



**COMMUNITY ASSET MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CAMP)  
OUTREACH COMMITTEE**

**REGULAR MEETING  
Wednesday, August 26, 2020, 5:00 PM  
Minutes**

---

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was held virtually using Zoom and called to order by Chair Bonanno at 5:00 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

Committee Members      Chair Gina Bonanno  
                                    Vice Chair Donna Allen  
                                    Dawn Argula  
                                    Steven Dunbar  
                                    Mark Palajac  
                                    Steve Stamos  
                                    Marco Torres  
                                    Nicol Williams-Pruitt  
                                    Jennifer Yeamans

Staff Present                      Debbie Bell, Management Analyst II  
  Kathy Hughes, Administrative Assistant  
  
  Joan Chaplick, Tim Carroll, Noé Noyola, MIG

**3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Bonanno asked Debbie Bell to explain the public comments process for the meeting. Ms. Bell explained that the meeting was taking place using the Zoom platform. An opportunity for public comments would be provided for each agenda item. Comments were to be submitted using the Zoom Q&A feature. Comments using the Chat feature would not be accepted. Comments were limited to one per person for each agenda item. Each comment should begin with the agenda item number and were limited to no more than 500 words. She explained that if more than one comment was submitted by a single person for a

single item, only the last statement would be read into the record. The public comment period for each item would end when the Chair closes the comment period, and no additional comments would be read for that item.

There were no public comments for items not on the agenda.

#### **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

ON A MOTION BY COMMITTEE MEMBER YEAMANS, SECONDED BY COMMITTEE MEMBER DUNBAR, CARRIED ON A 8-0-1 VOTE (WITH COMMITTEE MEMBER PALAJAC ABSTAINING DUE TO ABSENCE), THE FEBRUARY 12, 2020 MINUTES WERE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED.

#### **5. REPORT ON OLD BUSINESS**

None.

#### **6. NEW BUSINESS**

##### **6.01 Discussion Regarding CAMP Outreach Progress and Asset Survey**

**Findings** – Debbie Bell welcomed the members to the first virtual CAMP Outreach meeting. She reminded the Committee of the two meetings held in February 2020 where they provided input on many items, among them outreach strategy, goals, barriers and motivators, core messages, metrics of success and stakeholders outreach messages. Based on Committee input, we had planned to release many of the outreach deliverables in May 2020 to coincide with many community events. Due to Covid-19, the Committee members helped to revise the outreach schedule. They helped to create and publicize the Asset Management Survey that will be discussed at this meeting. She reviewed their roles as CAMP Outreach Committee members, telling them their roles are critical to the success of this process and that they are the program ambassadors. Their roles include advising staff, sharing their thoughts and ideas, establishing connections between stakeholders and the Asset Management Program and tapping into their personal networks to help spread the word.

Ms. Bell then turned to meeting over to Joan Chaplick of MIG. Ms. Chaplick gave the Committee an update on the work that has been going on behind the scenes the last few month. Project team meetings were held on a regular basis. With the help of the Committee's input in February, they were able to complete the Communications and Outreach Strategy, brand identity, digital newsletter template, online quiz, social media. She said that although the schedule needed to be adjusted, they have continued to move forward.

MIG is creating a tool kit for the CAMP Outreach Committee. She gave them a preview of what the book will contain, saying that it is intended to be an easy reference for the Committee to use to be able to answer questions and to help promote participation in this process.

She shared the newsletter template and explained that it was sent to over 500 residents who have expressed interest in this program. Chair Bonanno asked if the Committee would be able to take advantage of the City's newsletter database, or if they could include items on the City's newsletter to reach more people. Debbie Bell said that she is already planning an Asset Management article for the City's upcoming Fall newsletter that is mailed to all residents. She told the Committee that she will also send any updates to the Asset Management email group. Social media has been active and will continue to be used for updates. With boosted posts, the survey information reached over 20,000 people. She then turned to the meeting over to Noé Noyola of MIG to discuss the survey results.

The complete survey can be viewed at <https://www.livermoreassets.net/asset-survey-results-2020>

Noé explained that the survey was available for six weeks and received 1,121 responses. From those responses, there were 2,017 comments. The majority of the responses came from residents, with a small portion coming from people who work in the City. Overall, respondents showed pride and interest in the community, but there is still a need to build awareness of the responsibility for the maintenance of certain assets within the community. The condition of sidewalks ranked lowest of all assets, and streets were rated as the highest priority. The majority were opposed to reducing asset maintenance as a funding strategy.

Overall, the majority of respondents were satisfied with the condition of the assets and think the City does a good job of maintaining them. In regards to the frequency of use of City buildings, Noé pointed out that there were a large number of "not sure" responses, which could be because people are unclear on the use of City buildings, especially the Airport, the Golf Course and the historic buildings, or they don't use the buildings. He reiterated that the purpose of the survey was to obtain a baseline on where the community stands on assets and their condition.

Noé reminded the Committee that the survey received over 2,000 comments. In order to separate them into categories, they did a key word search using the various asset categories. This way they were able to get more accurate information for each asset and figure out trends. Noé reviewed the comment breakdown for:

- Buildings and Amenities
- Streets and Paths of Travel
- Green Spaces and Aesthetics
- Water Infrastructure

The full breakdown of comments can be viewed via the link above.

Noé then reviewed the priorities. Respondents were asked to rank maintenance activities by importance. He explained that the higher the priority number was (the highest being 14), the more people that ranked that particular asset as highest priority. The breakdown is:

- Roads/Streets – 10.81
- Sidewalks – 9.65
- Traffic Signals – 9.05
- Parks, Plazas – 8.63
- Flood Control System – 8.48
- Streetlights – 8.24
- Landscaping – 7.75
- Civic Buildings – 7.69
- Bridges – 7.43
- Trails – 7.41
- Curb Ramps – 6.34
- Historic Buildings – 5.63
- Decorative Walls – 5.23
- Golf Course – 2.84

Noé then explained the responses to the funding strategies proposed. The majority of people are in favor of public safety repairs and are opposed to a reduction in maintenance.

Chair Bonanno asked if any of the Committee members had questions on item 6.01.

Chair Bonanno asked that the last slide be brought back up (Funding Strategies) and said that all the data was fascinating, and it was just the beginning of the insights we could glean from the survey. She asked what question was posed to the public in regard to the funding strategies, and that the list seemed inconsistent because it seemed to be mixing two questions together (what are your priorities and finding new ways to fund asset management). Debbie Bell read the question from the survey to the committee: “What funding strategies should the City consider for the future” then then gave them a list to choose from. Joan Chaplick said that Chair Bonanno’s question was insight into making the report a little clearer and adjusting the terminology so that there is parallel construction.

Chair Bonanno then opened the meeting to public comment.

Resident Brent Siler commented:

*When taking the survey and how the questions were positioned, it made it*

*difficult to answer the questions to give a perspective that would be consistent with questions at the end of the survey. I would like to see the survey to more direct to the subject matter. The requests could be skewed, for example the sound walls which is important to the look of Livermore.*

Chair Bonanno closed the public comments for item 6.01 and opened the meeting to Committee member comments.

Joan Chaplick reminded the Committee that the survey was about establishing a baseline to help us understand what the community knows, what they value, and their priorities. She said they would like to know the Committee members reactions to the survey:

- What were they surprised by?
- What did we miss?
- What findings do you think are the most important and should be highlighted in outreach campaign tools?

Committee member Steve Stamos said it was a great presentation and he was impressed by the number of responses. He said the level of satisfaction from the respondents was more than he expected, and he was curious to see what the other Committee members thought about what they expected in terms of level of responses and satisfaction. He said the results were a little complex and he understood how they could be hard to read and should be simplified for campaign materials. He said regarding the pie charts, it would be helpful if the “Agree” and “Somewhat agree” categories could similar colors to make it easier to see the divisions between the sides of the categories. Joan Chaplick said that it was something that they also noticed, and it would be corrected. He said the results of the water questions surprised him a little, but that it might have to do with people being confused about the water infrastructure and where the water is coming from, and not knowing if it’s a City, Cal Water, or Zone 7 issue. He said if respondents knew who was responsible for the various maintenance issues, they might feel different on some issues.

Committee member Jennifer Yeamans said she was surprised at first on the responses regarding walls, but then she looked at it in the context of priorities and realized it actually reflects why things are currently the way they are. The walls are not in great condition, but they don’t take priority over more pressing needs. Regarding the chart that dealt with frequency of use, she felt that if the survey didn’t give user the choice of “never” so they probably chose “not sure” even though that isn’t the same answer. She suggested that MIG take that into consideration for all the questions. Regarding the questions on sidewalks and walls, it would be beneficial to have that information per individual neighborhood, in some neighborhoods they would be higher priority than others. She said she

was delighted with the amount of responses and the quality of the information. She suggested that when it is presented in the future, each chart should be paired with a “takeaway” summary statement. She felt it would make it easier for people to understand the material. Joan Chaplick said that MIG does have the capability to do some cross tabbing but that they didn’t want to get too deep into that, as the survey is meant to be a baseline. She agreed that location could be influencing some of the responses.

Committee member Steven Dunbar was surprised that curb ramps were low on the priority list because they are required by state law. In terms of the funding strategies benefitting most people, it was high on the list, but he felt that people didn’t have an alternative to choose from (i.e. by area or equity mindset). He said that when it comes to cross tabbing, it would be helpful to know whether an asset is under the City’s jurisdiction.

Committee member Mark Palajac said he thought the Airport and Water issues should be in a separate category because they are special districts and not subject to the limitations with the City in terms of funding. In terms of the sound wall responses, he felt that it would be interesting to know where the responses came from in terms of where the respondents lived in the City, or what specific area they have concerns with (i.e. Holmes). He feels it could dramatically change the responses and how we react to them. He said that in regards to Committee member Dunbar’s concerns about ADA ramps, he feels they are in great condition in his area, but the sidewalks are not. He feels that knowing where the respondents live would add to the value of the survey.

Committee member Dawn Argula said she would have liked to see more responses, because if the goal is to put out a comprehensive City-wide plan with recommendations, more input is better because it affects everyone in the City. She feels there are areas of the City that don’t get the amount of financial attention they deserve. She feels that having that level of detail from the respondents is critical to help with a targeted strategic plan. Joan Chaplick said that these won’t translate to priorities in a plan, but help us understand what people know and what they think is most important. Committee member Argula also said that more education is necessary as some people don’t even know that we have two water utility companies that service this community. She asked for clarification on the funding strategies slide regarding “replace high cost assets” and “keep non-essential.” Debbie Bell said the question provided options to “replace high maintenance assets with lower maintenance alternatives” and “do not replace non-essential assets when they are beyond repair” but these were inaccurately truncated on the slide.

Chair Bonanno wanted to know why the Airport and Golf Course were included in the survey since they are enterprise assets and the Committee purview was limited to non-enterprise assets. Debbie Bell said that in putting together the survey, leaving off Water and the Airport might confuse people, as most people

don't know the difference between general fund assets and enterprise assets. The plan moving forward with the Outreach process in providing information and fact sheets is to explain those differences. Chair Bonanno said she understood, and that you can see in some of the "not sure" answers having to do with the Airport and the Golf Course reflect the respondents confusion on the matter.

Chair Bonanno also asked how many of the responses came in Spanish. Debbie Bell said she thought it was three. Part of the reason it was so low was because we worked with the school district as they have direct outreach methods to the Spanish speaking population, and it was hard to get in touch with anyone during the process. Chair Bonanno felt it was very important to improve the outreach to all parts of the community without having to rely on the school district and going forward we should try harder to get those responses using other resources. She said those communities tend to be under resourced in every way and we have to be equitable. Noé Noyola pointed out that there were many people that identified as Spanish or Latino in the English survey even though they didn't complete the survey in Spanish, but they were still underrepresented.

Committee member Mark Palajac commented that he was in favor of simplification whenever possible, to make it easier to be successful. He said the focus should be on assets that are supported through the general fund. He also said it can be confusing because there are other entities within the City that are responsible for what some people think are City assets (i.e. Zone 7, LARPD).

**6.02 Discussion Regarding CAMP Outreach Tools and the Next Steps** – Tim Carroll from MIG gave background information on a video which will be used as the next outreach tool. The purpose of the videos is to educate viewers about community owned assets and build awareness of the need for strategic planning that ensures the long-term viability and resilience of shared resources. The video will be two to three minutes long, and possibly split into segments. The recommended format is an illustrated animated style that will allow depiction of a greater range of images and ideas. The videos will be distributed via social media and digital outlets. The key questions that the videos are to address are:

- What are Livermore's Assets?
- How does the City take care of its Assets?
- How is Asset Management funded?
- What is the Asset Management Program and why do we need it?

Tim shared three different styles of videos with the Committee. The first was "History". MIG has been working with the Livermore Heritage Guild and would use archival footage. The video would lead with the unique history of Livermore with a brief visual timeline of the City's infrastructure's growth. It would describe

how the infrastructure ages, and the need for adequate levels of service to ensure asset longevity.

The second concept is “Life Cycle”. This version would focus on one specific asset to describe the levels of maintenance and investment during its lifecycle. The case study approach allows for greater insight into the ongoing operations and financial needs of the assets. It would introduce Asset Management as a strategic way to care for infrastructure. Tim explained that it is difficult for people to grasp the entire concept of Asset Management, and by using one asset to focus on, it makes it more palatable for people understand.

The third concept is “Asset Hound”. It would introduce a canine narrator – a Basset Hound (or “Asset Hound”) who travels around the City. The Asset Hound would sniff out problems and describe how proper Asset Management benefits current and future generations. This concept offers humor and relatable connection, and a potential mascot for collateral and kid-friendly materials.

Chair Bonanno opened the item to public comment. There were none. She then asked the Committee members for their comments.

Committee member Dawn Argula said that she liked that each of the concepts focused on assets, the lifecycle, and the maintenance of the assets. Vice Chair Donna Allen felt that all three concepts could be utilized in various platforms, in particular social media. She mentioned that during these times, more parents are looking to do more activities with their children outdoors and wondered how we could use that to maximize learning. Joan Chaplick reminded the Committee that there aren't enough funds to pursue all three concepts, and that MIG would like their thoughts on which concept resonates best with them.

Committee member Yeamans ranked her choices as 2,1, 3. She also said she liked Vice Chair Allen's suggestions to get kids out into the City. She suggested some kind of scavenger hunt that can be done offline, to get the families out and about, and help them learn about Asset Management.

Chair Bonanno agreed that involving kids through some kind of activity, perhaps using the “Asset Hound” was a good idea. She also said that being a data person, concept 2 resonated best with her.

Committee member Steve Dunbar agreed with the idea of concept 2. His concern was that we have been using a lot of technical language in the outreach, and although he like the cartoon concept, he didn't feel that it would reach the audience we want.

Chair Bonanno took an informal poll of the Committee, and all nine members agreed that the “Life Cycle” concept would work best. Vice Chair Allen also



thought that the “Asset Hound” concept could work with the appropriate audience.

Chair Bonanno then reopened the public comment for the item.

Resident Brent Siler commented:

*To engage younger residents, even adults, I would suggest Geo Caching where things can be hidden and you find it from hints given within the game. Check out [www.geocaching.com/play](http://www.geocaching.com/play).*

Chair Bonanno closed the public comments and moved to the second part of item 6.02 – Upcoming Outreach Tasks. Joan Chaplick thanked the Committee for their feedback, and said that in addition to the video, MIG is working on an interactive game to illustrate the necessary trade-offs and need for prioritization of the assets. They continue to work on the social media campaign to broaden the reach and promote online engagement activities. They continue to hold virtual briefings where project representatives attend virtual meetings of local organizations and institutions. Noé Noyola gave a quick overview of the outreach program schedule. He asked the Committee to think about ways the engage the community virtually via their contacts, that would allow MIG, staff or Committee members to present a short presentation on the Asset Management Program. He said that they are continuing to work on the Tool Kit, as well as youth and kid friendly items. He also said there will be a second survey sometime in 2021 to help get the word out now that there is a baseline.

Chair Bonanno mentioned that Farmer’s Markets are still taking place, and they would be an opportunity for outreach. She said the Rotary Clubs are very active on Zoom and would be another great opportunity. She said the Climate Action Team did a Zoom program with school aged kids, and might also be a great resource, along with Face Book Live and Instagram Live.

Committee member Steve Stamos went back to the concepts and said that Life Cycle versus History will reach different people depending on how they are framed. He also wondered if we will be communicating Asset Management as a once in a generation heavy lift or a new ongoing effort that the City is putting out.

Committee member Dawn Argula suggested recording a webinar and let people tune in live, record it, and post it on the City website, and possibly other websites as a resource.

Committee member Steven Dunbar suggested including information in the giveaway bags for Bike to Anywhere Day in September. He also mentioned the possibility of using unused bus benches to somehow advertise the program.

Chair Bonanno liked the idea of connecting with other events, especially outdoor, non-contact activities. She mentioned the possibility of having an “Asset Management” mask giveaway, with the website link on the mask. Chair Bonanno opened the item up for public comments.

Brent Siler commented:

*If you look at human nature, the majority spend hours on their mobile device. I highly suggest that the City look at building a mobile application that can be used to better engage with the community on many different topics, upcoming meetings, collect surveys, broadcast messages. Most people will be more willing to engage from a mobile device as they always have it in their hands. You can then use Bluetooth beacons to proactively bring up CAMP topics as people are walking around town or engaging with businesses.*

Chair Bonanno closed the public comments.

Committee member Dunbar mentioned that he had been browsing the website and suggested simplifying it to get an action out of someone, as in “Here’s how we want you to participate”. He also said that public records such as the minutes are an inadequate way of learning after the fact and asked if the custom Asset Management website could get onto the official City website for the public record.

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 6:59 P.M. TO THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING TO BE HELD AT A FUTURE DATE, TIME, AND LOCATION TO BE DETERMINED.