community Workshop #1
meeting summary

Time and Location:
November 15, 2007, 6:30 p.m. – 8:30p.m.
Almaden Winery Community Center
5730 Chambertin Drive
San Jose, CA 95118

Attendance:
Approximately 155 attendees participated in the first community workshop for the Martial Cottle Park Master Plan project. Attendees included residents adjacent to the park, living within a mile of the park, staff and others. See attached attendance list for members of the community who signed in for this workshop.

Meeting Summary:
On November 15, 2007, the Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department (SCCPRD) held the first Community Workshop for the development of the Martial Cottle Park Master Plan. The purpose of the workshop was as follows:

- Introduce the community to the park planning process
- Familiarize the community with the park site and the Donor’s Vision
- Solicit community input on issues and aspirations for the park
- Solicit community input on the prioritization of the program elements set forth in the Donor’s Vision
- Inform the planning team’s articulation of park goals, objectives, and programs

Welcome and Introduction
Lisa Killough, SCCPRD Director, and Jane Mark, SCCPRD Project Manager, welcomed the members of the community and introduced the project. Staff also introduced members of the advisory Task Force that is assisting the County and State in this public participatory planning process. Staff also acknowledged the Donor’s representatives and the County’s planning partners including the State of California, Santa Clara County Open Space Authority, and the County Board of Supervisors in this planning process.
Project Overview and Background

Steve Hammond, Principal-in-Charge for Wallace Roberts and Todd, the prime planning consultant, gave an overview of the planning process and schedule, and the history of the Martial Cottle Park property. He reviewed the Donor’s Vision for the park, explaining the program elements depicted in the 2003 Donor’s Vision concept as well as the allowed and restricted park uses identified in the Property Transfer Agreement between the Donor, the County and the State.

Sibella Kraus, president of Sustainable Agriculture Education, the sustainable agriculture consultant for the project, described the concept and history of agricultural parks, and presented agricultural park precedents.

Community Discussion Groups

Workshop participants were divided into eight discussion groups to discuss their interests and aspirations for the park, identify their priorities for program elements set forth in the Donor’s Vision, and identify issues and concerns they had regarding the park. The discussion groups were led by facilitators who are members of the Project Team, comprised of County, State and other agency staff, and consultant staff. The groups’ comments were recorded on flip-charts. These comments are summarized below.

Community Report-back

Representatives from each discussion group summarized the key points of their discussion.

Wrap-up and Next Steps

- The community was informed that all of the information gathered at the workshop would be summarized and posted on the project Web site (www.parkhere.org).
- Everyone who signed in on the Workshop sign-in sheets will be notified via e-mail when the workshop summary is posted, and will be notified of future meetings.
- The next Task Force meeting is scheduled for December 11th, from 6:00 -8:00 p.m. at Gunderson High School. The public is invited to attend.
- The next Public Workshop will be held in the spring, probably in April of 2008.
- The SCCPRD will post the comment form to the Web site for people to download and send in comments via fax or mail.

Summary of Discussion Group Comments

The community was asked to provide comments on the Donor’s Vision through discussions related to the following two questions:

1. **Within the framework of the Donor’s Vision, what activities and features would you most like to see in the park (i.e., which program elements should have the highest priority)? Do you have specific recommendations about any of these program elements (e.g., quantity, character, etc.)?**
2. Are there elements of the Donor’s Vision for the park that raise issues or concerns for you? If so, please identify which program elements are of concern and what you see the issues being, so that the County and State can address them as part of this planning process.

The responses from all eight discussion groups to these two questions regarding priorities and issues are summarized below. The comments are organized by topic within each category. The first set of topics under “Priorities” addresses the program elements identified in the Donor’s Vision. This is followed by a list of additional program elements and priorities that were not specifically identified in the Donor’s Vision. Under each program element, those points that were recorded most frequently on the groups’ flip-charts are listed first. These primary discussion points are followed by a list of all verbatim comments recorded on the flip-charts.

NOTE: While the repetition of a topic by multiple groups suggests its importance to the workshop participants, the tally of the number of times a comment was recorded should not be interpreted as a vote of the community. In some groups a comment was listed only once when it represented the consensus of the entire group. While in other groups, a comment may have been listed multiple times when it was not necessarily the group consensus, but multiple members addressed it. Thus, these tallies are intended only to provide a general sense of the relative importance of each program area and do not represent a statistically valid vote for one program element over another.

PRIORITIES FOR MARTIAL COTTLE PARK MASTER PLAN

Program Elements Identified in the Donor’s Vision

Historic Farm

Key Discussion Points
- The majority of the groups identified the following as high priorities:
  - Preserving historic farm elements
  - Preserving and re-using historic farm structures for park activities
  - Including farm animals and hay rides as part of the Historic Farm
  - Developing interpretive programs and elements that interpret the Cottle family history, Native American history, and historic farming operations in Santa Clara Valley

List of Recorded Comments
- Structures
  - Keep the existing farm buildings
  - New structures should be related to agriculture – things for kids to climb on/play
  - Operating windmill on site

- Farm Animals
  - Pigs, horses, sheep, goats, rabbits, etc.
  - Free range egg farm
  - Petting zoo
  - Live animals pulling wagon
  - Hay ride
• Historical/Interpretive Elements
  - Working equipment, i.e., tractors
  - Native American Indian burial sites
  - Interpret family history
  - Historical aspects of property (family heritage, 4H participation on site, interpreting buildings
  - Like historical aspect
  - Historical Elements
  - Interpretation of family
  - Historic farm interpretation
  - Demonstrate historical work with the horses
  - Historical farming methods
  - Commercial uses to include: blacksmithing, woodworking, etc.
  - Park tour of estate: family, farming equipment, ethnic backgrounds

• Museum
  - Mr. Lester’s home as historic site/museum
  - Museum (Mr. Lester’s vision)

Farmers’ Market

Key Discussion Points
  • A limited number of groups identified the incorporation of a Farmers’ Market as a top priority.

List of Recorded Comments
  - Farmers’ market
  - Farmers’ market & trail system around and through the site

Produce Stand

Key Discussion Points
  • A limited number of groups identified the incorporation and/or expansion of the produce stand, and incorporation of a concession and refreshment stand as a top priority.

List of Recorded Comments
  - Concession and refreshment stand
  - Expand current fruit stand
  - Produce stands

Specialty Crops/U-Pick

Key Discussion Points
  • The majority of the groups identified the cultivation of specialty crops, including crops that represent the Valley of the Heart’s Delight, as a priority.

List of Recorded Comments
  - Representative crops of Valley of Heart’s delight
  - Mini “valley of heart’s delight”
  - Interest in food grown on site
  - Black raspberries – potential crop
- 50 acres (min) of commercial/specialty crops (historic crops/orchards)
- Encourage diverse crops, not monoculture
- Deciduous trees/ heritage flower gardens
- Flower farms, floral gardening

Equestrian Center

Key Discussion Points

• A majority of the groups identified some form of the Equestrian Center as a priority element, but most indicated a preference for a non-boarding type facility (i.e., day use only)
• One comment specifically listed the Equestrian Center as the lowest priority, while another expressed concern about who would use it.

List of Recorded Comments

- Equestrian center (2)
- Equestrian center as therapeutic program for those with special needs
- Equestrian center as part of historical demonstrations/education, family history & how site was farmed.
- Work horses and riding horses for kids
- Lots of horses
- Least amount of priority on equestrian center
- Concern: What is the equestrian center? Whose horses?

Community Hall

Key Discussion Points

• A limited number of groups identified the creation of a Community Hall with classrooms and a large meeting room as a priority
• One comment raised the question of what the Community Hall would look like and who would use it, while another comment questioned the need for a Community Hall.

List of Recorded Comments

- Community center that holds over 100 people, include kitchen, classrooms
- Community hall-gathering space for kids & they can go outside and experience historical aspects (i.e. grange hall)
- Buildings to rent out for community groups
- Event hall with room for 150 people
- New structures for community center – what will it look like? Use of community hall is exclusively educational or open to general community use?
- Why do they need a community house?

Grassy Park

Key Discussion Points

• A limited number of groups identified the incorporation of a grassy park as a priority.

List of Recorded Comments

- Grassy park
- Grassland and lake priority elements
- Grassy fields, what would be allowable uses?

**Trails**

**Key Discussion Points**

- A majority of the groups identified trails as a top priority with the following points emphasized:
  - access into and through the park should be a priority
  - a perimeter trail should be a priority
  - separate trails for different users (e.g., equestrians, bicycles, rollerbladers, and pedestrians) should be a priority.

**List of Recorded Comments**

**General**

- Like all ideas – trails, walk with dogs through park
- Trails are priority elements
- Likes the trail
- Extensive trails off road and away from houses
- Agriculture and trails – passive recreation
- Trails sooner than later, perimeter trail in 1st phase, paved for hiking/biking/strollers
- Trails interactive through park, sooner than later

**Perimeter Trail**

- Perimeter trail (2)
- Perimeter trail as priority for public access
- Trail system around park, access through to Chynoweth
- Trail system around and through the site

**Multi-use or Separated Trails**

- Hiking trails - seniors walking through acreage, rest areas
- No bikes on trails (hiking separate)
- Equestrian trails
- Separate equestrian use from pedestrian use on trails
- Bicycle trails
- Rollerblade access to trails (paved)

**Trails for Exercise**

- Desire exercise trails/ programs
- Trails for exercise, walking

**Access**

- Pedestrian/Bicycle access through the park
- Convenient, easy access (pedestrian) into park
- Access from every direction – get people out of cars
- Neighborhood (walk-in) access points
- Access – convenient neighborhood access (avoid driving)
- Access to park from Branham
- Access points important – especially where
Lake

Key Discussion Points
- A majority of the groups identified a lake or pond as a favorable element.
- Most comments expressed a desire for maintaining a “natural” character and designing it for wildlife habitat or flood control.

List of Recorded Comments
- Lake with trails around perimeter
- Stock lake for fishing
- Groundwater recharge/ lake
- Lake – beautiful space with birds
- Lake – lots of birds, foxes, & egrets (concern about foxes)
- Start lake first, keep it natural
- Lake – connection to flood control/wildlife
- Pond can be used to contain flood waters from Canoas Channel
- Pond/lake should be a natural area – not highly manicured
- Lake for wildlife – birds
- Water source for lake?
- “Cistern” program?

Cultivated Fields

Key Discussion Points
- A majority of the groups identified active farming operations as a priority.
- These comments described historical and sustainable farming, agricultural research and advanced practices, and community subscription agriculture as possible focuses of the farming operations.

List of Recorded Comments
- Advocate active agriculture – less grassy park area
- Focus on ag & farming aspects
- Historical agriculture practices versus sustainable practices (organic farming)
- Organic, sustainable farming
- Agriculture research & advanced practices
- Park needs real farmers – leasing land ok – organic farming only, with special rules & in a contained area
- Interest in community subscription agriculture (CSA)

Orchard

Key Discussion Points
- A majority of the groups identified orchards as a priority element within the park.
- Specific comments suggested heirloom and demonstration orchards as a focus for orchards within the park.

List of Recorded Comments
- Orchards (3)
- Second the heirloom orchard, there is a problem with public access at orchards at Prusch Farm Park
- Small orchards – site not suitable but good to educate kids, valuable for education, heirloom orchards (trees representative of what was present)
- Home garden orchards (demonstrations: i.e. pruning, tasting)
- More orchards

Parking and Maintenance Yard

- Specific reference to parking and the maintenance yard were not made in the community’s priorities, but parking and maintenance were discussed in the “issues” discussion. See issues summary related to “noise, odors, and maintenance” below.

Program Elements Not Specifically Listed On Donor’s Vision Plan

The following program elements are not specifically identified as part of the Donor’s Vision Plan, but were identified as priorities by the discussion groups. Several of these program elements would be compatible with the Donor’s Vision and the restrictions of the Land Transfer Agreement, while other elements will need to be vetted through the planning process.

Community Gardens

- Community gardens were identified as a desirable program element

List of Recorded Comments
- Community gardens (2)
- Community gardens – 1 per 10,000 resident population
- Community gardens – meter for water use to control
- 5 acres of community gardens

Composting

- Composting was listed as a desirable program element.

List of Recorded Comments
- Composting (3)
- Composting neighborhood contributions/ reuse

Dog Park

- A dog park or place for off-leash dogs was identified as a desirable program element

List of Recorded Comments
- Dog Park (2)
- Desire for off-leash fenced dog park, would this be considered?

BBQ/Picnic

- Barbeque and picnicking facilities were identified as desirable program elements.

List of Recorded Comments
- BBQ facilities
- Picnic area
- Dispersed picnic tables in the trees
Miscellaneous
During the group discussions, workshop participants identified various other park elements that might be desirable in the park. Their comments are listed below.

List of Recorded Comments
- Use buildings as kitchen/add value
- Demonstration kitchen
- Adequate facilities for school programs – could be a barn (not just a recreational center)
- Greenhouse/plant conservatory
- Would like washrooms
- Want office for someone in charge
- Amphitheatre for ranger
- Display case for areas 4H awards
- Rose garden –maintained with support from volunteers
- Could site include native tree nursery? (i.e. Our City Forest) 180 native species to choose from, street trees, trees to be given away for planting
- Want horse shoe pits
- Water fountains
- Memorial to Mr. Lester
- Summer camp – over night in teepees/yurts/ temporary, something small scale
- No summer camp – would require more staff

Habitat/Creek Restoration

Key Discussion Points
- Several groups’ comments reflected a desire to preserve or create wildlife habitat, with the focus being on the ecological restoration of Canoas Creek.

List of Recorded Comments
Habitat
- Fox habitat preservation – wildlife habitat, burrowing owl, waterfowl migration
- Lots of geese – keep them, provide more bird habitat
- Preservation of wildlife habitat (keep)
- Geese population explosion – encourage with pond development
- Save the foxes – move them to a safe place
- Species of concern that have moved onto site-environmental review
- Preserve wildlife qualities—concern for protection in context of park development
- Native habitat demonstration areas – like Hacienda School
- Natural wildlife

Creek Restoration
- Restore Canoas creek, open it up
- Creek restoration – flood control
- Creek as natural riparian zone – restore! “let’s not have a manicured park”
- Organic stream channel
Design Considerations

Key Discussion Points

- Several comments addressed design considerations for the park, including view preservation, treatment of park edges, tree preservation and planting, sustainable design, and site topography.

List of Recorded Comments

Views
- Maintain the views into the park
- No buffering (berms/trees)
- Not see civilization from the middle of the park
- Not block view of working agriculture with berms
- Visual Access – problem with topography
- Maintain view shed

Perimeter – Fencing and Buffer
- Buffer zone
- Concerned about buffering from neighborhood
- Fencing that people can’t climb – wrought iron – secure and transparent
- Fencing between residences and park, type of fencing, view into park

Trees
- Lots of trees
- Keep the oaks
- Additional trees for shade

Sustainable Design
- Green building materials – but cannot be all things to all people, consider vision
- Green features – green building examples/green meeting hall/ solar/ wind power
- How will park be powered? Would like to see green power here

Topography
- Add some topography
- Is there a plan for contouring? (convert flat area to one with topography)

Miscellaneous
- Keep integrity of park as-is, i.e. natural
- Natural design in recreational areas to discourage organized and unorganized field play
- Activities brought closer to Branham
- Lower community have priority
- Speed of development (too slow)
- “Active” community involvement multi faceted, educational
- Make sure the park is well used – multiple ways to use the park
- Development should be family-friendly

Education

Key Discussion Points
- Generally, there is strong support for an educational component to the park.
• Many of these comments describe opportunities to partner with schools, Master Gardener programs, 4-H, and other existing organizations to expand the educational outreach and benefits of the historic farm program.
• Several comments identified “hands-on” opportunities for children as a priority.

List of Recorded Comments
- Educational element is priority
- Provide educational opportunities especially for youth
- Educational programs for children – master gardener program
- Opportunities for kids, recapture agriculture, education but not county fair.
- Educational opportunities for kids of lifestyles of the past (i.e. farm equipment displays)
- Kids need to see the animals
- High tech education capabilities- green philosophy
- Notion of training future farmers at various stages (education) apprenticeships
- Livestock agriculture to continue 4H kids & school kids to learn about agriculture
- Strong educational component – master gardeners (conventional planting, raised beds, veggies)
- Bring in younger kids to demonstrate how things are grown (organized tours, instruction, classes)
- Connect school kids to agriculture
- Facility for agricultural education (for both adults/children)
- Create working kids camps to learn how to farm
- Ag farm for kids (crops, animals—currently no place; equestrian—not for boarding but a riding ring and perimeter trail)
- Master gardeners programs
- Partnership with school children
- Programs with the schools
- County should partner with master gardeners/4H/ garden clubs
- Livestock/4H programs for children
- Boy Scouts - horse boarding – free boarding in exchange for sharing the horses
- Hands-on field trips for children
- Kids hands-on community garden
- Hands-on activities – U pick, milking cows, horse petting
- Make farm hands-on, interactive, appeals to kids, exhibition gardens

Events

Key Discussion Points
• A number of comments indicated support for a harvest festival or similar events.

List of Recorded Comments
- Harvest festival (2)
- Village harvest Jam operation
- Harvest festivals & events

ISSUES

The following reflect the discussion groups’ recorded comments in response to the second question about perceived issues or concerns associated with park development.
Fees

Key Discussion Points
- A number of comments raised a concern that the park entrance fees and user fees for the park facilities be affordable.
- A few comments addressed the issue of park funding, including a couple in support of revenue-generating opportunities, and one stating a concern about creating a “for-profit” park.

List of Recorded Comments
Fees
- Pay per use (equestrian center/special events/day use) park should be free for pedestrians/pay to park
- Affordable equestrian opportunities
- Fees reduced for neighbors
- Entrance fees should be affordable
- Pay for use of park such as trails access
- Walk-in access should be free
- Current produce stand too pricey - food should not cost more than at a grocery store

Development Cost
- Cost of the park – maintenance could be too high, don’t want to make it a for profit place either
- Great plan – get $ from state to build park
- Encourage revenue generating activities (e.g. lease rates, crop sales, horse stables)
- Opportunities to generate revenue to supplement park’s operations

Parking, Traffic and Roadways

Key Discussion Points
- Parking emerged as a leading concern among the workshop participants.
- A number of comments listed traffic as an area of concern, including the potential for impacts on adjacent neighborhoods and traffic conditions on Branham Lane and Snell Avenue.
- A few comments expressed a desire to not put roads through the park.

List of Recorded Comments
Parking
- Parking is least priority
- Don’t want people parking in the neighborhood
- Parking fee OK
- UTA parking can be used for the park
- Shopping center overflow parking
- Parking along street
- Equestrian center requires lots of parking
- Prevent parking in neighborhood but allow neighbors easy pedestrian access
- Parking and entrance should be moved from Chynoweth to Brenham or Snell
- Parking along Blossom Hill
- How big are the parking lots
- Parking at perimeter – so don’t have to walk through
- Access/parking issues – understand where parking access should go – neighbors may not want parking next to them
- Worried about vehicular access from Chynoweth – permitted parking
- Concern about event parking programming
- Parking – people will park in the neighborhood to avoid the fee
- Stoplights & Parking
- Chynoweth is very wide, maybe room for diagonal parking?

Traffic
- Traffic control (area surround entrance)
- Increased traffic on Snell and Branham (increased noise)
- Traffic and parking impacts
- Traffic around the park – into neighborhoods
- Traffic abatement
- Traffic/parking

Branham Lane and Snell Avenue
- Branham lane widening – no direct access across shopping center, no vehicular access into park from dead-end streets
- Branham & Snell frontage should be maintained as it currently is
- Would need a stoplight on Branham if there is an entrance

Roads and paved paths through the park
- Concerned about violation of Mr. Lester’s vision, for example paved roadways, rollerbladers, bicyclists--should focus on agricultural preserve
- Chynoweth should not go through the park!
- Paths – not streets (for example, Chynoweth – do not want it to be brought through the park)

Other
- School bus access – consider non disruptive to park
- Light rail access – separate to park?

Safety

Key Discussion Points
- A number of comments addressed the issue of security, including a desire for the park to be closed at night, for security lighting to be provided, and for park security or emergency services.

List of Recorded Comments
- Lock down at night VERY important – concerned about drugs/noise/hanging out/litter
- Security after dark (fenced?), after hours issues (gangs, drugs, etc)
- Access – will it be controlled? Fenced for after hours?
- There should be controlled access – closed at night
- Park should be lit up at night
- Sufficient lighting – but not too much
- Lighting? Want to keep it natural but concerned about security
- There needs to be park security
- Security
- Secure trails
- Emergency phones
- Emergency services should be available

**Noise, Odors, Maintenance**

**Key Discussion Points**

- A number of comments expressed concern about the potential for the park to have operational impacts on neighbors, including:
  - noise from recreational activities near homes
  - odors from animals
  - maintenance and litter.

**List of Recorded Comments**

*Noise*
- Noise from traffic around homes
- High concentration of people around homes
- Noise – sound walls? Impact to view?
- Nearby picnic/ play areas adjacent to homes

*Odors*
- Doesn’t like equestrian center, messy & stinky, no rodeos
- Odors from the horses – equestrian center needs horse to rent
- Who will clean up the horse manure?
- Concerned about pig odor (high-tech pigs only)

*Maintenance*
- Maintenance
- Concerned about kids “stomping gardens to smithereens”
- Trash concerns (plastic, etc.)
- No snack shacks wanted [because of litter]

**Pesticides and pests**

**Key Discussion Points**

- Several comments expressed a desire to limit or avoid pesticide use, or require organic farming.
- A couple comments expressed a concern about rodents from the park infesting the neighborhood.

**List of Recorded Comments**

- Want to avoid pesticide use (organic, sustainable)
- History & future approach to pesticide use
- Concerned about use of chemicals, pesticides & herbicides
- All organic farming
- Regulate organic farming practices so chemicals don’t end up in water supply

- Concerned about rodents coming from Chynoweth to neighborhood
- Field mice infestation from park into neighborhoods
Other

Generally, other types of comments addressed the future non-historic agricultural uses and events that would take place at the future park and future access into and within the park.

List of Recorded Comments
- Don’t want to “cannibalize” Prusch
- Wedding/events should be run so that public can still have access to the park, limited number throughout the year
- Number of non-historic agriculture park events do not overcome historic elements
- Where is the access
- Dirt strip in front of Mr. Lester’s house – will it remain?
## Attendance List

### Members of the Public
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- Cynthia Batchelder
- Cynthia Z.
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- Berni Andrade
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- John Burn
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- Bob Colby
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- Leslie Daniel
- Gerry DeLaRue
- John Dixon
- Tim Dooling
- Michelle Douglas
- Jim Dumanowski
- Zimo Deemo
- Mary Eaton
- Melissa Eaton
- Paul Elles
- David Erfelding
- Mary Fanberr
- Cherill Fannin
- Ellen Finch, Master Composter
- Claude & Trish Fletcher
- Ruby Fong
- Steve Friendly
- Jose Garcia
- Nancy Garrison, Rare Fruit Grower/Master Gardeners
- Rebecca Giordano
- Kirby Gong
- Stefan Grace
- Chris Gremich
- Kelly Groth
- Liz Gutierrez
- Nancy Hardy
- Sachiko Hashimoto
- David Heinrichsen
- Greg Henry
- Tiffany Ho
- Christine Hoang
- Vadajo Hollingsworth
- Ronald Horii
- Tom Jacobs
- Brian Jacques
- Pringle Johnston
- Gaurav Khanra
- Jack Knoop
- Linda Lansright
- Sally & Bob LaMere
- Jerry Larson
- Gordon Lau
- Frank Lettieri
- Danh Lieu
- Ashley Lopez
- Shawn Luongo
- Manavi Mahdad
- Evelyn McGarry, Santa Clara 4H
- Rick Mercer
- Fernando Merino
- Doreen Morgan
- Jesse Mundis
- Micheal & Loretta Myers
- Mickey Neff
- Pauline Neff
- Nancy Newman
- Dave Noel
- Lorena & Jack Nogosek
- Nick Nyzawa
- Hasu Patel
- Tamara Payne-Alex
- Barbara Peakema
- Doug & Lynn Pena
- Linda Perrine
- Dave Peterson & Dave, Jr.
- Robert Reed, Montecito, HOA
- Adrian Rodriguez
- Pam Rodriguez, VEP
- Carmen & Bill Rous
- Dan & Harriet Roy
- George Ruel
- Zin Russo
- Conrad Russo
- Divina Russo
- MaryAnn Rustin
- Jessie Sapencheck
- Jay Shutty
- Jim Silvers
- Lester Smith
- Stacy Smith
- Karen Solheim
- Glenn Stansbury
- Lana & Pat Stein
- Karen Stevens
- Mae Tucker
- Charles Vaughn
- Paul Villarred
- O'Neil Wright
- Susan Zaslaw

### Task Force
- Rachael Gibson, Office of Supervisor Don Gage, District One
- Frances Grammer, Office of Assemblymember Jim Beall, Jr.
- Mike Potter, Office of Assemblymember Joe Coto
- Eric T. Crane, City of San Jose, District 10
- Charlie Friedericks, Member at Large
- R.Brian Gardiner, Member at Large
- Frank Giordano, Donor’s Representative
- Craig Giordano, Donor’s Representative (Alternate)
- Adina Pierce, VEP
- Marilyn Rodgers, VEP (Alternate)
- Greg West, SCC Parks & Recreation Commissioner (also TAC)
- Kevin, O'Day, Santa Clara County Division of Agriculture (also TAC)
- Rob Iverson, Member-at-large
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