



APPROVED

**MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
April 22, 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:

Staff Present: Daren Anderson, Catherine Bourquin, Rob de Geus, Peter Jensen, Claudia Keith, Walter Passmore

I. ROLL CALL CONDUCTED BY: Catherine Bourquin
Commissioner Ashlund came in after roll call was taken but was present for voting on motions.

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS:

None.

III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

IV. BUSINESS:

1. Approval of Draft March 25, 2014 Minutes.

Approval of the draft March 25, 2014 Minutes as amended was moved by Vice Chair Lauing and second by Commissioner Reckdahl. Passed 7-0



2. Presentation and Discussion on the "Our Palo Alto" Initiative—a Community Conversation About Our City's Future.

Chair Hetterly: Daren, do you have an introduction or do we want to just go to Ms. Keith.

Daren Anderson: Good evening. I'd like to introduce Claudia Keith, who will present a discussion on Our Palo Alto initiative.

Claudia Keith: Good evening, Commissioners. I am Claudia Keith. I'm the Chief Communications Officer here at the City of Palo Alto. Thank you for inviting me this evening to talk about an initiative that we're working at the City to implement. I've talked to a number of Commissions about it. I'm very honored to be here tonight. Essentially Our Palo Alto is a community conversation about our City's future. This just visually depicts what we're calling the three parallel tracks of the initiative. They include ideas, action and design. I'll go through each one of them in more detail. What we really want to do is create both opportunities for community dialog around important ideas and programs, while tackling the issues that we know the community cares about and that I assume you all hear about as well. We really want a lot of input and participation from our community and our citizens. We've organized the initiative into these three interconnected tracks. Our Palo Alto is really a way to express the totality of what we're talking about, that runs through many departments of the City and through a lot of different areas. It all starts with ideas generated from conversations that build connections between citizens. Our outreach approach is what we're calling Beyond City Hall. We really want to have conversations with our neighbors and businesses in the community, at community centers and schools. Like many folks, we know people are busy. We don't see them come to City Hall or come to Commission meetings. We really want to go out into the neighborhood in new and different ways. We're hoping that these conversations will bring people together to share their hopes and dreams for Palo Alto as well as their worries and their concerns. What we hope to do is deepen understanding and expand the voices that actively participate in our community. We do have folks who do come and spend their time at Commissions and at City Hall. Their voices are very important, but we know that that's a very small segment of our community. What we want to do is really provide opportunities to hear from a broader number of folks, because their voices are important as well. These ideas will take many different forums. We want to connect in different ways. We want to enhance our use of technology to reach constituents and groups that do not come to City Hall, but are very interested in the issues that our leaders are dealing with. We want to have lots of community gatherings, like picnics in the park, bike rides or neighborhood pizza parties. This Saturday we've got a bike along to look at the first of our routes on our Bicycle Boulevard project. Instead of having a meeting and looking at the maps, they're actually going to ride around with consultants and our staff to look at proposed changes to the bike routes. We have a series

APPROVED

of speakers from local thought leaders on issues that we know are important. You have a flyer there from our kick-off event tomorrow at the downtown library at 6:00 p.m., called Who Are We? We're going to look at the changing demographics of Palo Alto and what our population is going to look like in 10-20 years and what does that mean for the City and how should we plan for that, what are the schools going to look like, what kind of languages are going to be spoken. We're really hoping for a lively and interactive discussion on topics that we hope informs the process as we go along. As I mentioned, we want to have greater online connections. We have launched a much greater social media presence. We're building a micro-site that I'll show you at the end, our landing page. We'll have an online web portal and a lot of other ways. We've re-engaged on Open City Hall, which is our civic engagement tool that we launched, by asking a question about the Council's core values. We also are on Next Door which some of you may be on, which is a private social network that's grown organically to about 5,800 users in the community just by word of mouth. It's a really great way to get information to the community but also to targeted communities about specific things that are happening in their neighborhood. Ultimately what we hope to do with these ideas is to build citizenship and participation and create a dynamic culture where people are used to interacting with what's going on in the community. As you all know, City leaders and local government representatives can't do it all themselves. It's really a community effort and a collaborative way of working with the community. This is a long process. We recognize that. It will go beyond the programs and even maybe some of the issues that we're going to be talking about. We hope to spark some dialog by having the ideas part of it and the events. We have a number of them planned that I'll talk about. We're also very interested and have been talking to our Commissions about partnering with them in sponsoring such an event. I'd love to talk further about what might make sense and that you all could play a role in. We don't want to be all talk. We know we need to have some action too. As we continue with our ideas dialog, we plan to move forward with some near-term actions on some of our most pressing problems: traffic, parking. We know that a lot of these are things that impact our immediate quality of life. Our Council and certainly you in the community hear about them as well. Things such as our residential permit parking, shuttles, traffic, the California Avenue streetscape improvement project which will be completed by the end of the year. All those kinds of immediate, near-term projects we want to take action on as we continue our ideas dialogs. They do intersect, but we really want to move forward on a lot of these things that we know impact the daily quality of life for our community. Many of these you'll hear are coming to the Council over the next 18 months or so. Finally, Our Palo Alto also includes a design for our future with what is a new Comprehensive Plan for the City. The Plan is scheduled to be completed by the end of 2015. It's a very ambitious schedule. It's going to rely on broad community participation to really get the right input and to create the right blueprint. The foundation that we're hoping to create by these ideas and events and a lot of community involvement and public dialog as well as the action, we hope will build some civic capacity and momentum as we design a new plan worthy of our City.

APPROVED

All of these are interrelated and build upon each other. Our Planning Director, Hilary Gitelman, is leading our Comprehensive Plan and the outreach associated with that. All of these different elements, the ideas and the action and the design part of it, are linked and part of the whole Our Palo Alto initiative. Finally, I just want to show a screenshot of what we hope to launch in the next month or so. Hopefully the Our Palo Alto website is a one-stop shop for everything Our Palo Alto. It'll have, as you can see, the three buckets; ideas, action and design. It'll have information on all of those. It'll have videos posted of events that we've had. If you aren't able to go to an event, you'll be able to watch a video, either a long version or a short version. We'll have a calendar of comprehensive events about all the things that are going on in the City that, if you were interested for example in just one part of our Comprehensive Plan, you'll be able to go to or if you would like to come to a speaker talk on a particular issue, you'll be able to go. It'll be www.cityofpaloalto.com/ourpaloalto. We'll also have our social media portal. It's really a good way for anyone who wants to know anything about ideas, action and design. You'll also have Our Palo Alto lapel pins. Hopefully you'll wear them proudly and pass them along. With that, I'm happy to answer any questions about the initiative or anything else.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you very much. Any questions? Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: Can you remind me what department you're in? I didn't catch that.

Ms. Keith: I'm in the City Manager's Office. I'm the Chief Communications Officer. I've been with the City for about a year. It was a new position that was created to bring together all of the City's communications efforts. I work in the City Manager's Office.

Commissioner Crommie: Was it the City Manager's idea to launch this initiative? What part of the City did it get inspired by?

Ms. Keith: It was kind of a group think. I think we came at it with the realization that we needed to broaden engagement. Our City Manager, Jim Keene, has been involved in civic discourse, civic participation, it's not really a movement, in his role in local government for a number of years. We also heard from a lot of different folks that we really wanted to broaden our outreach to groups that may not engage with the City for a variety of reasons. I think everyone comes at it with a different perspective. We also have the Comprehensive Plan which is a very large undertaking. That's a big chunk of it. It kind of depended on what perspective and what lens you looked at it.

Commissioner Crommie: Are you going to have a metric to measure how well your efforts are working? I know you've brainstormed and are dealing with a tricky problem. How will you know at the end of the day if your approaches work?

Ms. Keith: That's a good question too. I think from a pure community engagement standpoint, we're hoping to build a database of folks who come to events, who sign up for our e-newsletter. These are numbers, but they do indicate some level of interest. We do have a pretty good base to work from. We do have people who receive the Mayor's newsletter or other kinds of news that we send out. We can look at the engagement level. We hope to do a lot of this via social media and online presence. Certainly there's a lot of metrics associated with that. There might be some soft ways to do it too. We look at neighborhood gatherings. We talk to people and get the pulse of what's going on out there. I think there are numbers of ways and also some qualitative ways that we're going to be doing that.

Commissioner Crommie: The reason I ask is because when you're physically at a meeting, you can see who's there. When you're doing these other methods, it's often hard to know. I don't know all the techniques that are used, but it sounds like you're going to employ some.

Ms. Keith: We are. We definitely are going to look at metrics. Hopefully as we gain an online presence, who's opened a survey, who's answered a question on our Open City Hall, if these are different people. There's all kinds of metrics and analytics that we'll be looking at as we go along.

Commissioner Crommie: Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Other comments? Commissioner Lauing.

Vice Chair Lauing: I just have one little question. As we roll out more of these community block parties and so on, is that an interesting venue to go to and say, "We'd like the first 15 minutes to just ask you about various things in the City and then we'll mingle for 30 minutes more and then we'll leave you to party"?

Ms. Keith: Yeah. One thing that we're thinking about doing is embedding Our Palo Alto in our Know Your Neighbor grants that we did last year and having some Our Palo Alto element, whether it's talk about an issue and then send us an email about the conversation or having someone from the City come and just talk. One of the things that we're also doing, I'm going to be talking to the outreach consultant for the Parks Master Plan about joining together in partnership on an Our Palo Alto event as they're going out and talking about what people want to see in parks. That might be a built-in opportunity. There will be ones that we create ourselves and ones that we hope to piggyback onto that are already happening. It really can take any form. We'll try lots of things. Some things might not work. Some people might not want us there or might just love us there. We're really open to any new and different way we can engage with the community.

Vice Chair Lauing: I presume your feedback from all of these venues is going to be a combined qualitative and quantitative?

Ms. Keith: Correct.

Vice Chair Lauing: So that you're putting a judgment layer over raw statistics or "these people said this and they're passionate about it but they're 3 of the 30,000 that live in this neighborhood."

Ms. Keith: Exactly, absolutely.

Chair Hetterly: Other comments? I have a couple of comments. I'm excited about this. I think this is a really great process. It's about time we opened up for a larger conversation. I've lived in Palo Alto many years; I don't remember anything like this in the past. I'm especially happy to hear that you're going to have links to videos of the events. I go to a lot of events, but I miss a lot of events and I often wish that I could go back and get the tone of what happened. I did have two comments. One is I think it's really important when you ask your citizens and your residents to participate in their civic affairs, that it's a two-way conversation, that there is some way for them to know that they've been heard. It's important in all of these different venues to have some piece where you explain not only why you're reaching out to them and inviting them to speak up, but also what's going to happen with their input, where it's going to go, what's the process and how will they know who's heard it and when. I think that's an important piece. Also as you may know, we're embarking on some pretty significant outreach and public engagement around the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Planning process. It would be a huge missed opportunity if these two tracks went in parallel and didn't cross over at all. I would like to see integrated into the various outreach at least providing some information about how residents might get involved in the Parks and Rec and Open Space Master Plan.

Ms. Keith: I couldn't agree more. In fact I'm having that conversation with your consultant tomorrow about how to integrate, so we're not on two different tracks. They're linked and we really want to be part of that conversation. We've definitely been partnering with a lot of folks who are on that path, whether it's the Comp Plan or the Parks Plan.

Chair Hetterly: That was it for me. Nothing else from the panel? Thank you very much.

Ms. Keith: Thank you very much. I look forward to seeing you in the community and getting some ideas. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Thanks.

3. Review and Recommend to Council Approval of the Draft Urban Forest Master Plan.

Chair Hetterly: This is an action item.

Rob De Geus: Let me just apologize for being late. I was at the Policy and Services Committee meeting next door presenting a reporting on teen services. We were first on the agenda at 6:00, but they were so interested it the discussion went past 7:00. I apologize for that. I'm here now, and happy to welcome Walter Passmore back.

Walter Passmore: Good evening, Commissioners. Nice to see you again. I just wanted to give you a brief introduction to alert you to what we've been doing with the Urban Forest Master Plan since our last meeting. We have added the Executive Summary which several of you expressed interest in. We've incorporated the About the Document chapter, partially into that and partially into other portions of the Master Plan. We have further enhanced the description of ecological benefits of the urban forest. There were individual comments regarding species benefits and other ecological benefits. We've incorporated the Considerations chapter into City Hall and also some other places. We've made some fairly substantial updates to Goals, Policies and Programs based on your input and used that to create an Action Plan chapter. Also I do want to note that as requested we redlined all of those changes. Some of them are actually in pink, but most of them are in red with the exception of the Executive Summary. That's all new, so we didn't want to redline the whole chapter. Furthermore, based on your input, we met with the community environment action partnership on April 10th to solicit additional community input. We provided an open invitation for them to invite us to give presentations to neighborhood groups. They are representatives from different neighborhood groups interested in environmental issues. We met with them at Lucie Stern Community Center. With that being said, I'm really just going to open it up to questions. We can take another look at this document.

Chair Hetterly: Great. Do we have any comments on this? Commissioner Markevitch.

Commissioner Markevitch: I didn't catch it the first time I was looking at it. It was about looking at using shorter trees near power lines instead of larger trees. Say you plant these trees and then that particular neighborhood gets undergrounded power. Are you just going to leave the shorter trees there? What's the plan for that? Maybe the neighborhood wanted bigger trees. I'm a little frustrated. It seems like it's going backwards on that one piece.

APPROVED

Mr. Passmore: I would say that the population of trees is very dynamic. We have small changes from year to year. The population is going to be much more dynamic than the rate that we underground new power, because undergrounding is a very expensive operation. There are definitely some small concerns about replacing tall trees with small trees because of power lines and then we underground the lines. In proportion to how swiftly the population changes, it's not going to be as impactful as any of the other goals, policies and programs that we've recommended.

Vice Chair Lauing: I just want to comment on the format. First, thanks for listening. You really did. Throughout this thing I can see weaved in a number of changes. Not a 100 percent, but that's okay. The net is you have a much better formatted document for everybody to read, including the Council. Just much more easily understood in terms of what the objectives are. Thank you for the new effort.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I do agree. The changes you made have really improved it, especially the Executive Summary. I appreciate that. The Council Members will appreciate that also, because the bulk of them will read this now. Before I think they would have skimmed it and put it aside. They will be able to digest the points that you're making. It's time well spent and I do appreciate you adding that. I did have a couple of questions on the Executive Summary. On page 15, on the middle column there, important tasks will include working sustainably and then you list four different items. Some of them were kind of vague. For example, the second one says identify potential conflicts and mitigation. I'm not sure what that means. Conflicts between what?

Mr. Passmore: Conflicts between different sustainability initiatives. For instance, we have initiatives to increase the amount of solar power which we talk about in much more detail further into the document. To do that we may have to sacrifice some tree spaces. That's one of the conflicts of many potential ones that we're going to have to deal with. Another one that we talk about in much more detail further in the document is the conflict between water conservation and the amount of canopy and the number of large-growing trees that we plant or the density of that canopy that generates benefits. On one hand, we want to conserve water. It's a very important sustainability aspect for our community in the future. On the other hand, we also know that large-growing trees with dense canopy provide the greatest amount of benefits at the lowest cost. It's a balancing act there. There's some conflict and we should expect that to occur as we have dialog on these subjects.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That brings up a very good point. For the trees, in general we don't water the trees. If you're talking about boulevard trees, they generally go unwatered. If you're dealing with water conservation, I would think a tree would be much better than any type of grass or other plants that need irrigation. Is that not the case?

Mr. Passmore: That's correct.

Commissioner Reckdahl: When you talk about the conflict between watering and trees, you're just talking in a general sense or is there a specific issue with trees taking water?

Mr. Passmore: No. It's more of a landscape decision. The further into the conservation topic that we go, the more we're going to have to try to motivate people to make landscape decisions that depart from the traditional lawn and flower bed and go to something that is more sustainable environmentally.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That second bullet, I would expand that. If you made that a little clearer, it would only take another three or four lines. You could have a much better explanation. Also, the third bullet is saying develop a list of preferred and restricted species. It doesn't say what this list is used for. Is it a binding list? Is it for public education? What's the purpose of this list?

Mr. Passmore: It's a guideline. It's for public use, but also for City projects. We hope this list is going to be quite extensive in utility. It's not going to be a policy. I anticipate that it's going to be a very useful tool.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Would you say this list is your office's recommendations? How would you describe this list?

Mr. Passmore: Correct. That's going to be our recommendations.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I would put that down also and say that the purpose of this list is to inform the public and inform the City of what you think are the best choices. Finally, the fourth bullet, evaluate carbon credit programs. What does that mean? Is that the City running carbon credit programs or does that mean using existing programs that the State or Federal government is executing?

Mr. Passmore: Currently we have a lot of energy conservation and carbon neutral initiatives as part of sustainability planning.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Those are City programs?

Mr. Passmore: Correct. Carbon sequestration is documented and we know that forests have a benefit. But the urban forest market for carbon credits is really in its infancy. The State has just started to look at new protocols for how to qualify projects for carbon sequestration and cap and trade. We want to be at the forefront of that market as it moves forward to determine if we can use part of our urban forest to account for part of our

APPROVED

carbon footprint. We do have a very widespread and very robust, very functional urban forest. We should be using that as part of our sustainability equation on how we're going to make the City of Palo Alto carbon neutral.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Does the City have any programs to expand the urban forest, to plant more trees in parks or other spaces?

Mr. Passmore: Beyond the Urban Forest Master Plan, there's not anything.

Commissioner Reckdahl: For example, giving CIP money for planting trees.

Mr. Passmore: Not currently.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Daren, if a tree falls down in a park, do you have money to replant that? How is that funded?

Daren Anderson: Yes, that's a regular occurrence. Typically if we do lose a tree, particularly in open space in a high profile area, we do pull from our operating budget to replace the tree. Oftentimes we'll work through Canopy and they get donations. Oftentimes the tree department has in stock contributions they can make to us. Quite frequently the process is to replace one that goes down. Sometimes the location gets tweaked. Oftentimes the configuration of irrigation around trees has changed over the years and it's no longer helpful to the tree or the landscaping. Some little tweaks here and there.

Commissioner Reckdahl: When you say the tree department has it in stock, do we have a nursery that we run?

Mr. Anderson: Correct.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Then they're growing in the ground and then we dig them up?

Mr. Anderson: Not in the ground.

Commissioner Reckdahl: They're in pots?

Mr. Anderson: Yes, at the Municipal Services Center.

Commissioner Reckdahl: One last question and this again is on the Executive Summary on page 21. This is talking about the benefit to investment ratios. Two comments here. One is a little better description would be good, because I had to really think about the benefit and go back and look at it and say, "What are they trying to say here?" I believe

the middle column is the benefit that the cities get for every dollar they spend on trees. Is that correct?

Mr. Passmore: Correct.

Commissioner Reckdahl: On the right hand, you've taken that and expanded that out to the total value. If you had a very high ratio but you didn't spend much, you wouldn't earn much money. You look at the total amount of money that you earn by planting trees, and then divide that by the number of people in the city. That's correct also?

Mr. Passmore: Correct.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Number two is Palo Alto. First I'm very proud of that. But then I thought, "Why am I proud of that?" What did we do to get number two on that list? Why are we so high?

Mr. Passmore: Not only does the City spend money to have a very good maintenance program, but we've also made wise selections of trees over the years. We're spending our money to a very good return. If you're looking at it from a business model, the cost to benefit ratio, like you observed, is only so good. If you don't spend much, then you might have a very good ratio but you might not have much of a return. Whereas, the differential shows that we're actually reducing every person in Palo Alto's tax burden by \$73 a year. That's \$73 less in taxes you're paying after the cost of the Urban Forest Management Program comes out.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Of that \$73, what's the bulk of that? What's driving that number?

Mr. Passmore: The bulk of it is on additional property tax and sales tax revenue. Realize this is only street trees. This only represents about 9 percent of the population of trees in Palo Alto. It's not a direct expansion, so you can't just multiply it by 10 and find out your return. Just to put it in perspective, this is only 9 percent of our population being represented for that \$73 that you're getting back on your taxes.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: Yes, I have quite a few comments. Thank you very much for what you've added to the report. I think it's a really big improvement. I'm going to make quite a few comments, because I gave it a very careful reading. I won't give you the typos that I found; I'll email those to you. I won't waste everyone's time on that. I will

APPROVED

make a few comments about taking out a few things. This Master Plan has gone through a lot of iterations which has made it a stronger document and a more balanced document. There's just a few comments in here that I think are holdovers before that balance got in. I'm going to go in order through the document. When I get to those, those are probably the most important things I have to say. I think there's just a couple of those. I'll go in order through the document. Commissioner Reckdahl brought up a few points that I also had on my list, so I can delete those. I just want to start in the Executive Summary on page 17. You have a light green box where you say preventing the loss of canopy and/or planting sites due to development will require improvements to project review and inspection procedures and likely changes to the Municipal Code. I wanted a little clarification on that. I think this section is really important. I'm wondering if there will be any provision here to fine developers that destroy trees. Is that what we're getting at? I notice on developments in my part of town, the south part of Palo Alto, I've seen some trees boxed off for protection and some very big, beautiful trees have then died. That happened on the redevelopment of the Palo Alto Bowling Alley. A beautiful old oak was killed. They had two beautiful oaks boxed off and one of them died. I see you want to put some more teeth into this. Does that fall under this possible change in Code? How would we get at that enforcement piece?

Mr. Passmore: There's currently enforcement authority in Code, but it's maybe not as specific as some of the input we've received. I'm not going to predict what changes to Code might be, because that would be a Council process that we need to go through. We're basically installing a placeholder because that's an issue that came up. People such as you observed that we weren't doing as good a job as we thought we needed to with some of our tree protection on construction sites.

Commissioner Crommie: So we don't need to add anything in? It would be carried under that? Is that correct?

Mr. Passmore: Correct.

Commissioner Crommie: Thank you. Moving on to the next page, 18. There's a section in here headlined Community Input and Outreach, which I think is also really good. I really like the way you organized this Executive Summary. The issue I have here is that when you discuss this, you just go over the results of this survey. I think that's important, but I think it's also important to put a few sentences in about what is the most significant outreach that you're going to do. I'm a little bit unclear of the educational piece of this plan as it pertains to future enforcement. I know that you want to motivate homeowners to possibly plant different kinds of trees. I don't understand exactly how that's going to work. I don't know if that whole concern falls under this subsection entitled Community Input and Outreach. I thought it might be the outreach part. I'm just not seeing anything in the Executive Summary about education. A summary, just a few kernels, about what

APPROVED

you consider most important. I'm not understanding if the recommendations at some point are going to be binding when you're listing recommended trees, if ultimately you're going to try to influence what people are planting, how that's going to be monitored and enforced. Do those concerns fall into this section of the document?

Mr. Passmore: I would say in part. Now realize that the Urban Forest Master Plan is broad-scale and long-term. We purposefully did not get very prescriptive. That being said, there are goals, policies and programs that call for certain actions to occur. Those are now incorporated into the Action Plan. There are specific educational and outreach items in there about how we're going to reach out to the community, what kind of information we want to have available. As far as enforcement goes, that has to be based on Municipal Code. We are going to continue enforcing the Municipal Code that we have until that's changed. Part of the recommendation in the Urban Forest Master Plan is that Municipal Code is reviewed and that City Council would consider changes. If there needs to be more enforcement or stronger incentives for people to make particular choices, then Council would be the final determinant. We will certainly make recommendations on what options we think are most palatable.

Commissioner Crommie: That makes sense. I'm sorry I'm not articulating this very well. There should be some summary statement here in this section about where you're going with this. I wasn't quite clear. Under goal number 1 you discuss making these lists of trees. There's also a whole goal about education. When we get to it, I'll remember which one it is. There's a whole goal devoted to education; yet, in this Executive Summary there's no mention of that. I was wondering if you could map what you consider the most important points from that goal into this and not talk only about the survey. On page 19, we have a section on disparity between north and south Palo Alto. I'm glad you highlighted that, because there's quite a lot of discussion of that in the body of the document. One thing that is missing in this table is the Charleston Meadows neighborhood. You've listed neighborhoods in the south of the City that were most deficient in trees in that 20, 30 year gap. The Charleston Meadows neighborhood was the second most deficient. It should be listed there. Is that possible, to add that into that table?

Mr. Passmore: Yes, certainly.

Commissioner Crommie: Thank you. It's discussed on page 57 of the document. On page 20, I so appreciate the discussion on page 20 where you define what the urban forest is. That's a new addition to this document to define it early. I'm going to ask you to reiterate that when you get to policies. I actually read the policy section of this document first, and I was very confused when you talked about goals and policies that applied to things inside the urban forest and outside the urban forest. This definition is essential for understanding that language that comes up later on. People might only read the policy

APPROVED

section. I just want to reiterate how much I appreciate this definition. There's one thing I don't understand, which is in the second column of page 20 under Parks, Preserves and Open Space Outside the Urban Forest. There's a bullet point that says develop an open space plan. I worked on the natural environment element of the Comp Plan as a Commissioner. We looked in a lot of detail at different policies and programs that pertain to open space. I don't recall something called an open space plan. We had things called comprehensive conservation plans. If you use that language, it ties back to the Comprehensive Plan. I thought Daren might want to chime in on this and whether there is something called an open space plan. It's mentioned a number of times in this document.

Mr. Anderson: Daren Anderson, Open Space, Parks and Golf. Yes, Commissioner Crommie, that's exactly right. I was in the meetings when the urban forest plan was being discussed. That was bantered about, open space plan. What they're referencing is exactly what you're calling for, a comprehensive conservation plan that would encompass things like trees, trails, all sorts of stuff specific to open space. Wildlife, habitat and recreation are the three components. As you mentioned, that's both in the Comprehensive Plan, at least the update will have a recommendation that all of Palo Alto's open space preserves should have one. As you know, we've already embarked on that; maybe five years ago for the Baylands but ran out of funding. We're continually trying to move forward with that.

Commissioner Crommie: Can we add that language in? Since it ties back to the other City documents.

Mr. Passmore: Yes.

Commissioner Crommie: And can you do a search and maybe swap that at the various places where that language is used? It's also used under the policy section. I'll probably mention it again when we get there. I won't go page by page through this document, but I am going through a lot of pages of the Executive Summary, so bear with me. On page 21, where you're talking about the benefit investment ratios, I recall from our prior meeting in review of this, that we mentioned that you might say that the biological ecosystem value is not measured in this. When you're measuring all of these, I don't see where ecosystem and habitat gets measured. Am I missing that?

Mr. Passmore: There are only certain aspects that are able to be monetized. There's a much more detailed description in the resource analysis that these numbers came out of. I would refer you to that. You're right in that currently there's no way to monetize wildlife habitat benefit.

APPROVED

Commissioner Crommie: Can you just make a note of it here? Some people will only read the Executive Summary. I know that it just wasn't me who brought that up at our last meeting to make a note of that. I wasn't able to go back to that section of the document and look and see if it's there. If you can also check on that. I'm moving out of the Executive Summary. I just have some small points here. I was looking under the Action Plan which is also new. That's on page 31. On page 31 where you mention the Action Plan which is an important piece of this. Number 2 also mentions developing open space plans and you cite Program 4.i.4. That's again where I'd like to mention the comprehensive conservation plans. Just talking about tying back to the point I just made about the biological ecosystem value can't be quantified. That relates to the benefits and values section which begins on page 37. If you can just check that it's mentioned there. I didn't have time to look for that. On page 58, this is a discussion of the disparity between north and south Palo Alto. You go into some detail of the various neighborhoods where there's this greater disparity, well where there's a greater diminishment of trees over time. On page 58 you discuss the Fair Meadow neighborhood. There's a discrepancy in how this is written and I just wanted to point it out to you. You give three bullet points on the first column about what might have created that discrepancy. One of your bullet points is listed as problematic for the soil type. At the bottom of that column you actually say that there was good soil in that particular neighborhood. I think it's called alluvial soil. I was just wondering if you can just make that more consistent between having a bullet point that says one thing and the paragraph down below says another thing. I'm quite familiar with this neighborhood over time, in the 13 years I've lived here. One thing that I've seen go on in this neighborhood that hasn't been mentioned here is the transformation of small homes into these humongous homes. That's particularly noticeable in the Fair Meadows neighborhood. When I was on the market looking to buy a home in 2001, I looked in that neighborhood and I saw what I called a lot of monster homes being developed there. I really think that that went on in such a pronounced way in that neighborhood that it actually should be possibly acknowledged. When people increase the footprint of a home that large, you lose space for trees. Now getting into the Action Plan, beginning on page 137. This is where I would recommend that you define what the urban forest is once again, at the beginning of this Action Plan. People will start here and not understand it. Because of this dialectic within the document of going between street trees where we have most of our data and open space, you're listing goals and policies for both. Yet the urban forest excludes some of these areas. That makes me realize I forgot a point, a very important point about that. If we go back in the document, can you tell me the page where you first define the urban forest plan? I think it's somewhere in the Executive Summary.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Page 20.

Commissioner Crommie: It's on page 20. This is actually a critical point. When you describe how it was defined, you say on the third paragraph on page 20 in 2010 the

APPROVED

Master Plan team identified a boundary for the urban forest. You describe it and you give a diagram which is really great. This plan is now in 2014 and so I think it could be confusing to the reader what's going on now in 2014. I think that you need a sentence that says, "These are the boundaries that we're using for this plan in 2014," to make it very explicit given there's a four-year gap in that description. If you can just again define the urban forest. I think it's so important to have this definition, that I would actually define it at the beginning of the Action Plan and also at the beginning of the policies and goals. If you can make it very succinct or you can refer back. I think it really needs to be defined on page 137 and also on page 140. Again, the fact that when you're articulating some of these concepts, you talk about things that are inside the boundaries and outside the boundaries. The reader really has to understand what those boundaries are. If you didn't use that language, it wouldn't be as important. Again I would ask for the definition on page 137 and in some form on page 140. It can be very minimal, referencing the reader to another page. I'll just illustrate why that's so important. If you look at page 139, the second subheading says parks, preserves and open space outside of the urban forest. The reader really needs to understand what that means. Now I'm going to get to something that ...

Commissioner Reckdahl: (INAUDIBLE)

Commissioner Crommie: Yeah, that's fine. Whatever you decide to do as long as there's some note there. Now I'm going to get to a couple of things in the policies. I mentioned things that I think need to be deleted. You appropriately and very nicely have balanced this document. I think the balance has been added in by what's in pink. Sometimes in this auburn color. On page 140 under Program 1.A.2, I think the last bullet point, which reads preference for species with the least undesirable traits such as surface rooting, prolific fruit or seed production, susceptibility to insects and diseases, etc., is at odds with what we've added back in, which has to do with what is desirable is really location specific. We've put in all this language to say that, so in some locations it's desirable to have fruit trees. It's desirable to have trees infected with insects for bird food. What I would like you to do is strike that whole bullet point. I think it's too confusing to have that and then go on to say other things are really important. The site specific is very important. You lose the granularity that you've inserted here by having such a broad, sweeping statement that is reflective of one bias for one kind of location which would often be street trees.

Mr. Passmore: I think that also applies to park trees in developed parks. That is a very important component of our population. I'll certainly consider that comment, but I'm not sure that we're going to completely remove the language on undesirable traits. It is good to recognize that there are undesirable traits and that's why we have a preferred and restricted. We can qualify that with being site specific. There are certain undesirable traits that we should recognize in the list.

Commissioner Crommie: Well then as long you modify that by being site specific. You don't go on to say what's desirable at other sites. It's lopsided right now. You're basically talking about certain locations, but it's not defined that way. You don't balance it by talking about what's desirable in other locations. I'm getting close. On page 142, this has to do with Program 1.D.i. This is again the disparity between north and south as far as the last 30 years of canopy. I would like to see a bullet point in here that says, "Create more tree planting sites." I see bullets about studying it, but I don't see a bullet with enough action sense to it. If you can just take a look at that and see if there's a way to insert that. Under Policy 1.F, you mention the stocking of viable planting sites, but I think it's really an important concept to talk about creation of sites when you know there's a deficiency. Moving on to page 145. This is where we have the goal about education, Goal 3, a community that appreciates its urban forest and partners with the City and Canopy to steward it. This seems like it's an important piece of this document. That's why I've asked for some things from this goal to be reflected in the Executive Summary.

Mr. Passmore: Yes.

Commissioner Crommie: On page 145 Program 3.A.4, you talk about continue pruning workshops and tree tours and consider additional ways for community and staff to interact. I had a little bit of problem lumping that altogether. I was wondering if you can have a separate program that says educate public about bird nesting season and the best time to do tree trimming and maintenance, so it's not lost in that overly wordy program. Where you say additional ways for community and staff to interact, I found that very vague personally. It might be nice to add some more to that if you can. On page 146 Program 4.C.2, where you say incorporate same into project review standards, I would reference back to the other. It's at the top of the second column of page 146 under Program 4.C.2. I just had trouble with the use of the word "same." If you can just specify what you're mapping back to, whatever that program is. I would just define what the word "same" means there. I'm almost done. This is another place where I want to create more balance. On page 147 the second column, you have Program 4.G.VII. Here's a very important section where you're talking about updating the Tree Technical Manual, which is a very important companion document. I'm glad to see that this new bullet point has been added, the second bullet point that says review and expand the requirements and options for mitigating the removal of existing trees. Delete the word "an." That's really good, but what you have written below it is too specific. It's talking about rooftop plantings. I would like to see that deleted, because I think it weakens this really important statement. For instance, this is a statement that supports the whole golf course mitigation that we did, to look at alternatives. This idea of the rooftop plantings doesn't encapsulate any of that. That kind of mitigation was done in a completely different way. I think having that second sentence really weakens the power of that statement. If you feel comfortable, I think it's really important to have that stand on its

own. I'm really close to the end, two more. These are very small points. On page 149 under Program 4.1.12, the second column, the very last program. This is just a question. It says consider transferring maintenance responsibilities from Community Services Parks Division to Public Works Urban Forestry Division for, and then it lists two bullet points including the golf course. I don't have a bias, but can you explain to us what the difference is to have one group be responsible for maintenance versus the other group?

Mr. Passmore: I think it's more budget, economy of scale, administrative oversight. Since the Urban Forestry Division is handling all other trees in the City, it'd be more efficient for us to also handle the trees in the open space along the park roads and in the golf course.

Commissioner Crommie: My last point is on Policy 4.K which is on page 150, Program 4.K.II. It says work with Canopy to educate the development community about the need to discuss trees during the early stage of a project's design. Can you please add work with Canopy and other stakeholders to that bullet point?

Mr. Passmore: Yes.

Commissioner Crommie: Thank you so much for all your work on this and your patience with my comments.

Chair Hetterly: I just have a couple of comments. I'll be very brief. I absolutely agree about the importance of addressing the elephant in the room of the benefits that are hard to quantify. I don't think we can just pretend that they don't exist. I really would also like to see some mention in there acknowledging that they exist and how we're going to deal with them in terms of monitoring, analyzing without the standard quantified data sets for consideration in future City planning. I think you have to say it. I think this is greatly improved. I liked the Executive Summary. I especially liked the Action Plan, those two pages before the goals in the back. One thing I found confusing was that the section headings don't all match up. For example, in the Executive Summary you talk about species. There's a section on species in the Executive Summary. I don't know what page it's on, page 17. But then you go to the table of contents and that's not a main heading. That's a consideration under the section composition. I think it would be helpful for the reader to have some signage. As you're reading the Executive Summary, you can say, "OK, I want to know more about species. Where do I look?" Maybe add a "for more discussion on this, see section whatever." I think that's especially important on page 18 for the community input. For the complete survey results, I would go ahead and refer to that. The public who reads this is going to want to know that section especially I think. Referring them to where in the body of the text would be helpful. Also I agree with Commissioner Reckdahl's concern about the benefit investment ratio. It was confusing to me even though I've read this now a couple of times. In the Executive Summary, I got to

APPROVED

that and I thought, "Huh. Who's going to know what the BIR really means, where it comes from?" I think it would be helpful to have one-sentence in English after that first column on page 21 where you list items 1-10. At the top of the second column, have a sentence about what the BIR is. Again, refer to the fuller discussion later in the body of the piece. That's it for me. Yes, Commissioner Markevitch.

Commissioner Markevitch: I just have one comment on the north/south disparity. While it's obvious, it would be good to note that in a lot of the north neighborhoods the canopy has been around for 50 years or more with regards to the south, which is one of the reasons why there's such a disparity and a difference. Thanks.

Chair Hetterly: This is an action item for tonight. I would entertain a motion to take some action on this, if there's motivation for that.

Commissioner Markevitch: I move we approve this.

Chair Hetterly: Is there a second?

Vice Chair Lauing: I'll second.

MOTION: Recommend approval of the draft Urban Forest Master Plan to the Council.

Chair Hetterly: Any comment on the motion?

Commissioner Crommie: Can we stipulate with the additions made at this meeting? Is that OK to add that on?

Vice Chair Lauing: I don't think the Urban Forester has agreed to take every single comment. You might want to couch that a little bit.

Chair Hetterly: That they'll consider our comments from this evening in the final draft. Would that work?

Commissioner Crommie: OK.

Chair Hetterly: Does that work?

Vice Chair Lauing: Do you take that amendment?

Commissioner Markevitch: Yeah.

Vice Chair Lauing: Yep, I'm OK with that.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION: The Urban Forester will review and consider Commissioners' comments in preparing the final draft of the Urban Forest Master Plan for presentation to the Council.

Chair Hetterly: Any other comments? Then let's vote. All in favor of the Motion. It's unanimous.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

Vice Chair Lauing: Thanks, Walter.

Mr. Passmore: Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you very much.

4. Recommend to Council a Park Improvement Ordinance for Hopkins Park.

Chair Hetterly: We have Daren Anderson here to present on that.

Daren Anderson: Good evening. I'm Daren Anderson. I'm with Open Space, Parks and Golf. I'm here tonight to ask your recommendation to Council to approve and adopt a Park Improvement Ordinance for the design of Hopkins Park capital improvement project. Since we reviewed this project and the plans in-depth at our previous Parks and Recreation Commission meeting and there have been no revisions to the plans since then, I'll be very brief. A community meeting was held in August 2013. Feedback from that meeting was incorporated into the design. In February 2014 staff shared that design with the Commission for review. The Commission noted it was a good design and a vast improvement over the existing design and supported the design. That concludes my presentation. I do have the design if anyone wants to see it up on the board. If you have any questions, I'm glad to answer.

Chair Hetterly: Are there any questions? Comments, motions?

Vice Chair Lauing: No speakers?

Chair Hetterly: No speakers. OK, we have no questions and comments. Would anyone like to take action on this? This is an action item, so we would need a motion.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I move that we approve it.

Commissioner Markevitch: I second.

MOTION: Recommend approval of a Park Improvement Ordinance for Hopkins Park to the Council.

Chair Hetterly: All in favor. I guess we need a consent calendar for things like that.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

5. Review New Information and Recommend to Council Approval of an Amendment to the Palo Alto Municipal Code Section 22.04.270.

Chair Hetterly: This is also an action item. We have Daren again.

Daren Anderson: Good evening again, Daren Anderson. I'm here to seek your recommendation that Council amend the Municipal Code to prohibit feeding wildlife and feral animals in Palo Alto parks and open space areas. I presented this topic to the Commission in May 2013. The Commission supported the idea and suggested I speak with the Audubon Society to get some feedback from them on whether the ordinance was broad enough to cover the overall scope of the issue and the problem. I did meet with the Audubon Society and they recommended that we include in addition to wildlife prohibiting the feeding of feral animals. I returned to the Commission in August 2013 and the Commission voted 6-1 to recommend the Council approve that ordinance. Commissioner Ashlund, the one no vote, felt that staff should consult with animal welfare groups to learn more about the impacts this ordinance would have on feral cats. I did meet with two animal welfare groups. I had a discussion that prompted my return to the Commission tonight. Most of the presentation tonight will focus on that discussion. That's the real substantive change. The ordinance itself is the same. The vast majority of the staff report is the same. It's really this discussion with animal welfare groups and an agreement that is the difference and why I'm here tonight. In October 2013, I met with Carole Hyde, the Director of the Palo Alto Humane Society, and Scottie Zimmerman, a Board Member of the Friends of Palo Alto Animal Shelter, to discuss the ordinance. They explained that their concern was that perhaps this was just the beginning, that it would gradually expand and become a bigger prohibition against all cat support throughout the City. That was generally the strong reaction amongst most of the cat welfare groups. They explained that Palo Alto doesn't have a very large feral cat population. That's in part, they say, due to a lot of the work they've done for many years. Lots of money, lots of effort to control those populations, predominantly through trapping and neutering. They also noted, I thought this was poignant, that they aren't aware of any legitimate feral cat feeding currently taking place in any Palo Alto parks or open space areas. They support keeping feeding of feral animals out of sensitive areas where wildlife might be impacted. Both Ms. Hyde and Ms. Zimmerman said they could support

APPROVED

the ordinance if it was clear that staff wasn't intending to prohibit feral cat feeding elsewhere in the City and if cat welfare advocates could submit permit requests to feed when necessary in parks and open space areas. The proposed ordinance already had a stipulation that allowed for feeding with a permit. I put that into the ordinance with the intent really for park rangers, for animal control officers or researchers who may have legitimate needs to feed either wildlife or feral animals or whatever in a park and open space area with a permit from the Director of Community Services. It was just a coverall. It does happen often that animal control officers and rangers do bait traps to catch different animals; because so many are dropped off in some of our urban parks and nature preserves. In speaking with Ms. Hyde and Ms. Zimmerman, who were both very reasonable, they said they didn't believe this would come up very often. It hasn't. It's not currently, but we'd love the flexibility. It seemed a very reasonable request to say, "Can we submit a permit application?" Just like an ACO would or ranger would say, "I've got to feed under these circumstances." I did confer with Director Betts who confirmed that right now no one in CSD is considering or looking at expanding no feeding to anywhere else in the City, just parks and open space. I've been with the City for almost 15 years and I think I'm the only one that I've met in the City who's pushed for this kind of thing. There hasn't been any other endeavors that I've been aware of in that time period to do anything with no feeding. Parks and open space was my concern and I'm very happy to move this forward. I think it's a valid and necessary thing. We've discussed this at length in previous Commission meetings. I passed out a sample permit request that was used for a study at the Baylands. I can open it on the big screen if that's helpful. That's an example I like because it shows the depth in which the person is saying, "This is where we're going to do it. This is a drawing of the park that shows where I need to do it. This is the timeframe. This is who's going to be here. Here's the contact information." Everything that adds legitimacy and control on the part of the City to say, and this is the big deal, "Feeding is probably going to happen whether an ordinance passes or not." It's very difficult to enforce. Someone can come in at midnight and put down a tray of cat food and no one would be the wiser. The advantage here is there's an opportunity for the City to say, "Yes, we're going to allow you to trap for two weeks at Bol Park in this area." We can monitor it. If there's other issues, like skunks are showing up or there's some negative concerns or issues, we have now someone we can contact and say, "Looks like it's not working. We need you to discontinue that. Maybe there's another spot in that park or maybe it just doesn't work. You'll have to go with something else." We have some dialog now; whereas before, it was this under-the-table thing. I also want to take a quick moment to address a comment that I saw was mailed to the Commission. I just wanted to clarify that the permit would not allow feeding of any predator, cat or otherwise, in areas where we've got endangered species or any sensitive wildlife for that matter. Furthermore we wouldn't be permitting to feed to sustain a cat colony. This would really be special situations. If, for example, one of the two organizations I mentioned or some other legitimate organization needed to feed for a while to help trap a cat or had something special going on, we could use it. It would not be some sustained,



APPROVED

ongoing feeding in a park or open space area and definitely not where there's wildlife present. During this process staff has consulted with State Fish and Wildlife Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service, the Audubon Society, the Palo Alto Humane Society, the Friends of Palo Alto Animal Shelter, and numerous other park and open space stakeholders. I think it's been a good process. I think we've reached a fairly good compromise. I think it still meets the main goal. The primary goal was to protect that wildlife, to protect the park visitors that are using these areas and to keep our open space and parks clean and safe. That concludes my presentation. I'm available if you have any questions.

Chair Hetterly: Any questions or comments? Commissioner Ashlund.

Commissioner Ashlund: Thank you, Daren. I think this is really thorough and I really appreciate you taking the time to discuss this with the animal welfare folks. It looks really thorough. I like the example of this special permit and why and when and where they would be used and that it still meets the primary goal. I really appreciate that extra effort. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Yes, Commissioner Lauing.

Vice Chair Lauing: As I read the plans for enforcement, primarily it's going to be new signage to inform constituents what the issues are and maybe slightly more patrolling, but not any incremental cost there. Do you feel like that's going to be sufficient for enforcement?

Mr. Anderson: That's a challenging question. I think it'll be helpful. I think you'll see the biggest impacts in areas probably where the feeding is most robust now, by the duck pond, by the picnic areas of all the parks and especially open space. By Children's Playground at Mitchell for example, where I know it's currently happening. People are throwing down food for squirrels. I think we can have an impact in those areas more so. I also think gradually the word would spread and it'd be helpful. It's the right thing to do even with some of the challenges of enforcing it. There's nothing right now that would stop you from legally feeding a coyote in Arastradero Preserve. A terrible thing to do for everyone's sake, but there's no law right now on the books to say, "You shouldn't do that. You can't do that." We'll incorporate this into all our interpretative programs. It'll be a part of our messages that we convey in our nature centers and the signage as you mentioned and enforcement when we've caught someone in the act.

Vice Chair Lauing: You must have considered a friendly surge of friendly rangers to be out there on weekends for the first six weeks just to break bad habits.

Mr. Anderson: Yes, yes. The rangers will be out there. Education is always the first and foremost technique that we use for enforcement. They'll continue to do so.

Vice Chair Lauing: Thanks.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Knopper.

Commissioner Knopper: I too was thinking about how to implement an enforcement program, especially the first few months of the program. Specifically the duck pond area where we have a really big problem right now. One of the things that I was thinking about is how we can create as part of the educational and learning process a service program for school groups, young people to come and monitor during those high bread-throwing, doughnut-feeding weekend times. Not only do we get to teach the children or the service group about the importance of why feeding wildlife is very bad, but they have an opportunity to, as we were talking earlier tonight with the Our Palo Alto program, encourage different people in the community that might not necessarily do civic work to be able to draw them into this important issue. I think it's a really great opportunity to reinforce the ordinance in a positive way by having people in the community be our day rangers, for lack of a better word.

Mr. Anderson: I think that's a critical point and one we've done. When we started pushing the educational companion many years ago now, seven years or more, we brought in partners that were there, like the EVs who have the Eco Center now but before they were running programs. We reached out to them, handed them the literature we wanted shared and the concise message we hoped everyone would hear. They did that for us on all their programs, which includes lots of school groups. Same with Save the Bay. Save the Bay has numerous programs. We're looking at 50 programs a year, most of them have some children component. Because the nursery is right there behind the duck pond, they're coming in and out of that area. It just so happens all their field educators have biology backgrounds and are teachers by trade. They're really good at conveying those messages to the school groups that come in. What's always been the way is people at the duck pond. We just have a connection with them and the rangers, because there's a lot of regulars. They'll serve as that day ranger for you or that goodwill ambassador to share the good word. Usually they get a lot of compliance too. When they don't, they come get a ranger to help.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: Thank you, Daren, for all of your hard work for on this. It's really good to see this coming online. I think it's a big improvement. I know it's not going to be easy for everyone to adjust. I think you've been very sensitive about developing this ordinance. I think you have good ideas about enforcing it. I hope you'll

APPROVED

come back to us to let us know how it's going. I have just a couple of questions. I understand why you're making the exception of considering this idea of having a permit. I was just a little bit concerned with this word "sustain." In the description you said animal welfare advocates need the flexibility to feed in order to trap or sustain a feral cat in an urban park would be beneficial. I understand how you would want to trap a feral cat, but I didn't understand the sustain part.

Mr. Anderson: I think I probably misspoke on that, or miswrote. It would probably be to sustain or keep alive a cat until they could trap it. That's what I had envisioned. I believe from my conversations with Ms. Hyde and Ms. Zimmerman that that was where they were going. They're very committed and they've been working tirelessly for a number of years to help reduce that population. They have no goal of increasing or developing massive colonies of cats. Their goals are to find homes and provide a better living situation for those cats.

Commissioner Crommie: That sounds really good. I also wanted to point out that our low-cost spay and neuter clinic hasn't been operational for some time now in the City. Even though we're lucky to have all these people helping us to keep the population small, I have some concerns about how that might impact growth of feral cat populations. I am hoping that that clinic will come back online. Do we have any staff watching that? I just call up periodically. They have a recording on, saying that the clinic is open but unstaffed. They've had that recording on for many months now.

Mr. Anderson: I'm sorry I don't have information on that.

Commissioner Crommie: Can you just report back on what the status of that is? It does concern me. I think that was a very valuable resource. On the recording they do say they make exceptions. I think they might be spaying feral cats still, but it's still a little bit confusing when that might come back online. How do you mention the permit process? Where is that advertised? Or is that by word of mouth, your interaction with these different groups or is it posted?

Mr. Anderson: It's in the ordinance itself. I would definitely have a dialog with different communities, like the two organizations that we discussed.

Commissioner Crommie: I looked in the ordinance and I didn't see it. Can you tell me where it is?

Mr. Anderson: This is on B. It says "Except as authorized by park regulations or with the written consent of the Director."

APPROVED

Commissioner Crommie: Thank you. I missed that. I appreciate you sending the sample around of a sample permit. When I was looking at that, one thing that wasn't really clear to me is how duration was mapped out on the permit. Do you require people to give dates?

Mr. Anderson: Yes. On the example that I passed out and in similar studies, we'll usually get down to the day and time. We wanted to know when people would be in the marsh in that particular example studying birds. Likewise with this one, we'd want to know when people were in the park conducting this kind of thing.

Commissioner Crommie: I feel comfortable with it as long as there's that oversight and specificity. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Any other comments, questions? Do we have a motion to approve the ordinance?

Commissioner Ashlund: I make a motion to approve this ordinance.

Commissioner Crommie: I'll second it.

MOTION: To recommend approval of an amendment to the Palo Alto Municipal Code Section 22.04.270 prohibiting the feeding of wildlife and feral animals to the Council.

Chair Hetterly: All in favor. None opposed.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

Chair Hetterly: So that does it for feeding wildlife. Congratulations, Daren.

6. Recommend to Council a Park Improvement Ordinance for the Magical Bridge Playground in Mitchell Park.

Rob De Geus: We invite Peter Jensen to come up here. I don't believe he has a big presentation, because we talked about this at some length last month. Hopefully it will be a fairly quick item. Peter, do you have a presentation?

Peter Jensen: I've got something.

Mr. De Geus: There is a tentative groundbreaking date that I understand is June 23rd, which is a Monday, for the Magical Bridge at 11:00.

Commissioner Markevitch: Could you talk a little bit louder?

Mr. De Geus: I'm sorry. There is a date set for the groundbreaking for the Magical Bridge project provided it gets through Council in May. That is June 23rd, which is a Monday, at 11:00 a.m. It would be wonderful to see some Commissioners there.

Commissioner Knopper: May I ask you a quick question?

Mr. De Geus: Yes.

Commissioner Knopper: Actually I should wait until comments.

Mr. Jensen: Commissioners, good evening. Peter Jensen, Landscape Architect for the City of Palo Alto. Like Rob has stated, we reviewed the plans at the last meeting. This meeting is to approve the Park Improvement Ordinance for the Magical Bridge Playground. A brief rundown of what's happened since our last meeting. The plan has gone to ARB, went to the Architectural Review Board last week where they approved the plan. They did have a few items that they would like to see come back to them. Some enhancements to the playhouse and a photometric plan for the light and fixtures, which we'll take back to them on May 1st. We also met with the Transportation Commission for the School Board and discussed the alternative routes that will occur as the pathway is under construction during the summer months. We figured out where those would be. As concerned the plan, there were no revisions or changes made except for, as I said, some more detailing to the playhouse that the Architectural Review Board would like to see. I know that there were some questions about the initial study for the Mitigated Negative Dec. I passed out that initial study for you to review. The initial study's broken up into A through R components. For the majority of those sections, there is no mitigation requested. For two of those sections, one being the biological, it refers to nesting birds and doing a review of the project site before construction. If any nesting birds are found, mitigation is spelled out; what would need to take place if nesting birds were found in that location. Also air quality as far as construction, keeping the dust down was the main element that the mitigation discusses there. As far as the mitigation goes of environmental impact, there was no other mitigation requirements for that. With that I will open it up to questions and hopefully answer them for you.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Overall this is a wonderful design. I'm very excited to get it going. There's still a couple of things that bother me about this. One of them is the restrooms. There are no restrooms immediate there. We have an existing restroom across the bridge, but it's pretty small. Is it handicap accessible? It's been a while since I've been there.

Mr. Jensen: Yes, the restroom is handicap accessible.

Commissioner Reckdahl: There is a segment of the disabled population that does need the restroom more frequently. I'm afraid that we're going to be underserved. We have a lot of people now being drawn to this. With the existing load of the park, I think we'll need more restrooms in the area, particularly handicap-accessible restrooms.

Mr. Jensen: We studied having a restroom on that segment of the park. Unfortunately there's no infrastructure there to have a restroom, because of the isolated nature with the creek there and how it's surrounded by the buildings. The restroom that is in the closest proximity to it is a ADA accessible and handicap.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I think it's too small. I think we'll have to expand that. When we do a development like this, do you look at the number of people that'd be drawn to that area and then you have some formula for calculating the number of restrooms needed in the area? How's that done?

Mr. Jensen: We currently don't have any type of calculation that is done for restroom use. In fact it's noted that a lot of Palo Alto parks don't even have restrooms. Mitchell Park does have two there. This one is along the access route and in close enough proximity that it is available for use.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm just concerned still that we will not have enough restrooms in the area. The second thing is handicap parking. A lot of these people are not going to be able to easily walk from the parking lot. The nearest one is over by the drop-off center, but that's quite a ways. Are there any other plans, any other options for parking?

Mr. Jensen: Currently the Mitchell Park parking lot is the main parking lot for the playground. There has been some discussions with the facilities around there, the church in particular, about adding handicap stalls that could be used by patrons of the playground. No agreement has been resolved yet. We were going to study that as the park opened to see if that was something that was really needed. It's felt from the parking study that the parking lot does accommodate the spaces needed for the playground.

Commissioner Reckdahl: We certainly can address the parking lot later. Restrooms, I guess you could address that later also. It would make sense to do all of the development at one time. It's much easier to deal with parking then, and plumbing. Apart from that, I think this is a wonderful project. I'm looking forward to having it built.

Chair Hetterly: Other comments? Commissioner Crommie.

APPROVED

Commissioner Crommie: I just wanted to echo the comment on the parking. I've also been quite concerned about the parking, also the access route. When we heard the presentation last Commission meeting, the presenter mentioned that she considered the primary access would be over the bridge. I'm not convinced of that. I think that people who have children that are going to have trouble making that length of a trip might try to park on the other side. Is it East Meadow? Is the Unitarian Church on ...

Mr. Jensen: Charleston.

Commissioner Crommie: Oh, it's on Charleston. I'm going to be curious to see how it plays out. My gut feeling is that due to access issues and because it is drawing in a population that has sometimes more limited access, people might try to park over by Charleston. My understanding of being there is that it's a shorter route in. Do you agree with that or not?

Mr. Jensen: I haven't measured the distance to know exactly. I would say it's fairly close out of the way. If you have to park out on Charleston, you couldn't actually park right at the entry of the walkway. You would have to park further down the street, which would probably make that further than parking in the parking lot.

Chair Hetterly: I don't think there is any street parking on Charleston through that stretch.

Mr. Jensen: No, there's not. It would actually be across the street.

Commissioner Crommie: That's where I think people might explore parking in the Unitarian parking lot, because that is close. When you're exploring it with the church, is part of that exploration to see if there could be a cut out in the fence?

Mr. Jensen: Yes.

Commissioner Crommie: Then that would be a very short trip.

Mr. Jensen: We've looked at the potential areas for a cut out. They would be somewhere in the middle of the walkway between Charleston and the Mitchell Park property line. It would definitely be closer, yes.

Commissioner Crommie: I've been concerned about this throughout the project; although, I think it's an amazing park. I'm really looking forward to seeing it come online.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Has there been any talk with Abilities United? They have a parking lot that is actually quite convenient.

Mr. Jensen: Their parking lot is not very large. They can hold between 18 and 22 cars in that lot and most of the time it's used. They're not interested in allowing any parking that's not for them.

Commissioner Reckdahl: If we extended a couple of parking spots into that grassy area and used their driveway, would that be an option?

Mr. Jensen: That is definitely another option. One of the first plans looked at was developing that area of the grass into a six-space parking lot. That could be developed in the future since it's not a developed space right now. For our purposes and for park improvement purposes, we would rather not create asphalt in a designated park area. If that relieved parking or allowed closer parking, then we would consider that.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Other comments or questions? No. OK, this is an action item for recommending approval of the Park Improvement Ordinance. Do I have a motion?

Commissioner Knopper: I'll make a motion to make a Park Improvement Ordinance for the Magical Playground in Mitchell Park.

Commissioner Ashlund: I second the motion.

MOTION: Recommend approval of a Park Improvement Ordinance for the Magical Bridge Playground in Mitchell Park to the Council.

Chair Hetterly: All in favor. None opposed.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0.

7. Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates.

a. Recreational Opportunities for Dog Owners Ad Hoc Committee.

Chair Hetterly: That is Commissioner Knopper and myself. Daren Anderson is our staff contact. We were working on a work plan that we were hoping to present to you tonight, but we're still sorting out some details about how our work should interact with the Parks and Recreation and Open Space Master Plan. We hope to be able to present that next month. In the meantime, we want to spend May, we would really want to get in touch

with the dog owners' group and talk about the Master Plan process as well as possibilities for a shared-use partnership and what their concerns and interests are to do a baseline. Basically May is our research month. We'd like to meet with them. We'd like to meet with the Menlo Park City representative about their shared-use model, what the pros and cons and costs are. Do the same with the Menlo Park dog group who's very active in that as I understand it. Then summarize what we know about the demands, needs and status of current resources, focusing primarily on gathering information about a shared-use pilot possibility. That's where we stand with the dog group.

b. Community Garden Ad Hoc Committee.

Commissioner Ashlund: Commissioner Crommie and I met two times and discussed this. We have been communicating with Cat Bourquin for our staff person. We mapped out the three locations of the current community gardens which are all in north Palo Alto, and talked about the status of the wait lists which aren't up-to-date on the website right now. We're working that out with Cat. We also are in the process of visiting the three City community gardens as well as the three that are neighborhood association; private but also available. We are reaching out to neighborhood associations. Commissioner Crommie and I are dividing up that list to talk about the needs and of course feeding this information into the survey process that we'll do as a part of the Master Plan. Lastly we're keeping an eye out for potential spaces for more community gardens. Two things that came up this past week that are particularly timely were Friday's *Palo Alto Weekly* had an article, "Down on the Neighborhood Farm," about Baron Park residents sharing gardening resources and benefits. The other is that Assembly Member Rich Gordon proposed a bill on community and school gardens, community food production for local fresh food being increasingly important. We think it's a timely issue and we'll have more actions to update on in the future. Commissioner Crommie may want to add something.

Commissioner Crommie: Thank you. I just wanted to add in that as you can tell from what Commissioner Ashlund said, we're very much in the information gathering part. I believe that by next month we can meet with our staff contact, who's Daren Anderson. Through him we'll also be exploring the Sterling Canal area in conjunction with our survey of available sites and available needs. We will be able to have a report at the next Commission meeting. I think we'll probably have something ready by then to let you know about what we found out and at least a first draft of recommendations we might have. I'll also add that as part of our community outreach, I did attend the Baron Park green team meeting. A former Park and Rec Commissioner, Joel Davidson, is on that committee and has a strong interest in community gardens, so I reached out to him. I just wanted to get a feel about what interest level there is. I know over the years I've been on the Commission, about six years now, we do get periodic queries about community gardens. It was very informative to visit them. What I learned more than anything was the broader movement in terms of this food sharing, neighborhood farming. It's a whole

APPROVED

other movement beyond a community garden. It ties into the Urban Forest Master Plan in terms of the planting of fruit trees. That could be another asset of our community, to have that local food available. I often talk about it in terms of food for birds, but there are cities in this country that have robust community fruit trees. I experienced that when I lived in Portland, Oregon. We're just learning a lot right now. Once we meet with Daren, we'll try to narrow things down and come up with some more concrete things to speak about.

Commissioner Markevitch: I seem to recall at one point the issue of Sterling Canal possibly being used for a dog run. I'd hate to see these two ad hocs not get together, well I don't want any Brown Act violations, but possibly in an opening meeting discuss the pros and cons of each.

Chair Hetterly: I think there's a first level question about Sterling Canal, which is whether it can be used for anything. Once that question is answered, I think you're right that we ought to have an open discussion about what's the best use for it if it's available.

Commissioner Crommie: Great. We'll keep that in mind. That's what we plan to evaluate, what you just mentioned, just the preliminary use issues.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Lauing.

Vice Chair Lauing: I have a pseudo ad hoc committee of one as of last month, which is to look into the communications, external communications and notification of people about coming to meetings about parks and so on. I met with Claudia Keith and Daren since that meeting. Daren put together an initial draft to be edited, which was a great start. I think we made very good progress. I definitely want to tie that into the whole Master Plan, which is another reason Claudia mentioned earlier that she's meeting tomorrow with the consultant on the Master Plan. I think it's reasonably likely that we could come back at the next meeting with a draft of what that plan should be.

Chair Hetterly: Great. Yes?

Vice Chair Lauing: I have a question. Is there any action on the 7.7 acres for the folks on that? Or when that might come back.

Commissioner Markevitch: Daren and I met yesterday. There was a follow-up call with Abbie. We went over a number of ideas that the staff had come up and we gave some ideas of our own. Since he was busy with the meeting for tonight, he will get something written up for next month to be able to hand out to the rest of the Commission.

Chair Hetterly: So we can have a discussion item for next month?

Commissioner Markevitch: Mm-hmm.

Chair Hetterly: Great. Thank you.

Vice Chair Lauing: Great. I actually had one question that was somewhat related to the ad hocs still. I thought that by this meeting we were supposed to get from Peter Jensen, who just departed, dates on the public meetings so that those on the ad hocs to start to calendar that.

Chair Hetterly: For the Master Plan?

Vice Chair Lauing: Yes.

Chair Hetterly: I think we're going to discuss that next month.

Rob De Geus: If the dates are available before that, we'll make sure that all the Commissioners get them as soon as they're set.

Vice Chair Lauing: He was charged to bring that back for this month. (INAUDIBLE) make sure we get it for next month.

V. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Knopper: May I make a comment? Rob, can I ask you a question? I think I asked you this last year. The volume of paper that we get feels counter-intuitive to being environmentally friendly. Is that a State law or City ordinance, the requirement for everything to be on paper versus electronic?

Rob De Geus: I would have to defer to the Clerk's Office to know exactly what the law requires. My understanding is that it is required, that we need to have a printed copy.

Commissioner Knopper: Right. So where does that requirement come from?

Mr. De Geus: I'll find out. I don't know.

Commissioner Knopper: For instance the dec for the urban plan to save trees, this is like the fourth time that we've received something this thick.

Vice Chair Lauing: We're using trees.

APPROVED

Commissioner Knopper: We're using trees to save trees, right. I think that this Commission should consider spearheading an effort to overturn that ordinance. No? I'm getting a no.

Chair Hetterly: I'm not for that.

Commissioner Knopper: Or consider maintaining, I don't know. It concerns me.

Commissioner Markevitch: Would you like the option of paper versus electronic for each Commissioner so they can have their own? Say you want to get yours electronically, but Jennifer is definitely a paper person because she likes to make notes.

Commissioner Knopper: I'm not saying not. I like having an agenda. That's fine. Something thick that's 157 pages times four times over, just those kinds of documents.

Vice Chair Lauing: Why don't we start with where the ordinance is?

Commissioner Knopper: Yes, right.

Commissioner Markevitch: My guess is it's a Brown Act thing.

Commissioner Knopper: This is a comment section and I'm just commenting that that bothers me.

Mr. De Geus: Yeah, I understand.

Commissioner Knopper: Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Other comments or announcements?

Commissioner Knopper: Speaking of dates, we normally get a rolling calendar for a few months out. Summer's coming up and we tend to skip a meeting in the summer or push the distance between the two meetings.

Vice Chair Lauing: We tend to talk about skipping the meeting and then we don't.

Commissioner Knopper: I personally need to know what that schedule is, because we have a lot of family planning with regard to summer holiday, etc.

Mr. De Geus: We definitely want to keep that calendar up-to-date of important dates for the Commission and include it in the packet. It wasn't in the packet this time?

Chair Hetterly: No.

Mr. De Geus: We'll need to do that. As far as the summer, I don't think the Commission has decided whether or not to take a meeting off. I know that Council is taking July off.

Chair Hetterly: I think our joint Council session is tentatively August 2nd or 4th.

Mr. De Geus: I want to say it's the second week of August, but it's right in there.

Commissioner Crommie: I already know I won't be here then. All of us are probably getting some sense of our summer schedule, so it might be good if we do it by emailing Catherine or something. Is that good?

Mr. De Geus: We can do that, yeah.

Commissioner Crommie: I'm not going to miss necessarily Commission meetings, but I'm gone the first half of August.

Mr. De Geus: OK. Just a couple of other announcements from me. One is the May Fete Parade is coming up. This is the 92nd year of the parade. It's May 3rd. Hopefully you've received something from Minka, the organizer. Hopefully you can be there if you're in town. It's a lot of fun. The theme this year is Caring Neighborhoods. It's the fourth Developmental Asset. It should a lot of fun and the fair at the end is also a lot of fun with the Kiwanis and Palo Alto Recreation Foundation coordinating the fair. That's exciting to look forward to. You may be curious about the golf course, so let me talk to you about that. We don't have a permit from the Water Board yet. Jim Keene is making progress. He's getting to know Bruce Wolfe quite well, who's the Chief Executive Officer of the Water Board. They've made some good progress together. We are hopeful that things are going to improve and we'll be able to get our permit soon. In the meantime, we have bid the construction contract and they have been received. We also previously did a pre-qualification of bidders. All four pre-qualified bidders submitted a bid for the project. We just received them and staff are reviewing them currently. That is what we know. As a contingency in the event construction is delayed we , I am going to Council next week to ask for additional funding to operate the golf course May and June. We have an approved budget to run the golf course until the end of this month. We'll need more money to pay our vendors if we stay open. If the permit is approved, then we will not spend additional operating budget and we will close the golf course and get on with the project. On the soil front, it's going very well. Importing soil is happening every day. Our dirt broker has received two additional sites with a lot of very good soil. It's looking at this point like we'll be able to get the full 380,000 cubic yards, which is tied to a \$1.3 million payment to the City for accepting that soil. That's good news.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Markevitch.

Commissioner Markevitch: As a reminder, on May 15th at 2:00 in Cogswell Plaza is the plaque placement for the police officers.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What time?

Commissioner Markevitch: 2:00 p.m.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Go ahead.

Commissioner Reckdahl: We had talked about the Cost of Service Study coming back to the Commission. Are there any plans for that?

Mr. De Geus: I haven't heard of that moving recently. In the last month I haven't heard any activity. Lam Do, who's our Business Analyst, had a baby so he's been out. I don't know if maybe we didn't get the communication. I'll look into where that is and see if we can get it on our calendar for the next few months.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Mitchell Park Library, do you want to give us a two-sentence summary? You could go on for a half hour I'm sure.

Mr. De Geus: I think we're headed in the right direction with the Mitchell Park Library at this point. We've got a new contractor that's being ...

Commissioner Reckdahl: Are we still shooting for July or August?

Mr. De Geus: No, I think it's going to be after that. I think it'll be in the fall before we're really open. Part of it is we believe the new contractor is going to be very good, but they're trying to get their head around exactly what has to be done at the center. There's some 4,000 punch list items that need to be looked at. Some simple and easy, but some a little complicated in terms of the roofing and other things. We're having some leaking issues. They're ramping up, but they're not quite in there working just yet. When they get in, the estimate is they'll need three to four months to finish the work. When they're finished and we get occupancy, then there is a move-in time. For the Community Services Department that's not a huge deal; there's not a lot we're moving in. For the library it's a big deal. They need four to six weeks to actually move in and bring all the materials into the center. I don't have a date. They have not provided us with a date. It's a little bit of a best guess at this point. October is probably a fair guess.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Do we have to wait for the library to get done or can Community Services move in before the library?

Mr. De Geus: The goal is to have both departments move in at the same time, to finish it entirely before anyone moves in.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Is the plan still to do some renovations at Cubberley after the library moves out?

Mr. De Geus: There is; although, that's somewhat tied to the lease negotiations with the School District for Cubberley. You may recall we talked about this, that the Council has given direction that the covenant not to develop be removed from the terms. The cost of that particular term, I think it's \$1.7 million or \$1.8 million, that that money be diverted back to Cubberley to invest in the infrastructure and, we hope, long-term planning of what we want to do with that center. All of the CIPs for Cubberley are in that holding pattern until lease negotiations done, because that's where we want to be able to fund the auditorium remodel and other things that we hope to do there.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: I just had an announcement that the City of Palo Alto is hiring their counselors in training. They don't get paid, but they're selecting them. It's one of my favorite programs within the City. There's two arms to this program. You can be what's called a CIT for the parks programs, like all the summer camps. You can also be what's called an SCA, a Science Camp Assistant, for the science camps. It's just this wonderful opportunity for kids who matriculate out of being able to take the camps, because a lot of the camps just go up through kids entering sixth grade. Once you matriculate out, you can actually apply to be a counselor in training. This is when those kids are being interviewed and hired. I've always thought it was just this incredibly enriching program for our youth. On the Commission we do talk about youth needs and support for youth. One thing I noticed about the SCA program, the science camp assistant, my understanding is it used to be for kids entering eighth and ninth grade. When I looked at it recently, I saw it's expanded. The SCA program actually extends now by a couple of years. It used to be you're unpaid when you take the SCA and then you can try to get hired when you're older, but a lot of times there are not jobs available. They've extended this so that kids can have an enriching volunteer experience. They also cover the developmental assets. When the kids are in this program, not only are they serving other youth and serving as a role model, they themselves are being nurtured and paid attention to by the older college-age students. To me it's just this incredible model of sustaining our youth in a unique and enriching way. I just wanted to talk about that.

Mr. De Geus: I appreciate those comments, Commissioner Crommie. It is a great leadership and mentoring program for young teens. We also have a junior life guard program that we get 30-40 young teens involved in. It's really terrific.

VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR MAY 28, 2014 MEETING

Chair Hetterly: I see we have the 7.7 acres ad hoc for an agenda item, the gardens ad hoc for an agenda item, park outreach plan for an agenda item, the Master Plan for an agenda item. Monroe Park, is that coming back to us also next month?

Rob De Geus: Yep.

Chair Hetterly: We may have a website ad hoc update; we're not sure yet about that one. The question of parking and benches at Arastradero, I think that may well come up for next month as well.

Vice Chair Lauing: And dogs.

Chair Hetterly: And dogs. Didn't I say that? That was second on the list.

Vice Chair Lauing: I don't think so.

Chair Hetterly: OK, thanks. Do you have anything else you think is coming our way? That's a pretty long list.

Mr. De Geus: That's a lot. We'll talk during the month; something may come up that we'll have to bring forward. There is one thing that's pretty interesting that we're working on. I'll just mention it briefly. Staff are working on July being a month that's focused on Community Services across the community. We're working on this passport program where we're creating passports and there's 20 different sites that we're hoping people will go to and get stamps, such as visit Foothills Park and the Art Center. It's shaping up to be a pretty exciting marketing effort to celebrating parks and recreation. We may bring that to the Commission.

Chair Hetterly: Sounds great.

Commissioner Knopper: Maybe as part of that program, we have a duck pond day. I'm serious. If this ordinance passes, so people are invited out to the duck pond for an event. However that could be marketed as part of this passport program, so that more people find out about the ordinance. It sounds like that's logical to include. You can have rangers out there and environmental people that have been trained in all the issues concerning feeding wildlife.

APPROVED

1585
1586 Mr. De Geus: OK.

1587
1588 **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

1589 Meeting adjourned on motion by Commissioner Markevitch and second by Vice Chair.
1590

