look at the site like an occupied building. How would you want to control construction and maintain circulation around the park? We need work think through this in a detailed way and can create a series of phasing diagrams once a realized goal is set.
TW	If on page 18, number 2 was moved further north by 15 feet, we could potentially move the two number 4s in between 2 and 3 to further consolidate the space.
TT	Do you mean moving the stage closer to Water Street?
TW	No, just move it from its current location 15 feet shorter than number 2 to create additional space between number 2 and number 3.

TT	A lot of it depends on the overall schedule of the park and the construction and renovation. You could move the stage twice or you could move it 3 times. If phases are compressed, then maybe the stage does not move until after Phase 2 is complete to move it only once. If the schedule is more protracted, then you may be able to do what you are talking about. It is just another angle.
TW	We do not want to put in infrastructure to then have to tear it out.
RLM	On page 18, there may be an Addition, but still trailers in the back?
PH	I think that is during the process.
RLM	Will trailers will go away totally?
PR	That is the question. This design is a placeholder, but the question is: How much should get incorporated into the new building, to minimize the number of trailers, or eliminate them if possible? This is a concept of how the site would look if the building were not big enough to house all those functions, then trailers are going to be needed.
RLM	Then, PPAD needs to tell us what they need here. The park should not be a place for office space or conference rooms. As a park, it should be open. If we are going to build something and then still need room for trailers, we need to look at consolidation and what they really need there.
PH	If I am not mistaken, some of the trailers are just during the festival season.
All	They all are.
RLM	Back on page 11, with all their storage, the total area is 3800 square feet? That is what is in the block here?
PR	TT, is the 3868 is based on what is in the fenced area, correct?
TT	Yes, that is the total area, not of the fence but of the components. We took the square footage of the trailers and came up with a total trailer area and includes storage from the Garage that will also be removed. The question is, are we really at a streamlined number? Is there a sweet spot? When you take out inefficiencies and put them all in the same room, we hope that the square footage will be reduced. We need to drill down on that a little bit more.
RLM	Are saying we only needed 3800 square feet? Would we be able to get an idea of how much space new code-compliant items would take up so we can get an idea of the full amount of square footage we will need?
JA	TT will put code-compliant stairs in there as well.
TW	We will add additional space in the Shaw that is currently taking up some of that function.
PH	Also, we do not want that building, like BM said, to be the star of the show. The big building, when you come up that is the first thing that you see, so we must be careful about the size.
BM	The guidelines say that it must be subordinate, correct? So, it will be slightly smaller.
PH	That is going to define some of the space we have left over.
CB	A clear next step is: what code compliance and utility spaces do we need and what are all those square footages? Pair that with what PPAF has in a consolidated and put it together to see what the total square footage needs will be.
RLM	It boils down to the needs and the wants. What are the worst- and best-case scenarios?
TW	TT - if you can anticipate what space will be available at the Shaw, combine that with space that will be available in the new building, and then cross that against what PPAF really needs, then we can see if we need the trailers at all. Final comment on BM's point – It seem likely that we will need a second building to make Shaw more usable. The tradeoff is that trailers would still be present on site, so, is the park better off having a grouping of trailers for one season or a second permanent building and minimal trailers during the whole year?
RLM	Page 5 - Do we also need to have staff offices and a kitchenette? Can we incorporate some of the space we would have in the Shaw in this whole thing?
PH	I think that is the existing plan.

RLM	I cannot see the new proposed plan.
PH	PPAF has those spaces now. The new is in the total.
TW	The space has been evolving from past years.
RLM	We still have storage: concert, event, active prop storage, and a lounge. What can be pulled out of the Shaw, or used in the Shaw that we would not have to add?
TW	Robin is right. We must ask PPAF.
PH	Courtney may come in and say: great, you are putting in new restrooms? Get rid of the restrooms. There are so many different things that may or may not happen.
PR	Reminder: this discussion is to inform Phase 1 Design. We are not in Phase 2, so we can drill down, but remember that, when we have consultants supporting us, we are spending budget. We wanted to bring these questions forward to help inform the design process, but also start thinking about it early. We have gotten questions from residents, so we want to make sure people understand that we are considering these things. There will be a further opportunity to talk about the specifics. It is a great idea to bring PPAF in, but we have a set budget, and when we deviate from the scope, we must change the budget or add money.
PH	So, have we been at all helpful to you?
PR	I believe so.
BM	Do you feel like you have enough to start planning Phase 2? I think we are settled on Phase 1.
JA	We only talked about it briefly, but there is a huge amount of information in the scheduling here. We should understand that this is an aggressive schedule.
PR	And there are some discussions that can continue that do not hold up the Phase 1 design work. This is an important discussion. It does not stop us from environmental permitting. The site layout and seawall do not change.
PH	At some point should we release some sort of statement to the public? You are getting questions and I am getting questions.
TW	That is on my list of things to get to at the end. Messaging is an issue. Should the committee have a conversation with PPAF without burdening our consultants?
PR	If changes are made, especially the way the programming is set up, it is worthwhile to investigate with our consultants at the table.
TW	Phase 1 involves relocating the Shaw and moving the stage back to create the bowl. Do you need direction from us today for approving the stage at this location, without regard to whether a permanent structure will be built?
PR	I do not think we need that information now. When we approve the 30% Design, we will have more information to present to you again. We should have that discussion with PPAF soon. We have been talking about how we would supply the power and how we would work with PPAF in the interim, because the Shaw building will not be code-compliant at that stage.
RLM	How about timeline here? When do you think you will have that 30%?
CB	We are still on track to submit on October 20 th . Then we will develop a cost estimate based on that 30% submission. We were planning to come back to you right afterward.
PR	Looks like a mid-November check back in.
TW	TT - Do you have anything else you want to add?
TT	Let us confirm that date. We still need to coordinate openings in the Shaw for an exploratory analysis, which is an essential part of the 30% submission.
TW	That would be great. This would be a good time to talk about messaging before we open it up to public comment. The city is in its 6 th year of this project. A lot of people were not around when we adopted the master plan. I am wondering if we can put up a sign in the park to answer people's questions about what is underway on the project.

PR	That is a good idea. We could direct them to the website for resources.
TW	Something that references 'the future of your park'.
PH	Especially concerning the garden. People think the gardens are disappearing.
PR	And which gardens are we talking about?
PH	Not the formal gardens. The trial gardens.
TW	Let's work on something.
PR	Stephanie Seacourt, Joe, Cassie, and I will chat. I think a QR code on a sign could be done.
TW	Opened for public comment.
Courtney Perkins	On behalf of PPAF, thank you all for your time and energy. We are also getting many questions about what is happening in the park. We are happy to help message what is happening. Secondly, to the request that has been communicated several times, we are happy to come have a conversation with this Committee and happy to support this process. We are 100% in support of eliminating trailers. We do not like them either. Anything we can do to support the improvement of the park, so it looks better for the audience experience and visitor experience, we are all for it.

**Motion to Adjourn, seconded
 All Approved**

End of Notes: CB