Hackmann, Richard

From: Mark Michael [mark_d_michael@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2010 2:33 PM
To: IBRC
Subject: Format of Chart E

It would be helpful if the summary of projected infrastructure costs were broken down into more than one different presentation format:

- By type of project or capital asset (e.g., buildings, streets, sidewalks, parking lots, bridges, pathways, parks, open space, etc.)
- By nature of expense (e.g., (i) deferred maintenance; (ii) periodic/annual maintenance, or (iii) future/planned improvements
- By sources of funding (e.g., (i) unfunded (or partially reserved) within the 5-year planning horizon or (ii) funded/fully reserved)

And while I don't have a specific suggestion for how to organize another view of the infrastructure funding needs, it may be possible to use a simple color code (e.g., green/yellow/red) to denote level of urgency. For example, if maintenance of a particular project or capital asset may be deferred with minimal risk to public safety or the projected life of the asset, this may be deemed less urgent or lower priority (e.g., green). On the other end of the spectrum, expense for maintenance that is critical and time sensitive to protect public safety or preserve the useful life of an asset might be identified as most urgent and highest priority (e.g., red). Other matters might fall in the middle (e.g., yellow). Various factors might be considered in classifying projects in such a "heat map."

\Mark

Mark Michael

1215 Parkinson Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94301
650 328-1506 (h)
650 328-7906 (fax)
650 380-1861 (c)