

## Hackmann, Richard

---

**From:** Bob Stillerman [bob@rsic.biz]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 21, 2011 6:37 PM  
**To:** Hackmann, Richard; IBRC  
**Cc:** Leland Levy; Ray Bacchetti; Gary Wetzel; Alex Panelli; Mark Michael; Emslie, Steve  
**Subject:** Proposed Working Group

Richard, Please distribute this email to the IBR Commissioners in accordance with City policies. Please also post a copy on the IBRC web page.

Thanks,

Dear Commissioners,

**Background:** At our last commission meeting we added a discussion topic for our next meeting to consider alternative IBRC organizations to the Working Groups discussed on 9 June. In light of the de facto cancellation of the 23 June IBRC meeting by the co-chairs, and the imminent Commission milestones that are approaching, several of us are proposing via this email to engage a parallel effort in order to address the future infrastructure needs of our city and provide recommendations in our report to the City Council.

**The Past:** Looking backwards, the Public Safety Building and the Municipal Services building were endorsed by prior Commissions or planning mechanisms within the city. The PSB was blessed in June 2006. As we learned at our last meeting, the MSC proposal dates back as far as 10 years. The need for Public Safety has not gone away, is likely still a good idea, but certainly doesn't need endorsement by the IBRC to move forward. The MSC may have merit, but could be refreshed and positioned in a more forward looking manner. Focusing the Commission's efforts solely on these two assets appears to waste an enormous opportunity for the IBRC to contribute positively to the future of the City.

**Situation:** After many hours of commission time in understanding the infrastructure issues, one of the fundamental questions (putting aside financial reporting for this discussion) that arises is how infrastructure provides the foundation of resources for delivering services to residents and businesses. What is the scope of municipal resources and the nature of the services we wish to offer? How do these evolve over the next quarter century? Do we, as a commission, make a significant impact or deliver on our mission if we simply polish the status quo: the PSB, MSC and fire stations?

**Proposal:** Form the "Infrastructure Futures Work Group (name subject to change)" to address key questions before the IBRC, and document the recommendations in a report:

- Take a forward look towards services and infrastructure
- Note how well the existing infrastructure provides those desired services
- Identify trends (e.g. population growth, increasing use of cyberspace) that suggest new strategies to meet future needs
- Put forth a set of goals, suggestions and proposals for optimizing Palo Alto infrastructure for the future.

**Actions:** A number of commissioners have already expressed interest to take this perspective, including Mark Michael, Alex Panelli, Gary Wetzel (time permitting) and myself. We, along with others who may be interested, plan on meeting as a separate WG early next week. We will propose endorsement of this WG by the full

commission at our next full Commission meeting. Other Commissioners who may be interested in joining this WG are invited to send an email to Richard Hackmann by Friday. I will follow up with Richard at the end of the week. Once we have the lineup of WG members, we will schedule a meeting to continue our efforts.

We hope to develop an action plan and timeline that is consistent with the December deliverables at our first meeting (TBD).

Regards,

***Bob Stillerman***

***t: +1-650-326-4800***

***c: +1-209-483-4800***