

**Summary of Task Force Comments**

Strengths	Weaknesses
-----------	------------

**1. Vision, Outcomes and Understanding Specific Plan:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very in tune with the Council Vision/Objectives</li> <li>• Sound capture of place &amp; background</li> <li>• Great philosophy of "place"---"It has to be popular"</li> <li>• Liked the term "holistic"</li> <li>• Similar comparable projects to Coyote Valley</li> <li>• Great theme "to build around the waterways"</li> <li>• Meets &amp; exceeds expectations!</li> <li>• Strong understanding of the issues</li> <li>• Good experience/Liked concepts</li> <li>• Good background in park design</li> <li>• Have good local and worldwide experience</li> <li>• Liked pictorial explanation</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not address staging</li> <li>• Did not demonstrate flexibility of approach</li> <li>• Over choreographed</li> <li>• Light on details and on plan parameters</li> <li>• Lacked local experience</li> <li>• Didn't share their vision on densities and on how jobs and housing can integrate</li> <li>• No creativity</li> <li>• Standard approach</li> <li>• Relying too much on past experience</li> <li>• Didn't incorporate plan principles</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

**Other Comments:**

- What role would Jack Robertson play?
- Very straight forward
- Concerned with making sure that all pieces integrate and would succeed

**2. Overall Project Approach:**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly organized and well choreographed</li> <li>• Clear emphasis on zoning/clear and direct</li> <li>• Said first thing was to listen to the Task Force (good)</li> <li>• Very enthusiastic and impressive presentation</li> <li>• Strong process and plan implementation tools</li> <li>• Good listening emphasis; Best firm all around</li> <li>• Creative and enthusiastic!</li> <li>• Good grounded planning principles &amp; "fun to work with"</li> <li>• Good recognition of need for regulatory flexibility</li> <li>• Good local experience (e.g., Santana Row)</li> <li>• Good understanding of stakeholders</li> <li>• Good respect for environment and natural features</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholder interaction process is unclear?</li> <li>• No major waterways in Coyote Valley</li> <li>• Did not focus on Coyote Valley specifically</li> </ul> |
|---|---|

**Summary of Task Force Comments**

Strengths	Weaknesses
-----------	------------

**3. Quality of Presentation:**

**a. Organization:**

- Did not waste time/Good Power Point presentation
- Good organization and work scope
- Impressed that they want a national scope
- Good team credentials
- Best organized and well rehearsed
- Best verbal presentation
- Excellent and to the point

**b. Substantive Content:**

- Great energy and enthusiasm
- Good examples provided and very direct
- Have a good sense of their approach
- Good on technical aspects and details

- Zoning approach glib and trying to please
- Not much attention to the env. issues
- Short on specifics regarding the Vision
- Missing the critical housing pieces
- Not sure where they would start?

**c. Graphic Content:**

- Clear strong graphics
- Good selection/Excellent and capable
- Good range and use of tools
- Exceptional capability/Simulated drive-through good!

- Does emphasis on listening mean loose understanding of plan needs?
- Few specifics about Coyote Valley
- Examples seemed too urban for our setting

---

**4. General Comments:**

- Good sense of creativity and excitement
- They have the experience needed
- Liked their approach to alternatives
- Strong information on zoning ideas

- Great experience with complex master plans at all scales.
- Would have good mutual respect with Task Force
- Covered all the basics but sounded too glib & easy

- They believe in "sustainability" of the Plan
- Public outreach seemed very important to them
- Projections are a bit sold and stark in style
- Did not address specific Coyote elements