



APPROVED

**MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
JANUARY 21, 2014
CITY HALL
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California**

Commissioners Present: Stacey Ashlund, Deirdre Crommie, Jennifer Hetterly, Abbie Knopper, Ed Lauing, Pat Markevitch, Keith Reckdahl

Commissioners Absent:

Others Present: Council Liaison Greg Schmid

Staff Present: Daren Anderson, Greg Betts, Catherine Bourquin, Rob de Geus, Hung Nguyen, Walter Passmore, Joe Teresi

I. ROLL CALL CONDUCTED BY: Catherine Bourquin

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS:

III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

IV. BUSINESS:

1. Approval of Draft December 10, 2013 Minutes.

The draft December 10, 2013 Minutes were approved as amended and moved by Commissioner Hetterly and seconded by Commissioner Reckdahl. Passed 7:0

2. Selection of Chair and Vice Chair for 2014.

Chair Lauing: Annually we do this and look at electing new officers for the year. This year is a little bit different because our term was extended by ten months. There is no reason to change out of the calendar year for election of officers for the year. It is sort of



APPROVED

traditional that the Chair read the Chairperson's role and what they do, so that we know what we're electing this person to do. The manual has 12 points; the first 11 of which are basically running this meeting in an organized way so that everyone is heard, so that it gets done before midnight. It doesn't really say that, but that's what it kind of means there and a number of things along those lines. The twelfth one mentions that the Chair or his designee is the media's point of contact for information regarding Committee activities. But what this doesn't mention, and I would like to elaborate on for about a minute is, it doesn't elaborate on all of the, what do you want to call it, behind-the-scenes interaction with City staff and coordination with City staff which is frankly a privilege with the quality that we have. This is not just preparation of an agenda. This is really what I would call a constant interaction with staff, whether that's in this case Rob or Greg or sometimes our Park Liaison which is now Council Member Schmid, occasionally the Mayor. Part of what's going on there is not just the agenda, but it's to help prioritize the work that we should be working on to best help the City back and forth. Also some of the time it's basically just an exchange of ideas. I remember one time I called up Greg and say, "Hey, here's what some people think and here's what some people don't think. What do you think?" That's all it is, but that really helps, I think, the deliberation, the setting of priorities for our Commission. I think it really helps the staff be totally involved in what we're doing. I just wanted to emphasize that as an important aspect of what goes on. Sometimes that behind-the-scenes stuff is to nudge issues along a little bit faster, if we can say, "Council Member, why are we not moving on this park quite so fast? Can we get the closure on that?" Or CIPs or whatever it is. I just wanted to emphasize that. So I think organizational skills, communication skills with some tact, and work ethic are an important point of that staff interaction. Any questions on that? So that is what it does. The process is to take nominations from the floor, which requires a second after that. Then after we're done with all the nominations, if there are multiple ones, the person who nominates as well as the person who is nominated can make comments. Any questions? Yes, Keith.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Can I make a Motion?

Chair Lauing: Pardon?

Commissioner Reckdahl: Discussion now?

Chair Lauing: There are no questions about procedure? If not, then the floor's open for nominations for Chair.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I'd like to nominate Commissioner Hetterly. She's been on four years now?

Commissioner Hetterly: Mm-hmm.

Commissioner Reckdahl: She's not only been on the Commission, did a wonderful job with the Cubberley commission. If you look at those attributes that you just read, she matches up with a lot of them. She's insightful, she's diplomatic. I think she'll do a wonderful job as Chairman.

Chair Lauing: OK. With the nomination, is there a second? No second.

Commissioner Markevitch: Second.

MOTION: Commissioner Reckdahl moved and Commissioner Markevitch seconded the nomination of Commissioner Hetterly as Chair.

Chair Lauing: Commissioner Markevitch, OK. Other nominations? Other nominations for Chair? No further nominations for Chair?

Commissioner Knopper: If I nominate a different person, then we just ...

Chair Lauing: Then we would vote.

Commissioner Knopper: OK. Here's another question. I don't know who wants this job, because we're not allowed to talk to each other really. I want to nominate you, but I don't know if you want to continue in the role. So is that appropriate for me to do that? I'm sorry to ask this question, but I've never done ...

Chair Lauing: The person who is nominated does need to say, "Yes, I want to do that."

Commissioner Knopper: OK.

Chair Lauing: Maybe we should go there first and see if the person nominated would be willing to serve.

Commissioner Hetterly: I would.

Chair Lauing: OK.

Commissioner Knopper: OK. I guess I'll nominate you, Chair Lauing. Can I do that?

Chair Lauing: You can. Yes, you can. Seeing no second, that solves that problem. Let me answer that question directly. It's been a blast doing this for two years. I've just loved it. I think it's time to maybe try somebody else, and I have no problem voting for the person that's been nominated. Thank you. OK. Without any other nominations, then

APPROVED

there is a ballot in front of you, which we can probably do with dispatch under the circumstances.

Catherine Bourquin: I have seven votes for Hetterly.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0.

Chair Lauing: OK, great. Thank you.

Commissioner Hetterly: Thanks.

Chair Lauing: Thank you. Take it away.

Chair Hetterly: Do I take over?

Commissioner Lauing: You get to take over.

Chair Hetterly: I guess we do the same process for Vice Chair. I don't have a printout of the job responsibilities. I can say basically what I've done in the last year as Vice Chair has been participating in agenda setting and planning meetings and working with staff in figuring out where we're going, reviewing the Minutes, preparing for the retreat and the joint Council session and reporting back to you all on those. It's a great job. I recommend it. I think the process is the same. We open the floor to nominations and then take a second. If we get more than one nominee, then we'll have an opportunity for the nominator and the nominee to address their interest. I'll open it to nominations. Pat?

Commissioner Markevitch: I nominate Ed Lauing for Vice Chair, because the two of you work so well as a team. It falls under the guise of "if it's not broke, don't fix it." I've seen a lot of Vice Chairs in the past and you guys are just phenomenal. I'd like to see that continue.

Chair Hetterly: Do we have a second?

Commissioner Knopper: I'll second that.

MOTION: Commissioner Markevitch moved and Commissioner Knopper seconded the nomination of Commissioner Lauing as Vice Chair.

Chair Hetterly: OK. Any other nominations for Vice Chair? Commissioner Crommie.

APPROVED

Commissioner Crommie: As much as I would love to see Ed Lauing as Vice Chair and that would be fine if it happens. It's always nice to have fresh interaction, so I'll nominate Keith Reckdahl, if he wants to accept.

Chair Hetterly: Do we have a second for Keith?

Commissioner Ashlund: I'll second.

MOTION: Commissioner Crommie moved and Commissioner Ashlund seconded the nomination of Commissioner Reckdahl as Vice Chair.

Chair Hetterly: I failed to ask either one of you if you would accept the nominations.

Commissioner Lauing: Yeah, I would. I won't make comments right now, since there's another nominee. I think it makes a lot of sense.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I would be willing to do it. I think I'd probably vote for Ed. Short answer, yes, I would be willing to do that.

Chair Hetterly: Do you want to speak to your nominations?

Commissioner Markevitch: I did already.

Chair Hetterly: You did already. Anything you'd like to add to your nomination or the nominees?

Commissioner Lauing: No. Deirdre ...

Chair Hetterly: Any other comments about the nominees? Any other nominations?

Commissioner Crommie: I've been on the Commission a long time and I think every time we've put people in these positions, they've done a great job. I know it's always lovely to have people continue, because they're in a groove. I think it's nice for an organization to shake things up a little bit. That's why I've nominated Keith. I think he's very conscientious, as we all are. I think he'd do a great job and he'd grow in the position. I think part of being on this Commission is getting those kinds of leadership experiences. I'd like to see more of it. That's basically why I'm nominating him.

Chair Hetterly: Do you want to speak to your ...

Commissioner Lauing: Yeah, sure. While I appreciated Abbie's support for Chair again and I do like that job, I think there is an argument for some change. That Chair is a

APPROVED

different Chair than the Vice Chair in terms of the responsibility and so on. I think one of the things that would be advantageous is for a new Chair to have a sort of consigliere. I think that can be done if I'm Vice. In terms of delegation of tasks and some of this behind-the-scenes stuff where I've enjoyed it and I think been effective, I will just be able to take whatever is delegated from the new Chair that she thinks that maybe I should handle, and I would go do that. The skill set's the same. I guess you couldn't find a more experienced Vice Chair. I know what to do if you're absent.

Chair Hetterly: That's for sure.

Commissioner Lauing: I think it would be a great match, and I do note and appreciate your comments there. I don't strive for higher office, but I would be happy to accept your election for this lower office.

Chair Hetterly: Any other comments? I'd just like to say I think either one of you would do a really phenomenal job. I have a slight leaning towards having Ed continue just in the interests of ease to me, since we've kind of figured out how things work together. That's gives me a little bit of a crutch as I try to figure out what I'm doing here. I think that, Keith, you would also do a fabulous job. I'd vote for both of you if I could. I guess we should take a vote. The ballots are in front of you.

Ms. Bourquin: I have two for Reckdahl and five for Lauing.

Motion Electing Commissioner Lauing as Vice Chair Passed: 5-2

3. Staff Recommendation on the Tree Mitigation Plan for the Golf Course and Baylands Athletic Center Expansion Project.

Chair Hetterly: This is an action item. We've got one speaker card for this item, Eileen McLaughlin, and one more coming.

Public Comment

Eileen McLaughlin: Good evening. I'm Eileen McLaughlin with the Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge. I haven't been participating in your committee. I know you've had a committee working in preparing this. I'm glad about that. I'm representing a group that works with the Refuge. We work with the marshes and the Baylands. The Baylands itself is, of course, an integral part of all of these marshes that we're trying to either sustain or develop elsewhere. I look at the idea of this mitigation as more of a restoring the uplands adjoining the wetlands to a condition that is much more valuable to improving the overall habitats of the adjoining marshes. I think that's a big opportunity here to improve the landscape quality of the shoreline for wildlife. I also wanted to

APPROVED

mention, I caught a comment in the report that said this kind of vegetation had less environmental benefit. I think you need to look at the landscape. When you look at this particular landscape and you're looking at how it helps enrich and balance the marshes which we're trying to both sustain, and especially to the south this whole project is going into Phase 2 to really start restoring those. We have an opportunity here, where we're building those marshes. It's been shown that our tidal marshes have a carbon exchange value that some scientists have equated to that of the rainforest. There's been some differences of opinion, but in fact the more we strengthen the health of our shoreline the more we build the carbon exchange value of those marshes. If you ever go down to that dock at low tide and you see the mud go out, you can just see the algae bubbling and they're a little oxygen factory just sitting there on the exposed mud. Those little pockets are all within those marshes. This is an enormous carbon exchange factory that we can build on the Bay. By your increasing the value of this associated landscape, we can really help bring the benefit there. Further, on the issue of where you can get expertise on this, on the Refuge down in Alviso, there is a big project that's been going on for years now on actually reestablishing this kind of landscape. There's a lot of information and probably a consultant that is somewhere connected there, that might be of specific help here on putting this kind of mitigation in place. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Next we have Emily Renzel.

Emily Renzel: Thank you. I'll probably want to speak on the next item as well, related to the golf course. I participated in the citizens' advisory group that was dealing with the tree mitigation. I have to say staff has been extraordinarily responsive to the various items raised. We had concerns about whether there was enough money to both plant and maintain through time and make sure that the mitigation actually did what it was supposed to do. There was concern about locating more of the mitigation in the Baylands. I think it's been a very good process. I support the recommendation that staff has brought to you, that includes some ongoing money for maintenance to make sure that these mitigations take place. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. The next speaker is Shani Kleinhaus.

Shani Kleinhaus: Good evening. Shani Kleinhaus with Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society. I planned to go and get dressed before I get here, but I made it just now and it took me so long to get here just from Sunnyvale. Sorry. I live in Palo Alto, but I didn't have time to stop at home. Audubon has been trying to figure out how do you measure the value of birds. I think that came through throughout the process that we went through in considering the mitigation that was proposed initially, which was let's plant this many trees for each one that is removed. It was how do you measure ecosystem services and later other things. Somehow in all of that we missed the value of the critters that live in the trees. If we're looking to just say, "OK, we have a large tree, let's replace it with three

small trees," well it takes a long time for those three small trees to create the habitat that all the critters that we like to see with us need. This comes out in many other ways. What we see with sustainability and the way that we're trying to measure what is our impact on the world and how do we mitigate it in terms of energy, water, trees, all these things that we value; we kind of have a very anthropocentric view in general and we forget the living things, the butterflies, the bees, the insects. We come to a place where kids now are afraid of birds, they're afraid of insects. They see a butterfly and they run away. The question of what do we do to bring nature and birds and insects into the equation of mitigation was at the basis of the discussion with City staff which was incredible open to the idea that maybe we need to look close to the place of impact and replace habitat and not just some sort of a picture of how much canopy is measured and how many trees. I think that the process was really informative for all of us. It was really interesting. I hope it moves forward and that there is enough money to create the proper mitigation and enough money to support it over time. I've seen again and again mitigation that somebody does. They put the trees in and after three years they don't have to do anything anymore and the things fall apart. Please do all you can. Thank you very much and thanks to staff as well.

Commission Discussion

Chair Hetterly: Rob.

Rob de Geus: I want to introduce Walter Passmore again, who is Urban Forester for the City and thank him for all the work that he's done on this tree mitigation plan and set of strategies. I think we've come a long way. I also want to thank Emily Renzel and Enid Pearson, Shani Kleinhaus, Catherine Martineau and many others that have participated in helping us work through a strategy that's really going to have an impact, a positive impact on trees on Palo Alto. We think we're pretty close at this point. I'm going to ask Walter just to share where we ended our last stakeholder meeting last week.

Walter Passmore: Thank you, Commissioners, for your service and your participation through this process. It has been, I think, a real growth experience for everyone that has participated. We have just a couple of very brief slides to synthesize what has been, I think, a very open discussion, to steal some words away from some of our commenters. It has morphed over time into what we're presenting as a final recommendation this evening. There are several parts to this. One on the mitigation approach is to establish new trees and native or naturally simulated landscape within the golf course. We had some hierarchy of how we thought mitigation should be applied. One is to apply the mitigation as close to the impact as possible. The impact is on the golf course; it should be applied on the golf course first. Two was to apply mitigation near site in a very similar ecosystem, very similar plant species that would naturally occur. That's where we have dedicated the bulk of the funding that we're recommending for the mitigation, is to

APPROVED

335 restore or substantially improve native Baylands spaces near the golf course. Our
336 original estimates were that this process could cost as much as \$200,000 an acre. After
337 further discussions and fine-tuning, we feel a reasonable approach is with participating
338 partners. We feel like it's more realistic that the cost is going to be somewhere around
339 \$100,000 an acre. The mitigation that we're proposing should restore close to 2 acres of
340 Baylands habitat. The exact costs have yet to be determined, but that 2 acres of Baylands
341 habitat is in addition to Approach Item Number 3, which is to protect trees that are
342 naturally established seedlings at the Arastradero Preserve. That's a much lower cost
343 item. By protecting those trees, we allow them to mature instead of being browsed by
344 deer or other animals that may decrease the likelihood that they would ever mature to a
345 full-size tree. These are naturally occurring seedlings that are already there. Obviously
346 they're native to the Preserve. In all we are removing 538 trees from the golf course
347 proper. There's another 83 for the athletic center. A total of 621 trees. The mitigation
348 approach that we are recommending is broken into two parts. The total result is expected
349 to be \$500,000 over a 20-year investment period. This does not include 300 new trees
350 that are being planted on the golf course. The mitigation amount is above and beyond
351 new tree planting. There are also about 50 acres of rough area within the golf course that
352 are going to be restored into that native or naturalized habitat. These are things occurring
353 in the golf course, not included in the \$500,000. The \$500,000 does include about
354 \$200,000 in one-time inception costs, so that'll be upfront costs to restore 1-2 acres of
355 Baylands habitat. It will also protect the 500 naturally occurring seedlings so that those
356 will mature into full-size trees one day. Then the additional piece that takes it from the
357 \$200,000 initial investment to the \$500,000 over 20 years is that there is maintenance
358 commitment pending revenues from the newly renovated golf course to fund that. That
359 money would go from excess revenue with some prerequisites that we've spelled out and
360 fund that long-term maintenance. This is really a strong commitment to a long-term plan
361 that, as Shani Kleinhaus mentioned, is very important so that mitigation will have the
362 greatest chance of success.

363
364 Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Did you have something add? OK. We had an ad hoc
365 committee that did some work on this as well. Do you all have a reaction to the
366 presentation?

367
368 Commissioner Crommie: Are you ready for me to present on our ad hoc committee?
369

370
371 Chair Hetterly: Any questions for Walter before we do that?
372

373 Commissioner Ashlund: One question on the first slide. It wasn't clear on what it means
374 by naturally simulated in number one. Is that natural or is that simulated? I'm not sure.
375

APPROVED

Mr. Passmore: There is obviously some debate on what is considered completely natural. What period of time we use would equate to how closely we simulate that naturally occurring environment. Obviously there's been a lot of change in the Baylands over the last 300 years. Particularly in the last 100 years there's been some fairly significant or dramatic changes. That's why we chose some fairly broad terms. We're trying to simulate closely what we think would have occurred there perhaps a 100 years before any dramatic impacts occurred.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Other questions?

Vice Chair Lauing: Yes. On the second slide, you now have listed 1-2 acres of Baylands restoration. I thought the proposal was actually for 2 acres.

Mr. de Geus: Yeah, it is for 2. I wasn't sure, so I had 1-2. I confirmed with Walter. I thought it was 2 as well. It is 2.

Mr. Passmore: We have not pinned down exact costs yet. We have not received cost estimates from vendors, so we did leave that a little bit flexible. Our expectation is that the money that we've dedicated to mitigation will restore 2 acres of Baylands.

Chair Hetterly: Other questions? Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: This is both for the ad hoc and also for Walter. Did we consider planting trees in parks? Was that thrown out early?

Commissioner Crommie: The first priority is to do the mitigation onsite. If that's not possible, to do it as close as possible to the site. Because we have a large need in the habitat close by, we moved on to that priority. The third priority is anywhere else. We didn't feel that we needed, well, we did get to the third priority in terms of us targeting Arastradero Preserve. We wanted to target natural environment areas.

Commissioner Reckdahl: This is just for the animals, to try and keep their ecosystem as unaffected as possible?

Commissioner Crommie: Right and especially what we're mitigating against. We're mitigating against loss of habitat on the golf course and loss of canopy, both things. We have a focus on the habitat.

Commissioner Reckdahl: When we're looking at the first two areas, either onsite or nearby, the sites that we're selecting, are we looking at them and saying, "Oh, that's a great place for a tree?" or "Well, I guess that will do?" How enthusiastic are we? Are we putting a square peg into a round hole or are we finding good spots for trees?

Commissioner Crommie: I think if I can give the presentation from the ad hoc committee, you'll have really good questions to ask.

Commissioner Reckdahl: OK.

Commissioner Crommie: I think we should give that background.

Vice Chair Lauing: I'm going to pass this out, Deirdre.

Commissioner Crommie: What Ed is passing out now is our ad hoc committee report on the tree mitigations recommendation for the mitigation. I'm sorry we don't have the ability to put this on an overhead, do we? No, OK. I'm sorry not everyone has a copy of this.

Vice Chair Lauing: That's because the ink is still wet on this thing.

Commissioner Crommie: Yeah, the ink is still wet. I'm going to start off the discussion, and then I'm also going to hope that my colleagues on the ad hoc committee, who are Commissioners Knopper and Lauing, will join in at any time they feel the need. Then we will take questions from the Commission and have discussion. I want to start off by saying we engaged in a really good process to come up with this recommendation. It was a lot of hard work. We met many times over the last few months. Many different stakeholders were involved. Some of these stakeholders have spoken today. As a resident of this City, I'm indebted to these leaders and environmental causes who have really allowed us to maintain a healthy enough Bay to support life. That is nothing that any one of us should take for granted. It comes at the cost of a huge amount of work, often hugely uphill battles. People work tirelessly to protect our environment and they do not get enough recognition, nor do they get enough money. When we undertake these mitigations, they're very difficult because they come as an almost perceived by-product of a project, but they are required by law. We need them when there is a deleterious impact as a result of the project. We have negative impacts in the Baylands as a result of the golf course reconfiguration and the potential Baylands Athletic Center expansion. That's what this mitigation is all about. It's to mitigate against that impact. We've worked through a lot of incredibly difficult issues in this committee. We've been well led and well supported by staff and all the participants. Many of the participant groups are listed on the opening sentence of this recommendation. I'm going to say that we started in a place of loss of, we're mitigating against the loss of canopy. The new number today is mitigating against the loss of 621 trees on the golf course. We had to wrestle with how to do that. We cannot replant those trees on the golf course, because of the environmental conditions there and our desire to get toward a more natural environment on the golf course. It will be one of the significant features of the golf course once it's

APPROVED

done, is that it is approaching a more natural habitat for that area. We worked toward this idea that we're going to not use trees for the replacement in full. We came up with a hybrid model where we will bring in as many trees as we can onsite. Then when we reach that capacity, we're going to move into other kinds of habitat. We want to restore the Baylands and produce a native Baylands habitat. We have expertise within our working groups to guide us in that process. We also are developing some expertise on staff. Daren Anderson has been instrumental in that regard, in terms of really learning a great deal about what's needed and being able to offer expertise and guidance along with our other stakeholder groups. I really, really value his participation in this process. What we have done is we are diverging in our, our recommendation is diverging from the staff recommendation in some significant ways. I see Ed kind of cringing. I guess I should just ...

Vice Chair Lauing: You said to come in at any time, so I'm going to just [crosstalk].

Commissioner Crommie: Oh, sure. OK.

Vice Chair Lauing: I think the phenomenal aspect is that the constituent committee, as you noted, completely aligned on what should be done which is obviously not put trees up in the Baylands, but to mitigate in alternative ways that really reflected the values that we value as a community and as a Commission. I think we're actually completely consistent as well in agreeing with the approach of the Arastradero tree mitigation and the Baylands habitation improvements. It's just a question of the financial approach and how far we should go. That's the only area of disagreement, which I also think reflects the constituent group in addition to the Parks Commission recommendation.

Commissioner Knopper: One of the areas of difference is that the tree loss is the equivalent of 6 acres. Instead of a 2-acre restoration, we're suggesting a 3-acre restoration, a 50 percent development of native habitat in the Baylands to augment the loss of canopy. We're also recommending that we work against percentages for tree survival. Instead of mitigating it and having ongoing maintenance that is funded with golf course revenue, what we are suggesting is that that financial piece is decoupled from required revenue and that there's an actual financial commitment saying for the next ten years this is the amount of dollars that will be committed to ensuring survival rates of what we're planting. We're looking for success criteria basically. Because revenue is always tricky, we know exactly what trees need in a native habitat in order to live, so we want the financial commitment to be a line item, instead of just based on golf revenue. Did you want to continue? I'm sorry.

Commissioner Crommie: Thank you for that input from both of my committee partners. I appreciate it. Ed Lauing did accurately say that we're really on the same page conceptually with everything we're recommending. We worked hard to come to this

APPROVED

consensus and we all feel really good about it. What Commissioner Knopper just indicated is that we would like to see more acreage of habitat restoration. We're losing 6 acres of trees, and it's hard to establish exactly where we should fall when we do this equivalency, because we're not replanting 6 acres of trees. We're doing an equivalency, and we're replacing trees with a native habitat in the Baylands marsh areas and surrounds. The way our ad hoc committee approached it is, well, we felt like 2 acres was too small. We felt that 6 acres was too big. Not because we don't need 6 acres of restoration, we need much more than that in the Baylands. It's just very expensive to accomplish this. We felt like it was probably not within the scope of this mitigation to ask for everything that we need there. We wanted to just come up with some reasonable approach to mitigate for the 6 acres. The best we could come up with, after a lot of discussion, was to aim for these 3 acres. I just want to orient everyone to Number 1. I want to go through the recommendations. Our recommendation has four parts. Number 1 is listed, I believe, on the staff recommendation. Just so everyone understands, the City has already committed itself to adding 300 new trees back to the golf course. I always get confused if we're taking out a net of 621. That's before we put the 300 back, is that right? Or is it a net loss after we put the 300 back?

Mr. de Geus: 621 are the total trees that will be removed.

Commissioner Crommie: That are being removed. OK. The total lost are 621, and that's what we're mitigating against. There's a lot of calculations that go into exactly how you do it, even if you're going tree for tree. It's quite complex. If you're taking out 621, you don't put back 621 because you have to replace a certain amount of canopy. It's a complex formula even tree per tree. Then we've had to extrapolate to get to a reasonable conclusion when we're going for trees for Baylands habitat. In this mitigation, Number 1 will be 300 trees back to the golf course. That's Number 1 on our recommendation. That has already been funded by the City; both the planting of those trees and the maintenance of those trees are already funded. Number 1 on our list is taken care of. Number 2 has to do with this equivalency of moving on. We're done with the golf course. We're at capacity when we put the 300 there, so we're moving now to the next priority which is proximal, proximal to the site. That has to do with the Baylands. When we get to be proximal to the site, we would like to aim for 3 acres of Baylands habitat. We have heard the cost of doing that restoration has varied somewhat. It's complicated and we've heard quotes from Save the Bay and Acterra. Daren Anderson also is getting a feel for this because he's involved in a CIP to do Baylands restoration. The value that our ad hoc committee settled on was the cost of \$130,000 per acre. We think that's what's needed to be successful in planting and caring for that restoration, planning it out, doing all the proper measures that is needed to get that planting done. That might also leave money for some kind of maintenance, but it won't leave enough money for long-term maintenance in order for that habitat to establish itself. That's dealt with later on in our recommendation. Number 3 is that, in addition to the Baylands habitat, we do want to

APPROVED

move offsite to get more trees. We know there's a need in Pearson-Arastradero Preserve for some support there for trees. We want to be ecologically sensitive when we go into the Arastradero Preserve, because it currently has a thriving grasslands habitat. We want to be mindful of that when we bring trees back in. The stakeholders working together with Walter Passmore and other staff have decided that the best way to approach this is to support saplings that have already germinated in that area and are growing but, without our help, will have a very low survival rate. That's Item Number 3. We recommend that 500 naturally growing seedlings in the Pearson-Arastradero Preserve be protected and nurtured with the goal of 80 percent survival. Number 4 has to do with the maintenance. As Commissioner Knopper said, we would like to decouple the commitment and accountability to the maintenance of this mitigation from the financial picture of the golf course. We all hope the golf course does really well financially. A lot of effort's been put in to make that a very successful golf course. We just felt that the funding for the maintenance needs to stand on its own. Part of our thinking there is that we do know of examples where this is just the mitigation. You have all the best goals going in, but without the maintenance things can really fail, especially with something as complex as we're doing here. This is really, I see, a cutting-edge kind of mitigation. I'm very proud to have been part of the process. I think it sets a really high standard for our City and for how we want to protect habitat. It does cost money to do that. One of the things that's often missing in mitigations is this commitment to the maintenance. I think with that we're ready. I'd like to let my colleagues on the ad hoc committee just have the first say, if there's anything I missed, and then open it up.

Vice Chair Lauing: The only comment that I want to make is on these couple of numbers here. You do the best you can, and we hope we got the numbers right on the golf course. That means it's going to be quite good. As these trees finally grow up, we're going to have a showplace, but that's going to take a while. There's only so much you can do to make the business model work. You can't raise the fees to \$100, if you need to do that to try to break even. That's market demand. That's completely unpredictable. What's not unpredictable is that trees need water and maintenance. That's why we need to decouple that for the first ten years and just have a maintenance budget for that, as opposed to have it be dependent on how the golf course happens to perform. A lot of the stuff that's going on, *i.e.*, the Arastradero trees, at that point doesn't have anything to do with the golf course. The second point is that the City estimate, and we know this needs to be fine tuned, is about \$20,000 per year for the kinds of maintenance that has to be done. You can multiple that by 10 years or 20 years and come up with a pretty scary number. It's \$20,000 a year to maintain a park resource that we've all invested in. The golf one happens to be \$8.5 million. At least you would do a net present value of that, but it's a fairly small number. To assign that categorically on an accounting basis all to mitigation just doesn't seem like the right way to do that assignment. The only other thing I want to add is it's been a great process, everybody involved, Walter indefatigable on it.

APPROVED

Everybody's that been involved in it has just given it great efforts, great Palo Alto process.

Chair Hetterly: Any questions about either?

Commissioner Ashlund: Yeah, I have a question. First I wanted to say to all three of you that this is a really incredible set of recommendations. I think it's really well thought out and I appreciate that you did that. The only question of clarification that I had is regarding the 500 naturally growing seedlings at the Arastradero Preserve. Over what time period do we expect that many seedlings to be naturally growing?

Mr. Passmore: The seedlings are already present on the Preserve. It would be a two-year implementation period to protect all of those.

Commissioner Ashlund: Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Markevitch.

Commissioner Markevitch: In your presentation, it's 500 live oak. Is that still the case with your presentation? It didn't specify what the seedlings were. Are they live oak or are they a different type of tree.

Mr. Passmore: I can answer that as well. It's actually a mix of native oaks. There are quite a few live oaks. That's actually the most predominant species. There's also a very good representation of valley oak, blue oak and a couple of other native species that we think would be prime candidates to protect.

Commissioner Markevitch: OK. I had another question and that was in point Number 4. In point Number 4 you say where you don't want the money to come from, but there's no recommendation on where the money's going to come from. Are there any thoughts on that?

Vice Chair Lauing: Yeah. There are a number of creative models that were actually thrown out at the constituents' meeting. We intentionally don't specify that. It would be basically somehow in the City budget as opposed to a bond measure or charging the golfers more or something like that.

Chair Hetterly: That's for that \$20,000 per year?

Commissioner Markevitch: This for \$20,000 a year?

Vice Chair Lauing: Yeah.

Commissioner Markevitch: Did you consider park improvement fees?

Vice Chair Lauing: We basically decided not to consider that at this point, but that the City should consider ...

Commissioner Markevitch: OK. My other comment on that, and it's my last comment, is when I served on the airport working group, it was determined that when the City of Palo Alto takes ownership of the airport away from the County, that the projected yearly earnings would be \$1 million in revenue. Did you look into that pot of money?

Chair Hetterly: I think that can't be spent outside the airport.

Commissioner Markevitch: OK.

Chair Hetterly: Do you guys know anything about that?

Mr. de Geus: I do know that there is a number of very large capital improvements required at the airport including replacing the runway, which will cost several millions of dollars . I'm not sure that there would be a funding stream there.

Commissioner Knopper: To your point, Commissioner Markevitch, what we didn't want to have happen and which is why we are making that recommendation, to decouple it and make it a line item in the City budget, is because if we restore 3 acres of Baylands and we have these 500 seedlings and we don't care for it because golf revenue isn't where it's supposed to be for any given reason, the plantings and the trees, they don't know the difference. All they know is that they're getting the proper care. It would be a shame basically to go through all this effort and upfront money to do all of this and then just not have a significant survival rate.

Commissioner Markevitch: I understand that. I'm just saying that you need to show where this money is going to come from. I haven't seen it.

Vice Chair Lauing: I think you're concerned about the source of funds.

Commissioner Markevitch: Yeah.

Vice Chair Lauing: What I'm saying is that I think we found that there would probably be a number of sources. We didn't go into that level of detail relative to this. But it's \$20,000 a year. We could figure out a place to get \$20,000 a year. If that's an assignment that we get from the City or the Council to look at those and come up with five, six, eight, ten options, I think we would do that.

Commissioner Markevitch: I understand that. It's just I feel like I'm being asked to make a vote without all the information. That's my point that I was trying to get across.

Vice Chair Lauing: The information, as Abbie said, is that at this point our recommendation is don't be dependent on the golf course for \$20,000 a year. It has to come out of the City budget and that we have to find a way to pay for that. It's real money.

Commissioner Crommie: I just wanted to make a point of clarification. What we feel on the ad hoc committee is that we need a commitment to the whole project for the maintenance, to fund it at least out ten years. I would include the saplings in the Arastradero Preserve. Our recommendation is not to only take care of the saplings for two years, but to also bring that out at least ten years. When we're talking about the funding of \$20,000 per year, from the perspective of our subcommittee that is to help with the maintenance of saplings in Arastradero Preserve as well as plantings, habitat restoration in the Baylands. We don't want to lose track of those saplings either.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm a little confused here. When I first read this I thought this said that the money was coming out of the golf course regardless of how profitable it was. But you're saying you don't want it to come out of the golf course budget regardless of [crosstalk].

Commissioner Crommie: What we're saying here is that the total of \$430,000, my perspective again, I'd like my other members of the subcommittee to chime in. My understanding of this is that for the \$430,000 that's the cost of the mitigation upfront.

Vice Chair Lauing: I'll respond to Keith's question. That's correct. That's one of the two points of contrast to the City proposal, which is that is dependent on the golf course performing. We're saying that it can't be dependent on the golf course performing because if it doesn't perform, we're not going to let the trees die. It's also not really coupled. That's what we're saying. Therefore, we do have to find a different way than depending on the golfers to pay more to cover that \$20,000 a year.

Commissioner Reckdahl: So you were thinking it would come out of the golf course budget unless it wasn't doing well, then the City would be responsible for finding another location.

Vice Chair Lauing: Our only point is that it should not be tied to the golf course. If it goes to City Council and they say, "That's \$100,000 a year, let's put it in the bond," they

APPROVED

can do that. If they say, "Let's look at some fee that we can add to recover that per year." If they say, "It's \$20,000 a year, no problem." Any of those are options. The only statement we're making is that we don't see why it should be correlated to golf course revenue performance.

Commissioner Reckdahl: OK. One thing I'm sensitive to is that the golf course will have a lot of debt. When it comes out, the construction is done, we still have more to do. We have the restaurant that we want to remodel. There's a long wish list here and I'm just leery of throwing any more debt onto Rob. If this money's coming out of the general budget, away from Rob's budget, I think that's probably a good thing.

Chair Hetterly: That would be for the ongoing maintenance, not the initial investment?

Commissioner Reckdahl: For the \$20,000, correct. [crosstalk]

Commissioner Crommie: Ed, can we clarify where the—oh, sorry. I just want, before we move on, to clarify where the \$430,000. What I'm even confused about sitting on the subcommittee is \$20,000 over ten years is \$200,000. Then we also have this \$430,000 value. We're not lumping them together and saying we want \$630,000, which I find can be confusing to people looking at this. Ed, can you just take a minute to clarify that?

Vice Chair Lauing: It is going to take \$630,000. It's still money, absolutely. But it's a future payment stream of ten years times \$20,000, which isn't really \$200,000. The question is should that be mitigation money or should that be budget money or should there be some fee for that. That's still to be determined.

Commissioner Crommie: So it's altogether. When we stream this over ten years, are we streaming the \$630,000 over ten years? We're getting some upfront.

Commissioner Knopper: The \$200,000 is over ten years.

Commissioner Crommie: Where does the \$430,000 come from?

Chair Hetterly: The golf course bond.

Commissioner Knopper: The golf course bond.

Commissioner Crommie: I'm sorry that I need this clarification. I've even found this part confusing. Staff is recommending that everything be tied to the bond measure for the golf course. Where we're differing here is we're saying tie the \$430,000 to that bond, but for the ...

Vice Chair Lauing: No. No, no, no. Rob, go ahead.

Mr. de Geus: The staff recommendation is \$200,000 would be tied to the revenue bond. Future maintenance funds over and above the \$200,000 would be tied to the performance of the golf course.

Commissioner Crommie: Because the ad hoc committee's recommendation is that—Ed, can you finish that?—\$430,000 be tied to ...

Vice Chair Lauing: \$430,000 instead of \$200,000. The \$20,000 is not necessarily mitigation money but, for lack of a better term right now, City budget.

Commissioner Crommie: OK. \$430,000 is our ad hoc committee recommendation gets tied to the bond. Thereafter, we find funding for \$20,000 a year not tied to the revenue for the golf course.

Chair Hetterly: I have a question.

Mr. de Geus: I do have some comments. This is the first time staff is seeing this as well. Go ahead and finish your questions.

Chair Hetterly: As I look at the staff report, your proposal of \$200,000 for the initial mitigation was to include planting and tree mitigation, maintenance for up to five years, and then you had proposed that additional \$20,000 a year for years 6 to 20. Right? You had 15 years of the ongoing funding. They have 10 years of ongoing funding starting five years earlier.

Chair Hetterly: Yours is tied to the revenue performance of the golf course.

Mr. de Geus: Correct.

Chair Hetterly: If I have that right. In terms of the \$200,000 over the first five years, I'm just trying to figure out where the difference is in the numbers. You're talking about \$430,000 mitigation upfront versus their \$200,000. Your \$430,000 doesn't include that five years of maintenance either. It's a little bit bigger distinction between the \$200,000 and the \$430,000. Am I seeing that correctly?

Commissioner Knopper: Right. For the first year technically it's the \$430,000 for build-out, for lack of a better way to describe it, plus \$20,000. Because once you plant it, you have to start taking care of it.

Commissioner Reckdahl: \$20,000 for five years.

Commissioner Knopper: \$20,000 a year. The first year is really \$450,000 if you're looking at it that way.

Chair Hetterly: Right. Their \$200,000 builds in that \$20,000, so it's ...

Commissioner Knopper: And then it's \$20,000 every year on for the next ten years. We're not saying, "Stop taking care of everything after ten years." We're just saying in this particular plan that we are just looking forward ten years.

Chair Hetterly: I'm trying to understand if that \$200,000 in the staff report is intended to cover the five years maintenance as well as the initial restoration and protection. Then five years at \$20,000, that's \$100,000 right there. Is that right? You're expecting only a cost of \$100,000 to do the initial protection and the initial habitat restoration on 2 acres of habitat.

Mr. Passmore: The cost estimates on this sheet actually do include that five years of monitoring and maintenance which is the largest chance of success or failure for the project. That's typically what restoration partners do. They commit to that five years. That's rolled into their implementation costs, is that first five years of maintenance?

Chair Hetterly: Right. I remember you telling us that before. Since we're talking about a \$20,000 a year maintenance cost, I don't know if that's a different cost for that first five years or if it's a similar cost for the first five years for each year. I'm trying to figure out where that \$200,000 number comes from. If the ad hoc committee is suggesting \$130,000 per acre to restore Baylands habitat, if you're planning to do 2 acres, then you're already at \$260,000 without counting the first five years maintenance. I'm trying to understand the difference in the numbers and how we figure that out.

Vice Chair Lauing: Really \$300,000 because there's \$40,000 budgeted for the Arastradero seedlings out the chute, \$40,000 there. If you use the same numbers, it'd be \$260,000 for 2 acres and then the maintenance. Yeah, it's over \$300,000. That would be a good question.

Chair Hetterly: I just want to compare apples to apples.

Vice Chair Lauing: Yeah. It seems like you're getting your work done cheaper than we are and we're all using the same resources.

Mr. Passmore: I think there are some differences in maintenance costs for Baylands ecosystem as compared to seedlings. On the seedlings, once they reach five years old there's very little chance that they're not going to continue to make it thereafter. So the

APPROVED

837 maintenance cost is very low for the seedlings on the Arastradero Preserve. Whereas, the
838 maintenance of the Baylands, there's a lot more of a flexible estimate as to what is
839 actually going to occur there. I don't want to speak for Daren, but I think he said
840 \$10,000-\$20,000 was a reasonable expectation depending on how solid the first five
841 years of performance was. If we have plants that are doing very well, they really take to
842 the site, we're really looking at a lower cost of continued maintenance that may be more
843 in the range of \$10,000. Whereas, if we have a really difficult time, a lot of invasive
844 plants that have to be hand weeded after that five-year implementation phase, then the
845 estimate may be as high as \$20,000. There's a lot of flex. Going back to my previous
846 statement, we have not received any really tangible, detailed cost estimates. We're basing
847 this on partners' experience, such as experience from Save the Bay. That organization
848 has done a lot of restoration. They're basing it on what their past costs have been. That
849 doesn't necessarily mean ours are going to be the same.

850
851 Vice Chair Lauing: Right. It's not adding up right now, Chair Hetterly, because basically
852 we used the Save the Bay number that we heard in the last committee meeting just as a
853 placeholder. We all understand that this is going to move around a little bit. We used
854 \$130,000. Basically if you take the \$40,000 for Arastradero that you've budgeted out of
855 the \$200,000, you're spending \$160,000 to get 2 acres. We're saying it's going to cost
856 \$260,000 to get 2 acres. We're using a number that's an order of magnitude higher, so
857 this delta is really not as big. We ought at least to be using the same number for the
858 Baylands restoration.

859
860 Mr. Passmore: Right. The 2-acre restoration estimate was also based on proximity to
861 Byxbee Park, which allows us to possibly use heavy equipment, staff, have access to
862 water. Those all reduce the cost from the \$130,000 to a lower number. That's why we
863 felt that 2 acres was a reasonable target. Even though the cost per acres is less than the
864 \$130,000, we felt like those factors would lower the overall cost from \$130,000 to maybe
865 around \$80,000.

866
867 Vice Chair Lauing: Wouldn't we put the third acre right next to it though and get the
868 same efficiencies?

869
870 Mr. Passmore: Absolutely.

871
872 Vice Chair Lauing: Yeah. I think the ad hoc committee would probably move the
873 number down then to more like, what did we just say? \$80,000?

874
875 Chair Hetterly: You said \$80,000 an acre.

876
877 Vice Chair Lauing: \$80,000 an acre, so it'd be \$240,000.

878

Commissioner Crommie: Yeah. What I ...

Vice Chair Lauing: But we have this speaker?

Mr. de Geus: Yes. If we could just take a short interlude. We do have Len Materman here, the Executive Director of the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority (JPA). We want to give him the opportunity to say a few words about his flood control project as related to the environmental permits that he's trying to get approved to start his project.

Len Materman: Thanks, Rob. I was asked to come here a few hours ago. Unfortunately I have another commitment that I need to leave for, which is why Rob broke in on that conversation. I'll say a couple of words and then I'd be glad to answer any questions anybody has. I just wanted to highlight a few points. We have a project between the Bay and Highway 101 called the Bay to 101 Project. I'm not sure how familiar you are with it, but it's been in the planning and design and EIR stage for several years. We've certified the EIR on this project. This project, as you may know, protects Palo Alto recreational facilities and businesses and East Palo Alto residents between Highway 101 and the Bay. It's an area that flooded in December of 2012, if you're not aware, on the East Palo Alto side. There's a life safety risk. The project also is a necessary first step to protecting Palo Altans and getting Palo Altans out of the Flood Insurance Program upstream of Highway 101 which is where most Palo Alto residences that are at risk are located. The project impacts three golf holes directly and a few more indirectly, which is why we agreed to a mitigation payment with the City of Palo Alto for that direct and indirect impact. There is virtually no flood control benefit to taking more of the golf course land, and we've analyzed that. We've told that to Palo Alto and we haven't asked Palo Alto for more land than the 7.4 acres which our design requires. Finally I'd say that our project did not mandate or assume an entire reconfiguration of the Palo Alto Golf Course. That was a process created by the City separately from our process. I thought it was important to make those points, because I know other points have been made about the projects and the nexus between the golf course and our project. I'd be glad to answer any questions. Again, sorry for the interruption of flow of conversation here.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: I really appreciate you coming to speak to us tonight.

Mr. Materman: Sure.

Commissioner Crommie: We did receive some information about the project. We received a letter from the Water Board dated on January 16th that was written from the Water Board to the City. The question that I have for you as it relates to both your project and our project, what does it mean for you that you don't have a permit yet for

your project? I know that you have submitted your own paperwork to the Water Board, and you're waiting on that and you're negotiating with them on the work plan. Your mitigation is funding our project.

Mr. Materman: In part.

Commissioner Crommie: In part exactly, because we did expand it quite a bit. We're also submitting our paperwork for permitting to the Water Board. I'm a little bit concerned just in terms of timelines. I know there are many levels of concern. I know you want to get your project right.

Mr. Materman: Yes.

Commissioner Crommie: You're working hard on that and I'm sure you're negotiating with the Water Board. I want to drill down to whether us getting our permit is contingent on you getting your permit and how that affects the timeline of this project.

Mr. Materman: Thank you for that question. Certainly we applied to the Water Board last spring, so it was about nine months ago, for the permit. There's been a lot of back and forth, requests for information that we've provided and further requests. In terms of our permit process, we have recently made some changes to our design to address concerns about fish and wildlife impacts and water quality impacts to the Faber Tract north of the creek which is, as you may know, part of the Don Edwards Refuge and it's owned by the City of Palo Alto. We continue in the dialog with the Water Board and the other federal and state agencies that we need regulatory permits from. I can't really speak to the Palo Alto strategy on the golf course permit. We apply for a permit on our project. Palo Alto has submitted materials to the Water Board as well on the golf course project. As far as I'm concerned, those projects are adjacent to each other. Palo Alto's golf course configuration project was inspired by the fact that the creek is moving into the golf course on some level. Those are separate permits, applications for separate projects. I know that we're going to be having conversations with the leadership of the Water Board in less than two weeks. Certainly that exact issue will be part of the conversation. That conversation includes the senior leadership from the City of Palo Alto.

Commissioner Crommie: Thank you.

Mr. Materman: Sure.

Chair Hetterly: Any other questions? Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I have a question about schedule of risk. How does your schedule of risk affect the golf course design and earth construction? I'm not sure if that's

a question for you or for Rob. These projects are happening simultaneously. Whenever you have two projects happen simultaneously, if one has a problem the other may have an unplanned problem. I'm just worried about that.

Mr. Materman: We would like nothing better for the golf course reconfiguration to be done irrespective of our work. The golf course reconfiguration assumes that the 7.4 acres of Palo Alto property is now either part of the expanded creek bed or a part of the new levee, the larger, more significant certified levee. What I'm trying to say is it's in both of our interests to decouple anything related to the schedule. Now certainly if you have two major construction projects happening at the same time with different contractors, there's going to be some coordination issues. I'm sure there will be times over the life of both constructions projects that people will get in each other's way. That's not to be avoided. If the golf course is ready to go, it should go. Our project would be the same or better off when the golf course project is done in terms of the golf course activities outside of our project footprint being completed. Rob may want to add something to that.

Mr. de Geus: It's a good question about the risk of the schedule. That's what we're all concerned about, particularly the JPA and the work they're doing. They are trying to protect lives and property. They want to get that levee built, and they have been working on it for a long time. They want to make it happen. On the golf course side, there's concern on operating losses of the golf course, in terms of recovering costs. We're losing money every month if we don't get started. More importantly we want the golf course to get built so we can essentially get out of the way, so the new levee can be built, so that our East Palo Alto neighbors are not at risk as they are now.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What is happening first? I was under the impression that the levee is being constructed first and then the golf course is being ...

Mr. de Geus: Not necessarily. We did think that for a long time, but the golf course project has caught up with the levee project at this point. We are at 100 percent design and we are ready to get our own permits to start the project. We may end up moving ahead of the JPA project, which is fine. It works fine for the levee project.

Commissioner Reckdahl: But won't some of the holes be affected by the JPA construction?

Mr. de Geus: Not necessarily, no. When the new golf course is built, we essentially vacate the 7 1/2 acres that they need to build their levee.

Mr. Materman: If I could just finish up on that one point. The work that we've done to date is preliminary work related to utilities. Of course, Palo Alto has started to stockpile soil for the levees. That kind of work can continue, again, irrespective of the activities

related to the golf course project. There's no reason to think the golf course project has to wait for our project to hit some sort of milestone or vice versa.

Mr. de Geus: The other point I would make is that the levee project in some ways is a lot more complicated. They're working inside the channel, and they can only work within that area certain months of the year. It's likely to take, Len can answer this better, at least two years to complete that levee project. We're hoping to get the golf course rebuilt in just over a year. Our expectation at this point is that the golf course would be rebuilt before the levees are completely done.

Chair Hetterly: I'm happy to hear you say there's no flood control benefit to taking more of the golf course space. These letters that we saw today suggest that there may be some benefit to maintaining flexibility to reconfigure the land bank over there in response to whatever revisions you all might need to make to your plan. Do you see that as a possibility or you feel very confident that doing the golf course now is not going to impact your ability to complete your project?

Mr. Materman: Certainly we need the permits to proceed with most of the construction. As I said, we're doing other construction activities preliminarily without the permits and that's fine. To do the major construction activities like building levees we'll need permits. What I said was there was virtually no, virtually no impact. What I mean by that is by moving the levee out more into the golf course, our hydrological analysis from our consultants says that it would lower the water surface elevation, which is really a key issue here, water surface elevation relative to the height of the levees or flood walls. It would lower the water surface elevation by a few inches. To us that's an immeasurable benefit, let's just say, a couple inches. I don't foresee us moving into the golf course much further than we are if the situation is as it is, which is there's virtually no benefit with a much greater cost. I would feel like it's incumbent upon people that maintain that more of the golf course should be marsh plain to explain their justification for why such a greater cost should be borne by the City and by the JPA entities for no benefit. We're proceeding with this design on the golf course side. The design change we're making is on the other side of the creek with the levee between the creek and the Faber Tract.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you.

Mr. Materman: Mm-hmm.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Crommie, did you have something?

Commissioner Crommie: Commissioner Hetterly pretty much asked my question. I just want to confirm it. What I hear you saying is that you have a design plan that if that design plan goes forward, it won't require any more of our golf course land.

Mr. Materman: Correct.

Commissioner Crommie: But I also hear you saying that you're not permitted yet, you're in negotiations with the Water Board. I read the Water Board letter which seems like there might be some concerns with your project. It's not only them speaking, but I've also heard other people saying it. I would have to research it more to really understand it all. Can you explain what the sticking point is? You said that you feel like more preservation of the marshlands around the creek is going to cost a lot more without that much more benefit, is your point of view. Is there another point of view that you're still having to argue? Are there people who are in control of your permit putting pressure on you, saying "We're not certain yet. We're still studying." I want to know is there something in process where the answer really hasn't been determined yet. What I mean in process would be these alternatives that do cost a lot more money, do take some more of the golf course land. We're trying to judge how likely that could be.

Mr. Materman: For anybody that's gone through a regulatory process like this, they know the permitters have a great way of using process to slow down important life safety projects. This is the situation here. There's no question that there are legitimate concerns to be had by these agencies. They basically have three concerns with our projects. One of which I consider completely legitimate and we're making changes to the design to address that. There are other concerns that are unrelated to this project. By the, let's just say, statements of the staff there, this project is comprised of a Joint Powers Authority. It's a regional project. It's important to the entities including the City of Palo Alto and the other cities. This is an avenue for them to acquire commitments by the City of Palo Alto and the other cities on topics unrelated to the creek project. I can't estimate when we'll get our permit, because we're in an environment in which demands on the project are unrelated to our application or the actual physical nature of the design. I'm not going to make a commitment on that. In terms of whether there are justifiable or unjustifiable demands on the project, I would say some of them are justifiable and some of them are perplexing.

Chair Hetterly: I think the bottom line for us is we don't want to get in the way of your project.

Mr. Materman: I appreciate that.

Chair Hetterly: The life saving flood control is far more important than the golf course. That's why this letter raised concerns for us. What I'm hearing from you, however, is that from your perspective we can go ahead and move forward with the golf course and you don't anticipate that having any impact on your project.

APPROVED

Mr. Materman: That's what I recommend. If there are impacts to our project that take more of the golf course, it would significantly delay the golf course project in which case I would be stunned if it happened this year. If we have to go back and redesign and take more of the golf course, that would not only do a complete redesign of our project and, again, for no reason, no actual benefit. It would also require a redesign of the golf course project which would mean there would be no way to construct either project this year. If I were in a position to vote on something or to make recommendations on the golf course project, I would say the project should move forward as quickly as possible, just as we're trying to do the same.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you very much.

Mr. Materman: Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Any other questions?

Mr. Materman: Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you so much for coming out and fitting us into your schedule. That was really helpful.

Mr. Materman: Sure, absolutely. Thanks. Thanks, Rob.

Chair Hetterly: We got a little off track; let's get back to the mitigation plan. I think we were talking about trying to get our numbers the same for the cost of restoration of Baylands acreage. Right?

Vice Chair Lauing: Right. I was just going to comment. Basically whatever the numbers are, they have to be the same, but let's use yours because it seems like you have a number that says \$80,000 per acre roughly. Whatever it is, our only difference in the whole proposal on that is that we'd like to have one more acre. Our increment, our delta is \$80,000 in the mitigation, to use the same numbers in this case. If we all use \$130,000, then our delta is \$130,000. That's the only difference there. We're accepting your numbers entirely on the Arastradero Preserve numbers, and we're very supportive of that.

Chair Hetterly: What we're talking about, the difference here between the ad hoc recommendation and the staff recommendation is one additional acre of Baylands restoration at either \$80,000 or \$130,000 or somewhere in between, whatever number we agree on. And decoupling the maintenance from the performance of the golf course. Is that right?

Vice Chair Lauing: Yeah.

Chair Hetterly: I had one other questions about Items 1 and 3, the 300 new trees on the golf course and the 500 seedlings at Arastradero. The ad hoc committee is recommending survival rates. I vaguely recall you might have had some discussion about that last time you were here. How do their 90 percent and 80 percent compare to your expectations?

Mr. Passmore: Those are reasonable survival rates. We would expect with proper practices to achieve those.

Chair Hetterly: OK.

Commissioner Crommie: I wanted to throw in one more thing. I think you stated the differences really well, that the ad hoc is recommending one additional acre, decoupling the maintenance. We have priced out what an acre costs differently. The other thing is when we look at the maintenance, when I look at the staff recommendation, the way I'm reading it is you don't kick in any extra maintenance money beyond the \$200,000 until year 6.

Chair Hetterly: Right.

Commissioner Crommie: That's a difference. Not only are we costing out the price per acre as higher, we're adding on money for maintenance starting in year 1 on our proposal.

Chair Hetterly: So that \$200,000, now you've got me confused. You're suggesting there should be an addition.

Commissioner Crommie: I'm just saying that's the difference when I read what staff has said.

Commissioner Knopper: If I may interject. The difference is whatever the acreage cost is, \$80,000, \$130,000, somewhere in between, plus \$20,000, our recommendation for maintenance.

Chair Hetterly: So we're looking for, in your proposal, 3 acres of Baylands restoration, ten years of ongoing maintenance, and ...

Commissioner Crommie: Starting in year 1.

Chair Hetterly: Starting in year 1 and \$40,000 for the Arastradero trees.

APPROVED

Commissioner Knopper: Right, but we're in agreement with that, with the staff recommendation. That's the same number.

Chair Hetterly: Right. What we need to do next, I guess, is figure out if the Commission supports that recommendation and then identify next steps for how to move forward. Do you have any more comments on this?

Chair Hetterly: Thanks.

Mr. de Geus: Just two thoughts that may help. The ad hoc committee's recommendation doesn't say anything about the additional 50 acres of natural Baylands acreage on the golf course that's part of the project, which is really significant and it's just not part of the equation as far as I could tell.

Chair Hetterly: That was not included in the staff report proposal either.

Mr. de Geus: But it's still an important factor. We bring up this important point because the additional 50 acres of natural Baylands acreage designed into the golf course is over and above what we're doing in terms of mitigation and that is really significant. I just think it's an important factor, and we are certainly going to highlight that point to the City Council. I think the Commission, I feel, needs to appreciate that. The other thing is the budget for mitigation. It has to come from somewhere. The idea that we will find the money, I'm not sure that's going to be the case. Tying the mitigation in part to a revenue stream is in some ways a stronger case for actually getting the mitigation money and funding for the maintenance. If the maintenance funding for this mitigation plan, for instance, is put in the CIP budget, the City only funds the CIP one year at a time. So every year you would have to make the case for annual funding. If it's tied to a revenue stream, which we hope and think will be strong particularly after 2018 when we retire one of the major debt services we have on the golf course, it may be a better strategic plan for funding ongoing maintenance for a longer period of time than asking Council to just to find the money.

Chair Hetterly: What we're talking about is an additional \$80,000?

Mr. de Geus: Well, it's more than that. Staff propose \$200,000 as the money that we would put forward and any additional would be predicated on the performance on the golf course.

Commissioner Knopper: The one point you just made was that you hope and think that revenues will be strong. There's no way to project that. I'm feeling you. I know what you're saying. If you're going to restore 3 acres of Baylands and commit to improving our tree canopy and replacing lost trees, we can't hope and think. We need to actually

APPROVED

pay to keep this stuff alive. If we're truly going to support mitigation, we have to support it. We can't just plant it and then just watch it die. That's what I do with my plants at home. I know they're going to die, so I spend \$3.99 on them. If I'm restoring 3 acres of Baylands, I want it to live and thrive and become an active habitat for critters and all of the mice and birds and everybody else who lives out there. I can't hope about it. I need it to happen.

Mr. de Geus: Yes, and we want the mitigation to work too. Staff's perspective is after the process and everything we have gone through, really relying on Walter's expertise that \$200,000 is the minimum requirement to do for the mitigation. We agree that in the end if it doesn't feel quite right, and we would like to do more. The "more" however needs to be funded somehow. That's staff's perspective. Tying it to some reliable, hopefully reliable, revenue stream is the way we would fund it. I think it would be hard for us to justify a mitigation payment higher than \$200,000 without some way to pay for it. We could certainly present to Council that the Commission would like to see a higher tree mitigation payment, but I don't think it's going to be staff's recommendation.

Vice Chair Lauing: You're on the maintenance issue now? The \$200,000?

Mr. de Geus: Just total costs. \$200,000 for mitigation funding and then any over-and-above costs would require a revenue stream of some type to pay for it, to justify it.

Vice Chair Lauing: I just don't know what you say to those people who call up five years from now and say, "All these trees are dying at Arastradero." And you say, "We're not making as much money as we thought on the golf course."

Mr. de Geus: I don't know that that would happen. I'll have Walter talk about that. In five years would all of the seedlings that we've been supporting die?

Vice Chair Lauing: It's just the tie specifically to the golf course revenue that is the objection, because that doesn't necessarily have to do with acres in the Baylands and so on. As I stated in answer to one of my colleague's questions here, if assigned the task, we could come up with ways to tie it to some revenue stream. That could be preferred parking at the golf course. That's kind of cool. Buy a yearly pass for whatever. I think there's ways to do that, but I just don't know how it gets tied to people playing golf at some amount of money for this year. Otherwise, we don't water the plants.

Mr. Passmore: What we've strived to do through this whole process is to tie mitigation to the impact. The impact is coming from the golf course; we should tie the mitigation to that. That makes a lot of sense as far as a revenue stream, for it to come from the golf course for the ongoing maintenance of these projects. When we talk about the predictability, we don't want seedlings to die in five years. It's very unlikely that once

they make five years they're all going to die. However, nature is unpredictable and so is future revenue. You alluded to the fact that we all want the golf course to do well, but we don't know how well it's going to do. General fund revenue is likewise unpredictable. We don't know what our sales tax revenue is going to look like in five years, how competitive our rental market's going to be, and so forth. There's really not a way to have a completely reliable commitment on revenue or natural survival. We're trying to do the best we can to tie a secure funding source to long-term maintenance so that we have the best possible chance of success.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I've got a question.

Chair Hetterly: Yeah, Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I support the Baylands restoration, but the thing is gnawing at me. Let me play devil's advocate and you tell me why the devil's wrong in this case. If we go away from counting trees and instead go to acreage, the reason we're doing this is because on the golf course site we cut down some trees. If you now look at the acreage, the golf course hasn't changed. It's changed from this old, big swath of turf and a lot of trees to something that's a lot more like the Baylands. The devil's advocate would say we don't have to do any mitigation because the golf course itself is improved.

Mr. de Geus: I'm going to weigh in on that. We didn't do that and we didn't think that would work. That could have been an approach. We could have said that the very design of the golf course, given that we're going from 130 acres of managed turf that's mowed and irrigated and fertilized to a footprint of only 81 acres of managed turf and adding an additional 50 acres of native natural areas of golf course is a significant environmental benefit. To try and really evaluate the value of that new and better habitat would perhaps more than offset the cost of the loss of trees. We didn't do that, and I'm not suggesting that, but I do think that it is a really important factor, because it's part of the golf course design and it significantly enhances the environment and habitat.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: I really do hear what Rob de Geus is saying here about some improvements on the Baylands golf course. The way I'm viewing this is from sitting through the stakeholder meetings. The perception is that there's a huge part of it that's aesthetic, so it's going to be a links course. It's going to have a very different look and feel. The piece of it that's missing for me is how viable this is as a real ecosystems habitat. That's why we see these words here that say establish new trees and native or naturally simulated landscape. Naturally simulated landscape is not an ecosystem that necessarily has living creatures in it. To really do this right we need to have a very high standard. We have stakeholders who have been part of this group that have very high

APPROVED

standards. It's very difficult work. What I'm hearing back from the stakeholders during the meetings is that they had some questions on the value of the naturalization for wildlife habitat. That's not to say it's not better. We're going in the right direction there. What it really comes down to for me is it's an unknown. For doing a mitigation, I don't think we can hang our hat on a unknown like that. We have stakeholders who have been focused on how you do native restoration. I don't see them involved on the golf course part of this. We don't know exactly how that's unfolding. It really wasn't discussed at our meetings, who the consultant is, who's planning this out on the golf course. It's also a golf course. You're never going to have it the same as a non-golf course. Those trees on that golf course even though there were golfers, they provided habitat for birds and other wildlife. When you make your simulated native areas there, we don't know what's coming back to that. We know something was taken away, because we know lots of animals lived on the golf course and they're gone now. The idea is how we're going to bring back new habitat. I see what you're saying and I think it's incredibly admirable that you're going in that direction. I think watching this unfold will give some direction for the future, because we will be facing these questions again and we can figure out how well that worked. Right now I just think it's too risky to factor into this mitigation. I feel like it's a piece of it, but it's not strong enough of a piece. At the Baylands there's this whole connection between the marsh tidal waters that are very, very important. My understanding is the golf course doesn't have that. Maybe it can be facilitated, but I don't see that's the direction of your project, to facilitate that intertidal connection. I think it's moving in the right direction.

Chair Hetterly: I think we're getting a little off track and we're way behind schedule. This is an action item.

Commissioner Crommie: Right. I think it's a really important point. It's a weakness in our ad hoc committee recommendation that we couldn't tie back into what Rob is saying. We struggled with that and it wasn't a big focus of the stakeholders meetings.

Chair Hetterly: OK. This is an action item. It sounds like there are a lot of different opinions about it. I think there are a couple of ways we could go. We could entertain a motion on the staff recommendation or additionally on the ad hoc committee recommendation or any other motion on this issue. Anybody want to put a motion on the table?

Commissioner Reckdahl: How tight for schedule are we on this? If we take another month to work with staff to get it ...

Mr. de Geus: No.

Commissioner Reckdahl: We don't have the ...

Chair Hetterly: We have to come out one way or the other.

Mr. de Geus: We're going to the City Council on February 3rd to ask for their approval of the site and design and hopefully to move quickly thereafter to start the project.

Vice Chair Lauing: I would move to accept the proposal of the ad hoc committee for tree mitigation.

Chair Hetterly: With any revisions or same numbers?

Vice Chair Lauing: The numbers have to be matched to City estimates so that there's similarity between both.

Chair Hetterly: OK. Is there a second?

Commissioner Knopper: I second that Motion.

MOTION: Vice Chair Lauing moved and Commissioner Knopper seconded acceptance of the proposal of the ad hoc committee for tree mitigation.

Chair Hetterly: Would you like to speak to your Motion?

Vice Chair Lauing: As we stated it's very complex. I think we're right on target in terms of how we're doing the mitigation relative to putting out more trees in the Baylands which would make no sense. The deltas between this proposal and what staff came back with have even shrunk in this meeting. In terms of finding sources of ongoing maintenance, if asked we can commit to do that. I think it's sensible. I think it's OK. I talked with Rob a little bit earlier today. It's OK if we come up with something to send to Council that's not identical with staff and it's not miles apart. It's may be even better in terms of having a debate at Council. That's why I'd support it. I don't think it needs more time actually, because it's been really vetted in months, months, and months times lots of people and really great staff participation.

Commissioner Reckdahl: As long as we get the numbers to be consistent with staff before we go to Council, I don't want to give Council two sets of numbers that don't seem to agree. That would just add confusion.

Vice Chair Lauing: Yeah, absolutely.

Chair Hetterly: Any other comments? Commissioner Markevitch.

APPROVED

Commissioner Markevitch: Overall I like the plan that you put together. A lot of hard work, but the fact that you don't have a funding source for the mitigation. You're asking the City to go back, they have a plan and it is tied to revenue. The fact that you don't have one, this kind of mindset is exactly why we are so far behind in our infrastructure. It just builds and builds and builds. For that reason, I'm going to vote no on that.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: I see where our sticking points are as a Commission. I feel that there might be some support for this plan. As a member of the ad hoc committee, I am willing to try to make our values meet on what we're costing out per acre. I just don't want to lowball it. I'd rather it land somewhere higher than \$80,000 per acre, because I never heard that number quoted. That's also including maintenance for the first five years. I really want to be mindful that there is a maintenance cost. That speaks to Commissioner Reckdahl's point. For Commissioner Markevitch, I've really struggled with this as well, not having the revenue source. I feel like it's a risky revenue source. I just want to open it up for discussion if there's any way that we could tie the maintenance cost, which again are not that large. We are only talking about \$20,000 a year here.

Commissioner Markevitch: \$200,000.

Commissioner Crommie: Over ten years' time. Again we have to always remember this is not a lot of money compared to what we're spending. We're spending \$1 million to just landscape the water processing plant. \$20,000 a year for all of this work is not that much, because it relies on a lot of volunteer workforce and that brings the price down. The thing that bothered me about the staff proposal is the line that says that it's predicated on the performance of the golf course and its ability to first pay all golf course operating costs, debt service, funding the golf course infrastructure reserve and City overhead costs. It just seemed like a lot is predicated on that, and the golf course whole project is just ballooning in terms of cost, in terms of the goals for that project. Is there any way we could strike a compromise and tie it to the golf course revenue source without so many contingencies, where we actually think there's a much higher likelihood of getting this paltry amount of \$20,000 a year? This is not a lot of money. Can we discuss that?

Chair Hetterly: I don't think we're negotiating with City staff on their proposal or our proposal at this point. I think we have a Motion on the table that we need to take action on. You could offer a friendly Amendment to the Motion if you'd like.

Commissioner Crommie: OK. I'll offer a friendly Amendment to our Motion on the table, that we tie our maintenance to the revenue source of the golf course but we define it such that we have some sense of certainty that we will get this for at least five years. I

APPROVED

1423 don't know exactly how to do that, but I'd like to tie it to the revenue with some form of
1424 definition.

1425
1426 Chair Hetterly: I think that's included in the proposal that's on the table.

1427
1428 Commissioner Crommie: No, it's not.

1429
1430 Chair Hetterly: The Motion that's on the table is the ad hoc committee recommendation.

1431
1432 Commissioner Crommie: But our recommendation does not have our funding source tied
1433 to the golf course revenue for maintenance. So I'm amending it and saying I'd like to
1434 explore having it tied to the golf course revenue source with certain stipulations added in
1435 that will ensure a higher likelihood of us getting the money.

1436
1437 Chair Hetterly: Do you have something to add to that, Ed?

1438
1439 Vice Chair Lauing: I don't accept the Amendment.

1440
1441 Chair Hetterly: OK. There you go.

1442
1443 Vice Chair Lauing: I don't accept the Amendment, because I think that's antithetical to
1444 what we're trying to go for. If our assignment is to find \$20,000 a year, we'll do it. We'll
1445 do that. If that's the only issue that we're worried about, then we'll do it. That wasn't in
1446 the scope prior to this meeting, but we're happy to do it. We're not saying where it should
1447 come from, as was pointed out. We're saying where it shouldn't come from because of
1448 the vagaries of that.

1449
1450 Chair Hetterly: All right. If there are no other comments—yes.

1451
1452 Commissioner Reckdahl: The whole discussion about how much it costs per acre brings
1453 up the point what do you do about cost overruns. Are we saying we are going to restore x
1454 number of acres regardless of the cost? Or are we saying we will put x number of dollars
1455 towards restoration and do as much as we can with that fixed amount of money? Which
1456 one are we proposing right now?

1457
1458 Chair Hetterly: I thought the latter, but I'll let the Motion maker ...

1459
1460 Commissioner Crommie: My understanding for the proposal on the table is that we stick
1461 by the acreage and make that happen as a priority.

1462
1463 Commissioner Knopper: Yeah.

1464

Vice Chair Lauing: Correct.

Commissioner Knopper: Three acres.

Chair Hetterly: Whatever it costs?

Commissioner Knopper: Whatever it costs. I support ...

Chair Hetterly: That seems impractical to me.

Vice Chair Lauing: That doesn't mean that they all have to go in day 1. If that has to be phased in because of staff time, etc., that can be done.

Commissioner Knopper: That is the goal and the commitment.

Vice Chair Lauing: The commitment for mitigation is 3 instead of 2. That is kind of the simple difference here. Question?

Chair Hetterly: I would offer an Amendment that we revise that to say our target is 3 acres. This is what we think it will cost and set the number. I think if you say 3 acres and then wait and see how much it actually costs to do each separate 3 acres, then you have this uncertainty that just hangs on forever, can balloon, can shrink.

Vice Chair Lauing: But we have an uncertainty right now. We don't have the exact numbers and they're saying that. Not because they're not trying. There needs to be more work on it.

Commissioner Crommie: When you put a park plan ...

Vice Chair Lauing: We have almost a 50 percent delta or a 40 percent delta between our two numbers when they all came out of the same committee.

Commissioner Crommie: When you put a plan in for other parks in the City, our designer says this is what I'm going to give you. I'm going to landscape everything. Then you put it out to bid. When you have a design on another park, you set your design. You establish how many acres you're remodeling and then you set it out to bid. The person who accepts the bid doesn't get to come back to you and say, "I'm sorry I ran out of money and so I can't finish it."

Chair Hetterly: But you do have a target budget to start with.

APPROVED

Commissioner Crommie: Right and that's why I would argue our target budget has to be a little higher than what staff is saying. We can't go to the bottom ...

Chair Hetterly: It is higher.

Commissioner Crommie: ... if we're debating between \$80,000 and \$130,000. I'd never even heard the number \$80,000 until tonight. That's an argument not to go all the way down to the lowest number.

Chair Hetterly: I have a question about the Motion. You proposed the ad hoc committee recommendation with the caveat that you come to some agreement on a number. Is that right? Where do we stand on the number in the Motion?

Vice Chair Lauing: I don't understand the question.

Chair Hetterly: For the per acre cost.

Commissioner Knopper: What the City tells us it costs per acre to rehabilitate an acre.

Chair Hetterly: OK.

Vice Chair Lauing: Right. If it's closer to \$60,000 or \$100,000, we can change that right now. These are cost estimates. All numbers to be bid by staff.

Chair Hetterly: OK.

Vice Chair Lauing: It's a quantity that ...

Commissioner Knopper: Right. It says estimated expenditures, because it's estimated. Just based on our conversations of numbers that have been thrown around.

Chair Hetterly: I think we're ready to vote.

Vice Chair Lauing: Yeah, because if it's their number at \$80,000 more than we're proposing. If it's our number, the one that we picked from the last meeting, it's \$130,000 more. That should be trimmed up, I'm sure, by the time it goes to Council.

Chair Hetterly: OK. The Motion is to approve the ad hoc committee recommendation. All in favor.

Vice Chair Lauing: Six.

Chair Hetterly: Opposed. We have six ayes, one nay.

MOTION PASSED: 6-1

Commissioner Reckdahl: Can I make one comment ...

Chair Hetterly: Yes.

Commissioner Reckdahl: ... to explain my vote? I think we're not all the way there, but I think we're close enough and that's why I voted yes. It makes me nervous that the numbers don't agree. I think we can rectify that. It also makes me a little nervous that we don't know for sure how much it's going to cost us.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I think we should be able to get rid of the uncertainty and get to hard numbers with some work. I'm willing to take that risk and recommend to the City Council that we do commit to doing 3 acres.

Chair Hetterly: Yes.

Vice Chair Lauing: I'd like to make a comment on something a little bit different: the issue that we have to continue to make efforts from everywhere, including the press who's probably here to communicate to constituents why this makes sense. That we're not replacing trees one for one, that it makes sense to consider community values and Baylands restoration as a very, very viable mitigation. I'm delighted that I was so badly misquoted in a January editorial saying that I favored trees on the golf course. It was the exact opposite. That absolutely was the best thing they could do to underscore my point, is that there has to be high communication on this. We don't want to put trees on the golf course and that's a good thing. We need to have our citizens understand that. We all have to make best efforts to make sure that happens.

Chair Hetterly: Council Member Schmid.

Council Member Schmid: Very interesting discussion. I'd just like to reiterate my point that the value to the Council is the discussion you just went through. I know there's very little time between now and the Council discussion of this. If you could get the verbatim Minutes especially once you started making Motions and make sure that that is available to the Council the week before the meeting, it would be very helpful.

Mr. de Geus: We can do that, Council Member Schmid. We're having the Minutes done verbatim with an outside contractor and they do that within five days. We can include it in the packet.

4. Recommend Approval of a Park Improvement Ordinance for the Reconfiguration of the Palo Alto Municipal Golf Course Capital Improvement Project.

Chair Hetterly: We have a number of speakers. We'll start with Eileen McLaughlin, followed by Craig Allen. You have 2 minutes please.

Public Comment

Eileen McLaughlin: Good evening again. I'm here to recommend that you do not recommend moving forward on the Ordinance or recommend this EIR to City Council. I want to go back a little bit. The Citizens Committee has been working for decades now with the Don Edwards Refuge in numerous projects along the shoreline. We have a lot of experience following projects that are going through CEQA and the permitting process. We've seen this a lot of times. I wanted to share some information which may be helpful. What's the reality of the permitting process? The major master permit they're looking for is a dredging permit from the Corps of Engineers. That permit feeds on and has the participation of a whole list of agencies; the Water Board, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Marine Fisheries Service, the State Fish and Wildlife Service, BCDC and others as may be appropriate for the project. Each of these agencies have to provide different kinds of approvals, different kinds of evaluations. That all has to build in. Secondly, alternatives that are considered under the Corps of Engineers and by the Water Board are the Federal Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA). It is not the same definition as your alternatives in CEQA. It is quite possible that there are alternatives that would fit that definition that were never considered by JPA. The permit may consider other alternatives. The Corps of Engineers at this point has not even put out as public notice, which begins the process for public comment. Presumably because it doesn't have a LEDPA on which it thinks most of these agencies concur and they heard many problems along those lines. We also know that the model that JPA is currently presenting to the Water Board, Fish and Wildlife Services and others was not evaluated in JPA's EIR. Are there other models yet to come despite what Len had to say? Are the projects separate? This project, the golf course, started as mitigation. It is mitigation for that project. If you're the Water Board and you're saying, "This is mitigation," you're looking at them together. Certainly it's a question that they're going to be looking into more closely. They are connected no matter how we want to say, "It's easier for us to do them separately and go our own ways." There is an interrelationship. Last July I brought the question of timeline to the Planning and Transportation Commission when they were looking at the draft EIR. Members of that board came to the recommendation that this EIR not go forward in final form until at least December, because there was a representative from ICF, the consultant working with JPA, there who said they were pretty confident that permitting would be done by December. We now know it's "we don't know when." We've got lots of uncertainties

APPROVED

going on here. To go forward and learn later can be very, very costly for the City. I know there is money to consider trying to move forward fast, but there's also money to consider at the backend as well. The unknowns here are just too great to just not sit and wait for a while. You need to stop the process, put it on hold for now, take a good look, work with JPA, work with the Water Board. Do what you need to do and learn what to do. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Craig Allen.

Craig Allen: Commission, Craig Allen. I played the golf course for the first time in 1956 when I was only 1. I've played it continuously since 1969. Having a golf course in Palo Alto has been a great part of my life here since 1969. First, I want to thank Rob de Geus and the staff of the City of Palo Alto who has done a wonderful job getting this project to where it is today. That's what I can say because they work with the golfers, they work with the community. Time is of the essence here. The golf course has been shrunk. Play is reduced. We're piling dirt. We're ready to go. This does not need to be micromanaged anymore. It's been managed to death for years. It wasn't the golfers who wanted this full golf course. As long as the City Council decided they wanted it, then we should go for it and do it and we should do it right now. As far as them being two separate projects, they are two separate projects. There's a nice line that goes down that side where we won't be anymore and the flood control can do what they want. Different designs for the JPA just can't happen or it's never going to get done. Don't even think about that possibility. Approve this, send it to Council. Let Council cough up the extra money that's been added because of already delays and because of things that have been added. The pro forma still says it will make money, so we just have to go ahead with it. There's dirt down there ready for something to be done with it, like make a golf course. Please let's not have any more delays. Let's just go ahead and do it. Thank you very much.

Commission Discussion

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Sorry, I guess I should have had you guys do your thing first. I haven't got this sorted out yet. Are you presenting or Joe?

Rob de Geus: We don't have a large presentation here. I'll just make a few comments. Let me first introduce Joe Teresi. He's the Senior Engineer for Public Works, and he's the project manager for the Golf Course Reconfiguration Project. We're asking the Commission to recommend to Council approval of the Park Improvement Ordinance that was in your packet. As you know, the Municipal Golf Course is dedicated parkland, and under Chapter 22.08.005 of the Municipal Code construction in parkland requires a Municipal Park Improvement Ordinance. The Commission has seen the golf course design go through many different renditions, from seven different ideas down to four,

APPROVED

down to a final option, then recommended that final option to the City Council in 2012. The Commission has provided input throughout the design process from then forward, then had a unanimous vote in March of 2013 to support the site and design. The design stays essentially the same as you last saw it, and that's what we'll be presenting to the City Council on February 3rd. We'll be asking the Council to do three things on February 3rd. One is to approve the final 100 percent site and design of the golf course. That does not include the 10 1/2 acres; it's just the golf course as you've seen it. We'll be asking them to approve the Park Improvement Ordinance that you have before you this evening. We'll be asking them to certify the EIR, which we got the final EIR completed document today. The Commission's role in the EIR process is really to be involved in the process and provide comment during that period, which the Commission did as a whole and as individuals. We thank you for that. I'm sure you'll be eager to read it. I have a copy here. There are copies in the libraries, at Lucie Stern Community Center. You can certainly have access to that before February 3rd. Joe, would you like to add anything to the context?

Joe Teresi: I would just add that the way I see this is that your endorsement of the Park Improvement Ordinance is a logical next step. You've already endorsed the site and design application. This is just really another way of doing almost the same thing. You're essentially saying that you've reviewed the project, its scope, its elements and that you agree that they're appropriate for the golf course. In terms of whether or not this should be approved now or later, we have many things that we need to get approved in order to actually start construction. As staff we're trying to assemble as many of those approvals as we can and not wait. I don't see any sense or any advantage to waiting. We're not going to be able to build anything without all the permits. The fact that you recommend approval and the Council approves a project, without the permits we're not going to build something that has to be redone in the unlikely event that the flood control project results in a change to our project, which I think is extremely unlikely. Even if that were true, we're not going to be able to build something without the permit anyway. I don't see really any disadvantage to approving the project now and having you endorse the Park Improvement Ordinance this evening.

Chair Hetterly: Is it typical to approve a Park Improvement Ordinance in advance of final certification of the final EIR and any of that other stuff? I understand that whatever is happening with the EIR isn't directly related to the Park Improvement Ordinance. By this document we're basically saying we support the design as we have consistently, and that's basically all it says. Right?

Mr. Teresi: Right. What will happen at Council is it's the whole package as Rob explained. The approval of the site design, the approval of the Park Improvement Ordinance, and the approval of the EIR are all done at one meeting. That's essentially

APPROVED

saying that the Council approves of the project and approves of the analysis of the project and its impacts and the mitigation measures that will be enacted as a result of the project.

Chair Hetterly: Is there an implicit support then for whatever ends up happening with the EIR or with the mitigation plan? I'm not being very clear about this. By approving this document, we're not saying anything else except that we support this project going forward and agree that it should happen on the parkland. Is that correct?

Mr. de Geus: I think that is correct. It shouldn't be assumed that the Commission by approving this Park Improvement Ordinance is recommending approval or certification of the EIR necessarily. It just came out today and you haven't even seen it. It's not that. It's a technicality in the Municipal Code that any project on parkland requires a Park Improvement Ordinance. We go through the Commission to ask for that recommendation. Was there more to that question?

Chair Hetterly: I'm sorry?

Mr. de Geus: Was there more to that question?

Chair Hetterly: No. My sense is usually we end up at the very end of the process doing the Park Improvement Ordinance, once all the T's are crossed and I's are dotted. It seems to me there are some items that are still not yet fully done, like the EIR which is just finalized today. Nobody's taken action on that yet. I'm wondering why we're doing this now instead of later. I understand you don't see any reason why we shouldn't.

Mr. de Geus: I would just say with respect to the EIR in terms of the T's being crossed and the I's dotted, it has happened with respect to what the Commission's role is with the EIR, which is to participate in the creation and development of the EIR. It's now complete and it's not going to change. It goes to Council from here. That is what we're trying to do, is trying to line up as many approvals as we can for Council so they can do them all at one time, so we can move the project forward.

Chair Hetterly: Any other questions or comments? Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: I feel that our role here on the Commission is to be supportive of the public and their concerns about parkland and open space. The EIR process at its heart is to encourage that kind of public participation. That's why I wanted to participate in the EIR process for the golf course reconfiguration, and I did participate in it. I would like to see that public comment before I vote on a Park Ordinance. I feel like that's part of the process, and I think that's our job as Commissioners. I think this is too premature for us to do this now. I think that we've done a couple of other things in the course of this project prematurely, and I have regretted it at those steps. I think I would regret it at this

APPROVED

step. So often when we vote on something it's used as support for these downstream events that we're not always fully informed on. We voted unanimously on Plan G for the golf course. It's cited in the staff report. At that time I didn't know that the EIR was going to examine the placement of five playing fields on that land. I was told, "We have to do it that way. We always have to do the biggest thing possible when we're doing an EIR." That came as a surprise to me because we had never heard five playing fields ever being mentioned. I sat on the subcommittee that looked at the golf course. I reviewed every single plan that came before us. That was the case where I just didn't have all the information when I voted. I feel like I'm being asked to do that tonight. I feel uncomfortable with it.

Chair Hetterly: Director Betts, do you have a comment?

Greg Betts: Good evening. Greg Betts, Director of Community Services. I wanted to clarify two points. One is that the recommendations that staff will take to Council are three independent recommendations. It's not one sentence, but it's three actions; one, two, and three. The other thing that I'd like you to keep in mind in terms of why now. The project is somewhat predicated, as you know, on starting in spring in order to be able to time the project to be able to allow the sod to grow in at the golf course. A Park Improvement Ordinance takes two readings of the City Council, and there has to be a minimum of 14 days between those two readings. Because of the timing of the Council meetings, that would be at earliest the first of February and the end of February. A Park Improvement Ordinance cannot go into effect until 30 days after the second reading. It's a little bit of looking at the timeline in terms of why in January this is being brought before the Commission. That's the reason.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Any other comments or questions?

Vice Chair Lauing: I entirely agree with staff, Joe and Rob, that we basically have already approved this. Now it's just a question of making it official. There's no down side, and I don't see any correlation between that and the EIR that, as you said, arrived today which is a matter of record. Any changes in design or whatever is up to the City and JPA and the Water Board to sort out. That's beyond our pay grade. I would support this.

Chair Hetterly: Council Member Schmid.

Council Member Schmid: If I could just ask a technical question. The Director of the JPA said there's nothing that would affect the golf course. I guess I was scared by one sentence in that letter that said there was a concern on the Faber Tract which is used as a secondary flood control basin. If that is turned down, are you saying there's no potential for a change in the levee design on the south side of the creek?

Mr. Teresi: I think the primary concern from the resource agencies was the fact that the initial proposal by the JPA was to lower that levee between the creek and the Faber Tract which would result in more frequent overtopping into the Faber Tract. Now the JPA has eliminated that element of their project and thereby eliminated that concern. I'm not exactly sure what the comment in the letter is referring to. There has been no specifics as to what the Water Board staff might be looking for. As Len mentioned, options of further widening the creek into the golf course were looked at several times many years ago. There's no benefit. The JPA has made it clear that they are not looking at the City for more land on the golf course. They don't feel that they need it. Again as I said, if this Commission recommends approval of the Park Improvement Ordinance tonight and the Council in turn approves it, we're still not going to build anything until we have the permit from the Water Board. In the worst case, if we don't get the permit from the Water Board, we're not going to build the project anyway. In the meantime our goal is to get all the approvals in line, so that as soon as we get that permit we can move ahead.

Chair Hetterly: Any other comments or questions? This is an action item. Do I have a Motion on this item?

Commissioner Markevitch: So moved.

Chair Hetterly: To approve ...

Vice Chair Lauing: Second.

Commissioner Markevitch: To approve the Park Improvement Ordinance.

Vice Chair Lauing: Second.

MOTION: Commissioner Markevitch moved and Vice Chair Lauing seconded approval of the Park Improvement Ordinance.

Chair Hetterly: Seconded by Chair Lauing. Any further discussion?

Commissioner Reckdahl: I have a comment.

Chair Hetterly: Yes.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I say this every time this becomes before a Commission. I'll repeat it. I really want to make sure that we don't shortchange ourselves when we're building up the golf course and adding the fill. Every load that you load lifts that turf that much further away from the saltwater. I think five years from now we won't look at the

APPROVED

turf and say, "I wish we hadn't put as much dirt in." I think it'll be the opposite. There will be spots where we say, "I wish we'd put a few more loads in over there." I would not cut any corners when it comes to filling up the golf course. That's my only comment.

Chair Hetterly: All right. We'll vote on the Motion. All in favor. Opposed. That's six for, one against.

MOTION PASSED: 6-1

5. Discuss El Camino Park Lighting Plan for Both Athletic Fields.

Chair Hetterly: I don't have any public comment on this. If you'd like to speak to this topic, get a card in soon please.

Daren Anderson: Good evening. I'm Daren Anderson. I'm Division Manager for Open Space, Parks and Golf. With me tonight is my colleague from Public Works, Hung Nguyen. He's the project engineer working on El Camino Park. We're here tonight to update the Commission about the lighting in El Camino Park. Let me preface this by saying the intent is to do a public meeting on some minor lighting changes from when you last reviewed this project. We're here to collect your questions and comments related to that specifically. The next steps would be that public outreach meeting in February. We'll reach out to the community especially, as we'll show you in a couple of drawings in the attachment, an apartment complex that would be impacted by some of the lighting that we intend to add. Then come back to the Commission in March with a PIO for the entire project which would include the lighting. With that I'll pass it over to Hung Nguyen, who will walk you through the staff report and some of these attachments.

Hung Nguyen: Good evening, Commissioners. Let me start by going over the project update real quick with you. The design process has been going real well. We are anticipating a 65 percent design by the end of this month. We plan to go back to you for final approval in March and get Council PIO approval in April and 100 percent design complete in May. We plan to obtain the construction permit and go out to bid in July of this year and start construction in October of this year. You might have seen this plan many times. I want to bring this slide up to refresh you. We have a north field and a south field. The original scope of the project was to renovate existing lights on the south field and provide for four lights on the north field. However, during the PARC and Council joint meeting in December 2013, there was some desire from the Commission and Council to add more light into this current scope of project. We concur with recreational staff that doing so will provide more flexibility in scheduling more games at night. There will be a cost savings if we add the lights in the current scope. We have revised the project scope to include four new lights and poles for the north field. On top of that we'll provide two more new lights on the south field to enable staff to use the far

APPROVED

most corner of the south field. The current drawing you see now, I'll attempt to show you the full measure of the trial lighting of the four on the north field and six on the south field. As you can see, the light blue or purple area is the spill that comes out from the trial lighting on the south field. The yellow area is the intensity. The most intense light that will focus on the playing field. All the new lights, you can see S1 to S4, will be mounted on the 70-foot high pole including B1, P1, and P2. All the lights will be on a 60-foot high pole. On the right-hand corner we provide two perspective drawings for the proposed lighting. That's looking from the Highway 101 looking to the playing field. On the left-hand you can see the four photographs that we include there. Those are the actual pictures that we took from the Alma Building. One is from the tenth floor. The others are from the sixth and the second and the street view looking across the playing field. The bottom drawing at the cross-section, looking from the high rise over the fields. The last one, we show you the light structure that we have selected for this project. The reason we chose this light is it is more efficient compared to other light structures, and it provides less spillage from the light pole to the playing field. If you look at the four pictures in the middle, you can see that demonstration between the SC light, which doesn't have any visor protecting the light from spillage, compared to the light that we chose. We also looked at the proposal of installing more shorter poles instead of the 70-foot pole. However, doing so will cause a lot more spillage to the community surrounding the park. If you can focus your attention to the pole, that illustrates the angle that we can use to focus the light from a higher pole to the playing field. Compared to a shorter pole, we have to focus the light more horizontally to provide light to the playing field. That will cause more spillage to the surrounding area. The last graphic we have on the bottom of this drawing illustrates the reflection from the light that bounces off the playing field. For example, for this we have a 70-foot light focused on the playing field. We calculate that around 20 percent of light will bounce off the playing field. The numerical you see there, intensity divided by a number that represents, for example, 6 foot-candle will bounce off the playing field. You get that 6 divided by the intensity, on the bottom you will get the foot-candle away from the playing field. We are still in the development process of trying to get all the data updated and finalized so we can go to the public meeting in February. Hopefully by the time we go to the public meeting we have most of the design and illustration more finalized.

Mr. Anderson: We're available for comments and questions.

Chair Hetterly: I'll start off saying I'm really thrilled to have this become before us. We've been talking for a long time about lights out there, but hadn't made any progress. Public outreach is a big piece that I think we really need to complete. I'm glad to see that's included in here. I did have a question about the public outreach. You mentioned inclusion of stakeholders, outreach to specific stakeholders. I wonder who do you have in mind as people for specific outreach.

APPROVED

Mr. Anderson: Mainly we wanted to make sure we touched base with the user groups to make sure this is the right kind of lighting they want. We'd reach out to the various leagues that would inevitably be using that as well as the residents in the surrounding area, so that they can see well in advance what this is really going to look like, give them some examples. As Hung explained, a lot of the terminology on some of this initial graphics is a little vague, and we need to translate that into layman's terms. When you see 25 percent lighting efficiency at such distance, we need to convert that into something that the layman can say, "Are we talking about a flashlight shining at me or are we talking about a spotlight?" That's where we're working with Siegfried, our designer, to help us get to that level of explanation, so it's in the simplest terms. We'd hoped to get there tonight; we didn't quite get there. Specifically that's what we're asking you for, what do you need that would make it intuitive to the public and to you when we come back to you and say, "This is the lighting plan. Does this make sense? Do you buy into it? Does it meet our needs at this site from your perspective?"

Chair Hetterly: Before we take comments, are there any questions? Commissioner Markevitch.

Commissioner Markevitch: My first comment is you've got to make these graphics bigger. I can't even read them they're so small. I'm not a lighting expert, but is it possible to look into just putting the lights on the railroad track side of the field? If there is light bounce, it's going out onto El Camino and not up onto 101 Alma because that's where you're going to get the most push back, is that building.

Mr. Anderson: Excellent comment on the graphics. We'll be sure to address that. The second point is one we looked at as well. Is it possible just to light it from the train track side and not back towards the residences? Unfortunately, we did investigate that and the answer was no. We can't adequately light the field in one direction to meet the needs of our stakeholders, the user groups that is. You won't adequately light that field. There will be shadows cast in weird directions that throw off perceptions for ball use and play.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: We've got two effects. One is that the light goes directly from the bulb to the surrounding areas. The other that the light can bounce off the surface. Which is the bigger effect? Off the surface is the bigger effect?

Mr. Nguyen: I would say the light reflecting directly from the light will be more intense.

Commissioner Reckdahl: From the light bulb will be bigger?

Mr. Nguyen: Exactly, yes.

Commissioner Reckdahl: In the text we talked about an aerodynamic, I think was the phrase, aerodynamic visor. Is that what you were talking about that would focus the light or shield the light?

Mr. Nguyen: Exactly. That will shield the light from it. We have the ability to angle it at any angle we want.

Commissioner Reckdahl: OK. Why do you call it aerodynamic? Is it designed to minimize wind?

Mr. Nguyen: No, to minimize the spillage from the light.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The term aerodynamic, why is that ...

Mr. Nguyen: I think the term aerodynamic got the sale point for them to say we can throw the light to any angle that we want.

Commissioner Reckdahl: This shield is just a physical shield that's blocking it?

Mr. Nguyen: Exactly.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Is there any way that you can make the bulbs be longer parabolas, so they have longer barrels so less light spills out?

Mr. Nguyen: I will investigate it.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm not a lighting expert either, but I would think that there would be different lengths of parabolas that you could get for bulbs or for the reflectors around that. If you could have a long enough parabola, I would think that you could really minimize the amount of spill-out going into the neighboring area. I would think that between that and a visor, you should be able to really minimize, especially with these tall poles, minimize how much is spewed out into the surrounding areas. The second effect, the bouncing off, if you look up at the graphic there, it's bouncing off one side and then going off to the right. Those poles are 70 feet. That means about 40 feet is the line of sight to the building. Is there any way you could put some type of netting, like you would have on the side of fences by tennis courts, something that would cut down the amount of bounce that you get up there?

Mr. Nguyen: If that's possible, I will investigate it.

APPROVED

Commissioner Reckdahl: Also it would be nice to see the, like you're saying, get that into real effects. I think a full moon would be a good one to compare it to, because people don't object to the full moon. You don't get complaints of people complaining the moon is too bright tonight. If it's the size of a full moon, I would think that that would not be objectionable to the neighborhood. If it's ten full moons, then maybe you're in trouble.

Mr. Nguyen: Right, right.

Commissioner Reckdahl: One more thing. We had talked earlier about possibly having rental lights up there to see. Is that being considered at all?

Mr. Anderson: We had initially discussed that. It's still under consideration. I think we'd play it by ear with how that public meeting goes and how well we can articulate what the impacts of those lights will be. I think some of those photos, the photo from the tenth floor inside the room is really handy to see, "This is what the tree canopy is going to block." Paul from Siegfried did have some suggestions on how much lighting. He seemed to indicate, though I don't have specific numbers, that it was really going to be negligible light impact to that area. The problem is we need to convey precisely what that is and we don't have that yet.

Commissioner Reckdahl: And where it's coming from. If you know where it's coming from, then there may be some mitigation you can do.

Mr. Anderson: Doing a rental light and getting it to the 70-foot height on that site, which still isn't developed, might have more challenges than we know just yet. I think maybe we can get to a resolution by working on this a little bit more.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That would be my preference. If you can explain it to them in words they can understand, that may save you a lot of money with the rental costs. What I'm concerned about is these rental lights are not going to be the same design as what we're going to be using. It may make matters worse in that they might find the real lights acceptable but the rental lights unacceptable. Now you've shot yourself in the foot. I would try to explain it in layman's terms and see if that works. That's all.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Lauing.

Vice Chair Lauing: Just two quick questions. One is estimated elapse time from now going through public process, doing everything you have to do, and then we turn them on and get more fields out of it. Are we talking a year?

Mr. Anderson: You mean until construction?

Vice Chair Lauing: I mean just putting in all the contingencies with stuff that could go wrong and so on.

Mr. Anderson: I think it would still be construction in October.

Vice Chair Lauing: OK. When we were doing the CIPs, there was some hope that maybe there was something that we could trade off that wasn't used in the El Camino Park, so that we could get quick funding on that. Has that been looked at yet?

Mr. Anderson: Do you mean extra funding not used at El Camino Park? I'm sorry, I didn't follow.

Vice Chair Lauing: We were looking at it not having to be a new CIP, because there was some funds that ended up not being spent, *i.e.*, the dog park.

Mr. Anderson: No. Unfortunately it's almost the opposite. This original plan did not install lights on the north field. It only stubbed them out and it didn't include these two new ones. In spite of those other cost corrections of not adding the dog park, we're probably still looking at needing \$300,000 additional dollars.

Vice Chair Lauing: OK. That's all.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: Hi. Thanks for your presentation. Since we have some existing lights out there, were there any complaints on the existing lights at the baseball field.

Mr. Anderson: Not that I had received. Rob, did you have any?

Rob de Geus: No.

Commissioner Crommie: I'm sorry I didn't follow everything technical in the presentation. Will the new lights cause more light pollution in the evening than the old lights on the baseball field?

Mr. Nguyen: We don't expect that; however, we're adding more light to the north field and people haven't seen that. They expect it might change when they see the north and south fields lit up at the same time. That's what we expect they might raise concern about.

Commissioner Crommie: You're talking about the synergy between the two fields?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, yes.

Commissioner Crommie: Have we ever used this kind of light in our City?

Mr. Anderson: Yes. It might be a newer model and Musco, the company we utilize for this, is constantly evolving and improving. That's what they do, sport field lighting. Light sensitivity and spillage is one of the main concerns at every field that has this. They're constantly working at cutting that down. That upper drawing that had these various iterations of lights and the capping of it and the angling, all go towards minimizing that light spill. We currently have Musco at our Stanford-Palo Alto playing fields. Those are similar lights. This would just be the newest iteration which we would expect to have greater light containment, that is, keeping it on the field.

Commissioner Crommie: There's a lot of lights on the Mayfield fields. When you measure it, will this be on par with that? I know OB Moore designed better. That's what I'm most familiar as having the most light emission on any of our lighting. Does this top that or come below it?

Mr. Anderson: I don't have a good answer for that. My guess is that it would be comparable, but we haven't done an analysis to say which would have greater lighting or which wouldn't.

Commissioner Crommie: What is the duration of the lights being on, up into the night? What's the time schedule?

Mr. Anderson: It's based off scheduled play. The cap would be 10:00 p.m. If the scheduled play was brokered out to 9:00 on that particular week or day, it would shut off 30 minutes thereafter to allow enough time for the participants to get back to their vehicles in a lit area.

Commissioner Crommie: I'm really excited about this project, and I'm glad it's moving forward. I just think, of course, it's essential to get a really good public process, because people do get worried about this. I just want to make sure that a lot of effort is taken to notify everyone who possibly might be concerned. Is there only one public input meeting scheduled for this?

Mr. Anderson: Just one so far.

Commissioner Crommie: Is that flexible if anything comes up and you miss a group of people or something like?

Mr. Anderson: Yes. It's always flexible in terms of what the public reaction is. I'd also be very sensitive to delaying or deferring this project anymore than we already have. Right now the City's got a couple of big projects that are delayed. There's that aspect of the public outreach, "Why are you taking so long to get these projects done?" We want to be sensitive to that as well and get this on target and completed as soon as we can.

Commissioner Crommie: OK. Thanks.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Markevitch.

Commissioner Markevitch: A couple of things. Are we going to have an opportunity to talk about any other improvements or issues with that park?

Mr. Anderson: When we bring the PIO back, it would be for the entire park, not just the lighting. The intent, I believe, was not to open up revisiting the entire design at this point. I think we've got that one very well vetted through over ten public meetings with the Commission on that one. The feeling is among staff that we've got the ...

Commissioner Markevitch: Seventeen.

Mr. Anderson: Yes.

Commissioner Markevitch: Now 18.

Mr. Anderson: That we've got the design fairly squared away. It's really just cleaning up this lighting and making sure we've got this right. This is really an enhancement in carrying out what we've already talked about. We put stubbing there for a reason, with the intent of adding lighting. You don't build the synthetic turf ideally unless you intend to light it. It makes the most sense to get the bang for the buck.

Commissioner Markevitch: Do you know when this outreach is going to be?

Mr. Anderson: Where or when?

Commissioner Markevitch: When.

Mr. Anderson: Mid-February.

Mr. Nguyen: February 19th we set up.

Mr. Anderson: Oh, February 19th.

Commissioner Markevitch: February 19th, because I'm going to let people know.

Mr. de Geus: We'd like the help.

Commissioner Markevitch: You'll get it. I just need to know. So it's February 19th?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes.

Commissioner Markevitch: At what time?

Mr. Nguyen: 6:00.

Commissioner Markevitch: What?

Mr. Nguyen: 6:00.

Mr. Anderson: 6:00 p.m.

Commissioner Markevitch: 6:00 p.m. And where?

Mr. Anderson: At Avenidas.

Commissioner Markevitch: OK.

Mr. Anderson: Cogswell, right next to Cogswell.

Commissioner Markevitch: Yeah, I know where it is. Thanks.

Chair Hetterly: Any other comments? All right. Thank you very much.

Mr. Nguyen: Thank you so much.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you.

Vice Chair Lauing: Thanks for jumping on this so quickly, after we got a little momentum from Council in that Study Session. That's great.

6. Recommend Approval of a Park Improvement Ordinance for the Scott Park Capital Improvement Project.

Chair Hetterly: Daren, do you have a report to make?

Daren Anderson: Yes, a brief one.

Chair Hetterly: We have a number of public speakers. Why don't you go ahead and make your report and then we'll hear from the public.

Mr. Anderson: Just to reintroduce myself again, Daren Anderson, Division Manager for Open Space, Parks and Golf. I'm here tonight to ask the Commission to make a recommendation to Council to approve a Park Improvement Ordinance for the design of the Scott Park CIP. I know you've heard this one several times, so I'm going to give you a quick recap of how we got here. This started in 2012, this CIP to replace some of the existing features out there, just to repair them and replace them. A public meeting was held on August 28th, 2012. At that meeting a couple of stakeholders said, "We'd like you to consider bocce." July 30th, 2013, we had an online survey. We had 93 responses and about 85 percent supported bocce. There were some serious concerns from some of the neighbors. The report still needed that and we've talked about it at previous meetings. On August 27th, 2013, Staff brought a Park Improvement Ordinance to the Commission. The Commission did not support it and suggested that we hold another public meeting and form an ad hoc committee. Commissioner Reckdahl and Commissioner Hetterly formed that subcommittee and participated in the public meeting. We met with stakeholders on November 21st. Peter Jensen and I incorporated numerous comments and feedback from various stakeholders, the Commission, and the ad hoc committee into a revised design. Staff returned to the Commission on December 10th, 2013, and at that meeting the ad hoc committee explained that there were some community members who were still against bocce and various iterations of that. Some included not having two courts. Some just didn't want bocce at all. Some would prefer getting rid of the basketball court and just having bocce. There were various concerns ranging from noise to parking, etc. In spite of those, the ad hoc committee felt the current design that included bocce had a lot of support and fit well in Scott Park. With that, I pass it over to the Commission.

Chair Hetterly: We have six speakers, I believe. We'll start with Keith Gilbert, to be followed by Neil O'Sullivan. If you could keep your comments to 2 minutes or less, that would be great. We don't have the lights going, so I'll wave my hand at you.

Public Comment

Keith Gilbert: Keith Gilbert. Sue and I live on Addison Avenue, not far from Scott Park. I'd like to say first of all that the process as was described, I think, has been very effective in getting inputs from all of us, desires, concerns, ideas, putting them together and coming up with a very good plan for the park. One thing I like is that they've come up with an innovative idea in going to a potential system for checking out at the library of

APPROVED

the bocce equipment and instructions for bocce. That's really a great tie-in of two of our neighborhood functions. I'm certainly a strong supporter of bocce. I think it's going to be a lot of fun. It's a very appropriate activity of being a quiet activity that brings together all age groups in something that we can do together at the park. I think having bocce and particularly as they've put it into the plan now is a very good idea. In summary, the proposal is something that makes Scott Park into much more of a neighborhood, bring-together place. You're going to see the start of people, instead of just walking through the park, which is something that I do almost every day, now we're going to have a lot more reason to stop and really enjoy the park. My summary is great proposal, good inputs, good process. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Neil O'Sullivan.

Neil O'Sullivan: Good evening. I'm here representing myself and Mike McDono, who also lives at 362 Channing, and my next door neighbors, Chris and Carolyn, who can't be here because Chris is recovering from a broken back. We are all opposed to this plan primarily because we're trying to shoe-horn two sports courts into a 1/4-acre park when there's a perfectly good 2-acre park one block away that has no courts in it. We don't care whether it's bocce or basketball, but just one in this tiny 1/4-acre park and move one of them across the street into the other park which is 2 acres and virtually empty. That's my input. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Next we'll hear from Andrew Robell.

Andrew Robell: Good evening. I'm Andrew Robell. I own a condominium at 325 Channing. That's in the Woodmark condo development of 36 units. We are right across the street from Scott Park. Many of our units including mine overlook Scott Park. I can see Scott Park from my window. At the last meeting on this subject as president of our homeowners' association, I stated that we had no problem with refurbishing Scott Park, but we are opposed to the inclusion of a bocce ball court. Number one, Scott Park is the smallest of Palo Alto's 28 parks. Sixty feet of lawn would be sacrificed for a bocce ball court. That's 20 feet more than a croquet field for a tiny, little park that's, I believe, less than half an acre. That's a lot of lawn gone. Secondly, parking. The staff gave no description or attention about parking. Scott Park has no dedicated parking area, unlike other parks. Where's the impact study regarding parking that would result from this inclusion? As you well know, parking is probably the hottest issue, certainly in our part of Palo Alto. I think any changes need to take that into account. Third, the survey that was reported was well intentioned. It was a good idea, but it cannot be considered definitive. The survey was not restricted or targeted to close neighbors. Indeed anybody not even living in Palo Alto could respond to the survey by accessing the URL. There was no restriction on multiple responses. Let's say an enthusiastic proponent, either pro or con, could submit as many responses to that survey as he or she wanted to. Fourth,

APPROVED

bocce ball is a team sport. You could have a number of players and their supporters cheering them on. Whether it's a lot of players or very few players, I think it's reasonable to assume that bocce ball would not be as quiet as a lawn. Fifth, there was no survey or estimate in the reports that we've seen on the number of potential bocce ball players. In more than 50 years that I've been in touch with Palo Alto, there's never been an express need to build a bocce ball court or at least one has never been built so far. I'm sure there's a few people that are enthusiastic about it, but I think it's fair to say that it's a rather obscure sport. The few aficionados of it might come from other parts of town or even from other communities since there are very few bocce ball courts that are public. The argument that it's primarily for immediate neighborhood use may not be realistic, because devotees of bocce ball in other parts of Palo Alto would gather here because it's the only bocce ball court in Palo Alto if it's built. If it's necessary to establish a bocce ...

Chair Hetterly: You're at the end of your time, if you could wrap-up please.

Mr. Robell: Pardon?

Chair Hetterly: You're over time, so please wrap-up quickly.

Mr. Robell: OK. If it's necessary to please a handful of bocce ball enthusiasts to establish a bocce ball court, please put it in a larger parker with dedicated parking spaces. The people closest to Scott Park which is the gentleman that spoke earlier, Mr. O'Sullivan, our homeowners' association of 36 homeowners request that you not put a bocce ball court in Scott Park. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Next we'll hear from Richard Brand.

Richard Brand: Good evening, Commissioners. Richard Brand, 281 Addison. I live a block away from the Scott Park. Who would have thought that just renovation of our aged Scott Park, which has been there for over 25 years,. I've lived there 22 years, but that park used to be houses. Who would have thought it would have taken this long to get this park renovated? I have to say I think your staff has done a great job here. They've gone out, got a survey. By the way that survey was sent to local residents, neighbors, not to the whole community. The comment from my dear neighbor about everybody being able to comment is incorrect. That was a local distribution and Daren can speak to that. The point was that we had a neighborhood group that wanted to use the park for, first of all, for our kids to enjoy swings and things like that. Today it's derelict. There's no swings. My neighbors will talk about that I think. Joyce, you're going to comment on that. We need to have a park done. The recommendation is to have bocce. My good friend, Councilman Schmid, knows parking's a problem, but it's a neighborhood issue. We don't expect people to come in from East Palo Alto or wherever to play bocce. We've got neighbors that are going to do this. Some of us have our own

APPROVED

2344 bocce balls. I recommend that you pass this. I think we have a good design here. There
2345 may be a few adjustments that need to be made. By the way the Summer Hill projects or
2346 Woodmark, I guess is the term now, is twice as far away from Scott Park as it is to
2347 Heritage Park. If you've been to Heritage Park lately, there's a lot of kids that enjoy and
2348 recreate and shout and play. They make a lot of noise. I guarantee that bocce is going to
2349 be 30 percent or less noise than is generated by the park that's closer to Summer Hill. In
2350 conclusion I support the work you've done. I know it's been a tough road to go and I
2351 thank you for your work.

2352
2353 Chair Hetterly: Next we'll hear from Joyce McClure.

2354
2355 Joyce McClure: Hello. I live at the corner of Bryant and Addison. We also own a home
2356 at the end of Scott Street at 310 Addison. Then we own a home that's actually next door
2357 to the gentleman who has been participating who is complaining about the noise. I
2358 actually am not that happy with the way this process has gone because the previously
2359 approved design, which is close to the design that's been there for 30 years, was in place
2360 for a year. That was the one that was distributed to people which people responded on
2361 the survey. I personally happened to be out of town on November 21st, and I wrote to
2362 Daren and said, "I'm not going to be at the meeting, but these are my concerns." I didn't
2363 know that there was a plan to completely change the design that's already there. Now I
2364 would like to speak to the previous design. I don't know if people are aware of what that
2365 is or not, if you have pictures of it. I do and I have some that I can pass out if you would
2366 like. I'm a preschool professional. I've been teaching preschool in this area not recently
2367 but for 30 years. When I noticed what this group did not approve, did not like the design
2368 that was approved by the residents, they don't really say why the Commission did not
2369 support the design of the park. One thing that they say is they relocated the play area to
2370 improve visibility from the street. I don't know why any children need to be a part of
2371 improved visibility. You've got children that are right there, and we're talking about that
2372 street, Channing Avenue, where people don't start. We've got no barriers between
2373 toddlers and the street. That street is also used for just people to walk through from Scott
2374 Street through to Heritage Park. Originally my understanding of the design of Heritage
2375 Park and the Summer Hill project is there's supposed to be a visual openness from
2376 Addison through to Homer. This will kind of obliterate that vista. If we look at the
2377 previous plan and what's there now, where it says turf area, that's where picnic tables
2378 were so people can eat there and then they can enjoy things. Most importantly the swings
2379 are now located under the stand of redwood trees. They're separated. It's a much
2380 healthier environment for children. Right now where it's currently located in this new
2381 proposed plan is right behind a parking lot for the convalescent center, and this is where
2382 the employees of the convalescent center take their smoking breaks. My son and my
2383 daughter-in-law live on Channing right behind the park. I also support bocce ball. The
2384 basketball stakeholders, the picnic stakeholders and the children stakeholders have now
2385 been all compressed in a tiny area which is not going to be satisfying for any of them.



APPROVED

The previously proposed plan did include the bocce ball. I think it's unsafe and I think it's a mistake, the new plan. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Next we'll hear from Andy Hertzfeld.

Andy Hertzfeld: Hi, I'm Joyce's husband. I lived in 370 Channing, which is right behind the park. We've owned that for over 30 years now, so I know how that park is being used. I think bocce is great. That park does serve multiple constituencies with basketball. I used to play basketball there myself. The swings have been defunct. I think it's been two years since the swings have needed repair. That's space that hasn't benefited the neighborhood for two years. I don't know why it takes so long. I think they were maybe structurally unsafe, but why not just fix the swings? It seems silly to prioritize the bocce ball, which will be used by primarily older people, over the facilities for the kids in the park. The swings were in the optimal place really for the children. To move them near the parking lot and closer to the street. I think in the current plan there's trees separating the basketball court from the picnic tables. Those trees aren't going to form a perfect edge. Those basketballs are going to shoot through, I think, at least until maybe it's a hedge or something. Until it gets mature, you're going to need a fence to stop the basketballs from hitting the picnic tables. I think it's great to have the bocce ball court, but not for the bocce ball court to dominate all the other uses of the park. Thank you.

Commission Discussion

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. That's the end of our public comment. As you all know, this came before us last month as well with the same design. We had quite a bit of discussion. Just for the information of the public, the reason the playground moved was associated with the movement of the picnic tables out of the dark corner. I think there was a judgment made that it was useful to have the picnic tables in the vicinity of the playground as well. We made a recommendation from the adhoc committee.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The reason those were moved is because of neighborhood complaints. People congregate at late hours and that was undesirable for a lot of the neighbors.

Mr. Hertzfeld: I lived in that house right across from it for ...

Chair Hetterly: We can't have a dialog. Sorry. What? Are there any questions or comments? Do you want to hear from the ad hoc committee?

Vice Chair Lauing: Yeah. Does the ad hoc committee have any input for us?

APPROVED

Commissioner Reckdahl: This has been a long grind, but I'm really happy with the current design. I think that Daren and Peter Jensen have done a very good job. We had multiple outreach meetings. I think the final product is very good. The bocce is a perfect fit for this neighborhood park. I think the location of the sand is very nice. The picnic tables, moving them to be visible, I think is a very good design. It can be very usable, very popular. I think this is a no-brainer.

Chair Hetterly: We also appreciated that so many people came repeatedly to meetings to share your input. I know it often has kept you late at night with sitting through all our other stuff. We really do appreciate all your input. Obviously when there's disagreement about a plan, you can't always please everybody. Our ad hoc committee at least thought that this plan was a defensible plan. Yes, Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: I'm happy with the plan too, the way it's turned out. But I'm also very sympathetic to the people who are unhappy with it. I wish we could make it better. I live across the street from Monroe Park which is probably the second smallest park in Palo Alto. We see activities there waxing and waning. We had our swing set removed. We were all distraught. Now ten years later, we're hoping to get another one back again. I think you just kind of go with the flow. It's always disappointing when it doesn't go your way. I really feel for that. I visited the park and looked at the old swing set there. It was in that corner and I know it had assets to be under those trees. One compromise that we're trying to strike in Monroe Park, we also have a lot of redwood trees in our tiny park, and we're trying to maybe put a play house in among the trees for some creative play. That's one idea I have for you for future thought. I know it doesn't replace the swings. I'm excited about the community interest in the bocce ball. I think it's unique. It's followed a good process, and I think we're going to learn a lot from this. I see it as an experiment. I hope people come back and talk to us about it if we go this direction. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: If there's no further discussion, do we have a Motion on this?

Commissioner Markevitch: I move that we approve the Park Improvement Ordinance for Scott Park.

Commissioner Knopper: I second that Motion.

MOTION: Commissioner Markevitch moved and Commission Knopper seconded approval of the Park Improvement Ordinance for Scott Park.

Chair Hetterly: All in favor. It's unanimous in favor of approving the Park Improvement Ordinance.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

Vice Chair Lauing: Thanks Daren. That was great effort.

Chair Hetterly: Yes, thanks very much.

Commissioner Knopper: Thank you.

7. Discuss and Plan for Annual Commission Retreat.

Chair Hetterly: This is an action item. I'm not quite sure why it's an action item. I'll just open the discussion. I think the methodology we used last year for the Retreat was useful, where we went through a list of things we thought were coming up on our agenda or that we wanted to put on our agenda and try to prioritize them and fill in any gaps. I did look back at the Minutes from that meeting. It was March 15th. You all can look as well. I would propose for the Retreat we would start with this list and evaluate how we've done on it and, again, come up with any additional items that we want to add. I know there's been some thinking about that in the interim. That would be my proposal. Also finishing up as we did last year on talking about how efficient were our meetings, how did the ad hoc process work, administratively what did we want to do the same and do different. Of course I'm open to other suggestions of how we might handle the Retreat. If there are any other ideas, throw them out there. Yes, Commissioner Markevitch.

Commissioner Markevitch: I like the process that you brought up. Is this at Foothill Park? Because I'd really like to see that 7 acres.

Chair Hetterly: That's what I was thinking also. It would be nice if we could do it at Foothill again and do a walking tour of that 7 acres. That'd be great.

Rob de Geus: Yes, absolutely. It would be great to get a date on the calendar for everyone. If you want to consider that.

Commissioner Knopper: Yes, I was going to ask if we could get a date on the calendar.

Vice Chair Lauing: I want to see Council Schmid wearing his Smokey hat up there, leading us on that trip.

Commissioner Knopper: What is a smoking hat?

Vice Chair Lauing: A Smokey hat, the ranger hat.

APPROVED

Commissioner Knopper: Oh, a Smokey hat. I'm like a smoking hat. I don't know what that is. Sorry.

Chair Hetterly: Obviously if we're going to do Foothill, daytime is better than night time. Then we have the two questions of whether we want to replace our February meeting with it. I'm not sure what we have on the agenda for February or if we need to add a meeting. And if you'd rather do the Retreat in February or March. I guess it would come down to what the calendar [crosstalk]

Vice Chair Lauing: Generally we had to add, because we've just been so busy. I don't know what we're looking at [crosstalk]

Mr. de Geus: There are a couple of park improvements that we would like to bring forward. I think one of them is Monroe actually and Hopkins. Maybe you'll get that swing set after all.

Chair Hetterly: So we should add a meeting.

Mr. de Geus: I think so, yeah.

Chair Hetterly: Then the question is do we add it in February or do we add it in March. February's a short month. As I recall daytime meetings were easier for most people on Friday. Is that still true?

Commissioner Crommie: Are we considering over lunch time? I'm sorry I missed that.

Vice Chair Lauing: We didn't get to times yet.

Chair Hetterly: We didn't get that far.

Vice Chair Lauing: We could do a 9-12 like we did last time or we could do a 10-2 so we have time to have lunch together as opposed to taking our lunch and go home. That didn't quite work that well last time.

Commissioner Crommie: Is there any way to do like an 11-1 and go over lunch? I can make accommodations if necessary. I just [crosstalk]

Vice Chair Lauing: That's what I was saying, go over lunch. I said like a 10-2 or something like that.

Commissioner Crommie: So you want it to be four hours?

Chair Hetterly: [crosstalk] more than two hours. We probably want ...

Commissioner Knopper: Yeah.

Chair Hetterly: ... three plus.

Commissioner: What did we do last year [crosstalk]

Mr. de Geus: Yeah, especially if you want to include a short hike or something.

Chair Hetterly: Right. We did a four hour.

Vice Chair Lauing: We're not there yet, right? Pick one.

Chair Hetterly: Yeah. So we're looking at Fridays in February or March.

Commissioner Markevitch: OK. There's a school five-day weekend in February starting on the 13th [crosstalk]

Chair Hetterly: Yeah. Let's not do that.

Mr. de Geus: How about March 7th?

Commissioner Knopper: Our school goes through the following weekend, our break.

Chair Hetterly: So let's look at March.

Commissioner Crommie: Mine does too.

Commissioner Knopper: [crosstalk] the 7th?

Chair Hetterly: How about March 7th?

Chair Hetterly: OK. So we'll throw out March 7th as a tentative plan. Do we want 10 or 11? We could do 10-2 or 11-3.

Commissioner Knopper: [crosstalk] 10-2.

Chair Hetterly: 10-2?

Vice Chair Lauing: That's good.

Chair Hetterly: OK. So that's a tentative plan. Rob, you can ...

Mr. de Geus: I'll look to see if the room is available up at the Interpretative Center.

Chair Hetterly: That would be great.

Commissioner Knopper: No lizards or whatever.

Mr. de Geus: Lots of animals up there.

Commissioner Knopper: No reptiles or insects.

Chair Hetterly: In the interim I'll try to update this list. If people have things in mind already that they would like to add as subjects that we might consider doing in the next year. That includes not just what might come before us naturally through the regular processes, but if there's a new idea or some initiative that we think that we ought to start from the ground up from this Commission, that's certainly an appropriate topic for conversation. Any other comments on the Retreat? All right.

Commissioner Reckdahl: March 7th at Foothill.

8. Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates.

Chair Hetterly: I haven't heard of any updates, but we'll ask about the off-leash dogs. Do you have anything to report?

Commissioner Markevitch: Nope

Chair Hetterly: OK. Sterling Canal?

Vice Chair Lauing: Wait. Are we going to have a dogs one by next month? That's kind of a new initiative that ...

Commissioner Knopper: Pat, are we going to have one by next month? An update?

Vice Chair Lauing: I'd love to see one.

Commissioner Markevitch: We need to schedule a meeting with Daren to get that moving. We'll talk offline.

Commissioner Crommie: Can I recommend a field trip for the dogs committee? I've been starting to use a dog park near my house that I think I reported on at the

Commission. It's very interesting. I want to just tell you to try to visit it if you can. I don't know what it's called. It's on San Antonio Avenue near Fayette.

Commissioner Reckdahl: San Antonio Road.

Commissioner Crommie: San Antonio Road near Fayette. It's very interesting because it's small and very well used. It has artificial turf. I'd never seen those three things together. I don't think we have that model in Palo Alto. This is in Mountain View. I really do think it's worth a visit. When I go there, I do ask people what they think about it. People are very talkative about it. I just thought just to look at the world of options.

Chair Hetterly: Any other reports from ad hoc committees or liaison activities?

Vice Chair Lauing: We formed two new ones last month.

Chair Hetterly: For Sterling Canal and the Lucy Evans ...

Vice Chair Lauing: And Evans Interpretative Center.

Chair Hetterly: Interpretative Center.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Greg Betts mailed us a copy of the CIP. Was that approved ...

Vice Chair Lauing: No.

Commissioner Reckdahl: ... or is that still in work?

Mr. de Geus: It's still in the works. It's currently going through an internal vetting process with the Budget Office and then to the City Manager's Office.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What's the timeline for being approved?

Mr. de Geus: Let's see. It goes to the Planning Commission sometime in March and then to the Finance Committee sometime in April, May. Then eventually to City Council in June.

V. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Hetterly: Anyone have comments? Do you have any comments or announcements?

APPROVED

Rob de Geus: I'm just going to make it real quick since it's late. We do have a summer camp fair coming up on February 1st. That's an opportunity for you to come to the Lucie Stern Center and see all the variety of summer camps that we provide across the department. I also wanted to make mention of this, you may have seen this Make the Switch. We're upgrading our registration system for summer camps or anything you sign-up for, whether it's middle school athletics. If you have an account within the Enjoy! system, Enjoy! registration, that's being upgraded. In order to do that we're asking everyone to make the switch and create a new account in the new system. That needs to happen before February 10th, which is the date we do the draw, the big summer camp registration day. Please share that with people you know.

Vice Chair Lauing: At Rob's kind invitation, he asked Jennifer and me to go to the Children's Zoo. It was absolutely fantastic. I'm going to start hanging out there just to watch the kids watching the animals. The objective being that they're in the midst of a huge renovation. As that goes forward, we'll be involved in that process. We had a great tour from the director there who was like Mr. Energy. Excited about his stuff which he should be. Some of the plans that we got a first glimpse of are phenomenal. Need about \$10 or \$20 more before they can break ground. It definitely has impacts for us and Rinconada and the park there and so on. It was just a great intro. Thanks for making that happen.

Chair Hetterly: I'd also add that the City Council has put their values survey on, what is it? Open City Hall. What's it called? I don't remember the name of it. Soliciting input on what the public thinks ought to be the City's values. What is it called?

Mr. de Geus: I think it is called Open City Hall. What's kind of interesting is they're trying to do a few creative things. If you go to any of our community centers, Lucie Stern or Cubberley, there's a really large interactive smart board where you can actually just using your hands or fingers or a stylus write what your values are for the community. That'll be up for several weeks. I encourage you to drop by and submit your thoughts.

Chair Hetterly: Yeah, absolutely. You can do it online too. I think you all should have gotten an email link to that. That's going to be part of the guiding information for everything moving forward. Please do participate. Also the City is applying for a Cubberley Neighborhood Grant. I can't remember all the details of it. It's a small grant that they would use to create community building events at the Cubberley Community Center, bringing together the tenants and the service providers there as well as the neighborhoods and the community to get to know each other and understand what we're all doing and what Cubberley's all about and create a strong sense of community around it. That may come to us if we hear anything about the grant.

Mr. de Geus: We hear about the grant, I think, in June whether we get it.



Chair Hetterly: In June?

Mr. de Geus: Yeah.

Chair Hetterly: Finally apparently there's been an international design studio looking at potential designs for the 27 University. Did everyone get that email today? The email should have gone around today, I think, announcing this Thursday this design studio. There have been six different groups who have been trying to come up with ideas for what could be best done with that site. They'll be reporting out their ideas. This is not a City-driven process. It's a Stanford-driven process and it's been students from around the world participating in person and online. Yes?

Commissioner Markevitch: Council Member Schmid will be our liaison for the next year.

Council Member Schmid: I have the privilege of attending the most exciting Tuesday nights in Palo Alto. I think informally the policy is that liaisons should last for two years, because they gain a little knowledge the first year. They're two-year terms so everyone can get a chance to experience a variety of the committees. I'm counting on keeping up the exciting Tuesday nights.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Long Tuesdays.

Chair Hetterly: Yeah, long Tuesdays.

Vice Chair Lauing: Long Tuesdays, yeah.

VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT REGULAR MEETING

Chair Hetterly: Rob?

Rob de Geus: We're going to have to talk about that. I know that Daren has two park projects that he wants to bring forward. Monroe and Hopkins I think they are. Beyond that, we'll talk. If any of the Commissioners have something that comes up, you're welcome to call me or call the new Chair and we'll see how to fit it in.

Vice Chair Lauing: As it was discussed a few months ago, I think it was Commissioner Crommie's suggestion. Let's be proactive on the ad hocs. If you've got a report, tell us in advance so that we can maybe prep as well and get it on the agenda specifically as opposed to just ad hocs.

APPROVED

Commissioner Crommie: As far as the agenda for next month, are we going to hear back on the Parks and Recreation Master Plan? I'm wondering where we stand on that.

Mr. de Geus: I'm glad you brought that up, Commissioner Crommie. That will be a topic for next month. We're just starting to get that going now. We've met with the consultant once. We have a second meeting for staff tomorrow. I think we'll be ready for a good update and maybe even have the consultant here in February to talk about the Plan and how the Commission's going to interact and participate in it.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned on Motion by Commissioner Reckdahl and second by Vice Chair Lauing at 10:23 p.m.