



APPROVED

**MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
May 27, 2014
CITY HALL
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California**

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

Commissioners Absent: Pat Markevitch

Others Present: Council Liaison Greg Schmid

Staff Present: Daren Anderson, Greg Betts, Sally Camozzi, Rob de Geus, Peter Jensen

I. ROLL CALL CONDUCTED BY: Sally Camozzi

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS:

Chair Hetterly: I'd like to suggest we move up item number 5, the ad hoc committee report on 7.7-acre property in Foothills Park to be dedicated as parkland. Move that up to number 2 since Daren Anderson is back and forth with the Finance Committee meeting. We'd like to get him while we can so he can make that presentation. Are there any objections to that change? No objections, so we'll move number 5 to number 2. Any other changes?

Vice Chair Lauing: Did you want to change 3 up to take advantage of Daren's presence as well?

Chair Hetterly: Sure. So move 3 to 3 and 2 to 4.

III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

IV. BUSINESS:



1. Approval of Draft April 22, 2014 Minutes.

Approval of the draft April 22, 2014 Minutes as amended was moved by Commissioner Reckdahl and seconded by Vice Chair Lauing. Passed 6-0

2. Ad Hoc Committee Report on 7.7-Acre Property in Foothills Park To Be Dedicated as Parkland. (Formerly Item Number 5)

Daren Anderson: Daren Anderson, Division Manager, Open Space Parks and Golf. Council gave staff two directives concerning the 7.7-acre, undeveloped piece of land sandwiched between Foothills Park and Mr. John Arrillaga's property. The first directive was to get the 7.7 acres dedicated as parkland as soon as possible. The second was to have staff develop some options for that and bring it to the Commission on how we might utilize this piece of land. The first priority really is to get that 7.7 acres dedicated as parkland. The first step of that is to have it surveyed. We had our City Surveyor come out and mark the area. There wasn't a lot of utilities. It was just typically what they use to stake out areas and find exactly where the property lines are. It took him a good deal of time, and he still hasn't completed it. So we've contracted that out to a subcontractor, another surveyor who will have that work completed. This will be a record of survey and map that will be submitted to the County on June 10th. We anticipate that work being completed. They haven't yet begun. A contract's just being finalized now, and we'll have that person on board soon. That will firm up exactly where the boundaries are. I met with Mr. Arrillaga's staff person, Mike Wisowaty to talk a little bit about this. He's managed that land for about 25 years now. When I say managed it, I mean when John Arrillaga had the lease, he would be the person grooming it, moving the materials there. When the lease ended, he would also continue to take care of the drainage ditches and the creek which has sediment deposits. If someone doesn't clean that up, eventually the sediment reaches a point where the water flows over the creek and starts flooding both on our property in Foothills Park and on the residents down below, which would be Mr. Arrillaga and others. He's continued to do that. I talked to him a little bit about those fence lines. We're not totally sure those are exactly on the property line. He said he understood that, and he's on board and working with us. When the surveyor comes out, probably June 2nd, he'll have access to the side areas just outside the fence lines to make sure we have everything accurate. That's the priority and that's what we're focusing on right now. However, I did meet with the ad hoc committee working on this, Commissioner Markevitch and Commissioner Knopper, to discuss some initial, high-level ideas for what could possibly go there. Council had asked us to come back with cost estimates. We're really not at that phase of development. The amount of effort and time that would go into developing a conceptual plan to get to the cost estimates, if we were to pay MIG, we'd be in the neighborhood of \$10,000-\$15,000 to have them put together six fully developed cost estimates with drawings, designs. So you're going to

81 spend a chunk of money. It seemed to me to be prudent to meet with the ad hoc
82 committee and flesh some of this out before discussing it with the Commission, so that
83 we're not investing too much money that we don't really want to. As well as it's a little
84 bit "the cart ahead of the horse" before we get to exactly where the boundaries are. So
85 that's where we are. When we met with the Commissioners, staff suggested again four or
86 five general concepts. The first being the least invasive, the least likely to generate high
87 costs, and probably the least invasive in terms of privacy for the surrounding area.
88 Acterra, who has the nursery site, they have a lease for another two years with an option
89 for five more. And the Arrillaga property adjacent. This concept was a habitat
90 conservation study area where we would restore it with native trees and shrubs and
91 probably small grassland and still maintaining that emergency evacuation route. Likely
92 involved in that would be, even this being the most basic, you'd still probably have to
93 scrape out the first couple inches of dirt. It's all heavily compacted. It's mixed with base
94 rock. Not a good situation for restoration, so we'd probably have to remove some of that
95 and add some amendments. The actual flat area where we would probably do most of the
96 re-vegetation is more like 2.3 acres, 2.5 acres. The rest is either sloped or in the creek.
97 Not all the 7.7 acres would be totally developed under the concept of restoration. Some
98 of it is already forested, has the trees on it, that have been planted. A lot of redwoods are
99 up there. That could look a lot of different ways. You could invite in special groups to
100 do some sort of environmental study. There are a lot of different ways. You could
101 minimize the amount of access you wanted in any number of ways. That's on the low
102 end for all things; costs, number of people accessing the site and everything else. Every
103 single scenario involves restoration in my mind. I think we agreed on that too.
104 Everyone's been to the site and knows what it looks like. It's an area that's been scraped
105 clean and it's been storing rock and it looks like it. Every scenario had some element of
106 restoration in it. The same would be for this second one, restore the area with native
107 vegetation and include a simple loop trail. This would be your basic one. Not an in-and-
108 stop trail but a loop. It could still be in there I believe while incorporating the emergency
109 evacuation route. That would have to be there and is existing. Still work around the
110 creek, probably add a couple of simple benches. Something like that so you'd have
111 access. There are some pros and cons that I'll get to in a little bit, just to flesh out some
112 of the thinking that went into these ideas. The third idea was Commissioner Knopper's
113 and I'll let her elaborate on this one. We could restore the area and add some sort of
114 group meeting area. We could have public art there. It could be some sort of small,
115 natural pavilion where people could gather and meet; different from what we currently
116 have at the site where we have an interpretive center, where people meet and that's
117 common and we have picnic areas. This was a little different. We had talked about it
118 being without all the amenities, no picnic tables, but it would have a nice seated area with
119 shade. As we escalated up the ideas as to cost and more impact, we got to the ideas of
120 group picnic areas and campgrounds. The challenges that those things pose are a lack of
121 utilities. There currently isn't water or sewer or parking in that facility and all the things
122 that would necessarily come with that. We already have a group picnic area nearby with

APPROVED

parking that just meets that, just barely. You would have to add parking if we were going to add an element like that. Where would that go: How would that fit? I don't know. It would be a challenge. And the same would go with the camping. When you add those other elements, you would need bathrooms, parking, and a few other things. So those were some of the ideas we kicked off. There are a few complications that I think we discussed a little bit. The Acterra site is there. I did have a private discussion with Acterra, Alex Von Feldt, one of the leads at the agency. She explained a couple of thoughts to me. One is that they're excited about the concept of planting this area. I won't be too elaborate because I know you've read a number of letters that have been written on behalf of Acterra. As we discussed it, she said they'd like to maintain the nursery where it is if possible, but they were open to moving it if need be, maybe take advantage of some more sun. That's a rather shaded area. Depending on what design we came up with, Acterra would very much like to keep the nursery somewhere in there unless they could find a more advantageous place in there. They hoped not to be removed. From a staff perspective, it has been a mutually beneficial relationship. One we would certainly like to continue. It's beneficial to the City and beneficial to our habitat to have that one continue. The creek is another challenge. Buckeye Creek comes down right through that parcel, as we've all seen. Some of the things about the creek is upstream we have an erosion problem. A lot of sediment is coming down off that creek right into this area and it needs to be cleaned out. It needs to be serviced about annually. The gentlemen I mentioned earlier, Mike Wisowaty who works for Mr. Arrillaga, says about each year he brings his backhoe out there and cleans up the sediment. Somehow we'd have to, unless we're addressing that upstream problem which is not likely to happen in the short-term, we're going to have to continue to allow access for some heavy equipment to get down to these areas and service them. Another complication and something to take into account as we look at these different scenarios. With the creek traveling through, there's a certain sensitivity to riparian habitat. There are some exceptions, but typically you have a setback of a certain number of feet. We looked through some of the documents that pertained to that and I can share it in more detail later when we do a formal proposal. There are different setback requirements off that creek that limit what you can put next to it. Parking, for example, is one that typically would not be allowed within a certain number of feet, typically 100 feet, of a creek. We can get more details on that later. I did mention the emergency access route. Another challenge that we thought of is you're traveling right through the Foothills Maintenance Shop area, which is traditionally not an area where we've allowed anyone to pass through. We would have to make some security changes on how we have it. We have staff vehicles stored there. We have equipment. We have a maintenance shop with tools. So they'd be passing through there. Not insurmountable but certainly a challenge and maybe less than ideal. Acterra also would face security issues, because right now there is a gate there that doesn't allow people. Their facility is unsecured. That keeps the deer out. If we now had access with a number of these different options that we talked about, they would have to make some significant changes, probably fencing the entire perimeter

APPROVED

of their 1.5 acres they lease through the City, to keep both deer and people out. I think they maintain, and maybe Alex can correct me, something like \$100,000 worth of plants at the peak of planting season. So a significant amount of value in materials stored onsite. Again when I met with Mike Wisowaty, he said the chief thing he hoped I would convey to the Commission is that they are willing to be good neighbors and help with the fence installation and to continue to service the creek and the drainage ditches, which is very generous and helpful. Their big concern was security and privacy. They would like that taken into account as much as possible. Again we have not conducted any cost analysis for the possibilities and suggestions that we've put forth so far. That concludes my presentation.

Commissioner Knopper: Thank you, Daren. You said everything very eloquently. There are so many things that have to come first with regard to the actual surveying and figuring that out and then just really understanding the specifics of the restrictions with regard to the creek and what we can and cannot put close to it. That's really going to limit what can be done there with regard to any kind of real infrastructure like sewage or for camping, bathrooms, parking, etc. I guess I'd open it up to any questions at this point.

Chair Hetterly: We have a member of the public to speak, and then we'll have questions and comments. Alexandra Von Feldt.

Alexandra von Felt: Would you like me to use the microphone?

Chair Hetterly: Yes, please, because it goes to the recorder.

Ms. Von Feldt: Thank you, Commissioners. As Daren previously introduced, I'm Alexandra Von Feldt and I'm with Acterra Stewardship Program. Acterra has a long history with the City of Palo Alto as some of you may know. We've been working in Arastradero Preserve and along San Francisquito Creek for over 15 years now. What we do is help improve the ecology of these parks and open spaces using community volunteers to do the work. Last year we were also awarded the contract for Foothills Park, so we've started working there as well. It's been a great partnership, and I mean that in the true sense of the word. As we do get from the City help to do some of the stewardship, we also go out and seek other sources of funds that benefit the City of Palo Alto. For example, this past year we were successful in raising \$200,000 for our work in Arastradero, in Foothills Park, and along San Francisquito Creek. All that directly benefits the City. To do all this, we need to grow plants that are native to these different watersheds, so our native plant nursery is the place where we grow all these plants. Not only do we supply the plants for our own projects, but we also do it for other regional partners, like Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District. They're in the Pajaro River Restoration Project. Post sometimes buys plants from us as well. We're a really important regional resource. I wanted to introduce myself to you all here today. I'm

APPROVED

more than happy to answer some questions. Daren also gave you some background on what he and I had discussed. We're really happy about the change in designation of the park, because it's (inaudible) to really secure the future of it for that 7.7 acres. We hope, as he said, to continue our nursery operation. We think it could integrate very well. We already have volunteers that come and work at our nursery on a regular basis, but we could expand that and have an open house maybe once a month where people from the public could come in and visit the nursery either to learn about native plants or just about restoration ecology in general. Of course, we have regular weekend workdays at Foothills Park. I support Daren's idea for the lighter approach, just given the site. I think most of you have seen it. It's going to take a while just to try to rehabilitate it and get it back up to where we can grow a plant in it. There are also some really nice ideas for the future. At one of our other sites in Redwood Grove and Los Altos, we actually did a natural willow sculpture that also doubled as erosion control for a creek bank. We did it with a local artist and involved the community in creating this natural structure. There are things like that that we could pursue in the future. Thank you again.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. All right, I'll open it to questions and comments. Commissioners?

Commissioner Reckdahl: You mentioned the possibility of having a trail go through there. Is there any way to interleave that or have that connect with existing trails or would that be a loop by itself?

Mr. Anderson: It would be a standalone loop.

Commissioner Reckdahl: There's no way to connect behind the shed and connect up to Los Trancos or the other trails on that side of the creek?

Mr. Anderson: Not without significant impacts. It's fair to say the main road that comes through the picnic area and through the shop area is walked commonly. So that is, in a way, a trail. Not in the conventional sense that we think of open space trails, but it's used commonly. You would still have connectivity with all the trailheads that come off that main road.

Commissioner Reckdahl: When you come down Los Trancos and you want to cross over and go behind the interpretive center, you still have to walk across the grass. It would be nice if you could just stay on a trail and loop around. That would make for a nicer experience. I don't know if there's room there even if we wanted to connect it up, whether we could.

Mr. Anderson: I don't think so. I think it would be too many private parcels you'd be slicing into to get through to that. I can take a closer look at it.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Does the shed go right up against the creek or is there some space between the sheds?

Mr. Anderson: The maintenance shop?

Commissioner Reckdahl: Yes, the maintenance shop.

Mr. Anderson: Yes, it's right next to it.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Right on the creek. We talked about a CIP last year for Buckeye Creek. That was shelved and it's on next year's list for potential.

Greg Betts: Staff does intend to resubmit that one.

Commissioner Reckdahl: When we do take care of that erosion, are we going to do something like serpentineing the creek to try and slow down the velocity?

Mr. Anderson: That was what we submitted money for, not for action but study, to tell us the best technique. We need a hydrological expert to come in and look at that stretch and tell us the best way to deal with it.

Commissioner Reckdahl: They way we've done it in Wild Horse Valley with the rocks and casing, that seems very secure now. There's not a lot of erosion there.

Mr. Anderson: It is. That's a robust structure. It's called gabion rock. They put the rock in cages, and it's very stable. The problem is it causes down cut, so you keep going deeper and deeper. If you look at sections of the creek, now it's very, very deep where normally that would not be the case. It's scouring the bottom and sending all the sediments (crosstalk).

Commissioner Reckdahl: Along that grassy area, it gets really deep there.

Mr. Anderson: Yes, that's right.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Now originally that creek was down the center of the grassy area.

Mr. Anderson: Like most creeks, I bet it meandered, just like all the creeks that pass through the Baylands and everything else.

APPROVED

Commissioner Reckdahl: We've seen a lot of erosion on that. Would we ever sacrifice some of that grassy area and move the creek further towards the center, towards its historical path.

Mr. Anderson: I think that's within the realm of possibility and may be necessary, depending on what the hydrological study ends up telling us. I know Acterra is working on this. They got a grant to do some vegetation work down there. We had hoped this CIP would coincide nicely with what they're doing.. They're going to do some native planting in and around the area, which will help and no doubt will be part of a long-term solution. I don't have the answer.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That wall opposite the interpretive center is almost vertical at some spots.

Mr. Anderson: Yes, that's right.

Commissioner Reckdahl: It's not surprising we have a lot of erosion, just because it's so steep.

Mr. Anderson: You're absolutely right.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The sheds are at the end of the current valley or the current property, right?

Mr. Anderson: There's a gap. There's a row of redwood trees, a parking lot that services the oak grove group picnic area, and then the shop.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Is there any long-term desire to move the shop and swap where the shop and the 7.7 is?

Mr. Anderson: We had internally kicked that around as an idea.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Is it just money?

Mr. Anderson: Yes.

Commissioner Reckdahl: If we had the money to do it, would we want to do that? Or do we want to keep this 7.7 as a little nook and leave the maintenance shed where it is?

Mr. Anderson: We haven't even gotten to the point where we know we could fit it in there yet. I think it's premature for me to answer that one. I'm not sure if operationally

331 you could transport that whole thing. There's gas there that we just had upgraded. If you
332 were to pick that whole thing up, it would be very, very challenging.

333
334 Commissioner Reckdahl: Is it gasoline?

335
336 Mr. Anderson: Diesel and gasoline. This is to service our vehicles.

337
338 Commissioner Reckdahl: Is it underground?

339
340 Mr. Anderson: It's a vaulted, concrete-bound unit. It just took us ten years to get it
341 recertified and rebuilt. It was a very long process to get it solid. It's much needed,
342 because it services both us and Station 8 of the Fire Department. Whether we could pick
343 that up and how close and where that would fit, I don't know.

344
345 Commissioner Reckdahl: Do you have any feeling whether the neighbors would be
346 receptive to that? Would they rather have a maintenance shed or a picnic area?

347
348 Mr. Anderson: We did ask. I did speak with Mr. Arrillaga's representative and he was
349 open to the idea. In general, their chief concerns would still be privacy and security.
350 They're open to the idea.

351
352 Commissioner Reckdahl: In some ways a maintenance yard where the public can't go
353 would be a buffer to the neighbors.

354
355 Mr. Anderson: Then you'd have the rest of the park contiguous. Certainly there are
356 advantages to that. It's just all the challenges of picking up that entire operation and
357 whether it would fit and everything else that goes with it.

358
359 Commissioner Reckdahl: How about the Acterra greenhouse? If it wasn't there, would
360 we pick that as a spot or do we know of better spots where we'd put it if we were starting
361 from scratch?

362
363 Mr. Anderson: What Alex told me was there would be advantages to move that in other
364 places where they could get more sun. If they were starting from scratch, they would
365 probably choose an area where they could maximize the sun. There are a few challenges
366 there though. Their proximity to the shop allows for water to be run over. If we moved
367 them too far, we would no doubt have to put in some water lines, which is not
368 insurmountable by any means, just an added step.

369
370 Commissioner Reckdahl: The shop has electric and it has water, but it doesn't have
371 sewage.

Mr. Anderson: Correct.

Commissioner Reckdahl: And the nearest sewage is at the interpretive center.

Mr. Anderson: No. There is a sewer line that runs up to the oak grove picnic area which is nearby.

Commissioner Reckdahl: So it's not that far. It would be doable but not convenient.

Mr. Anderson: Right.

Vice Chair Lauing: First just a question of the ad hoc committee and Daren. What are you feeling like the overall timetable is to work through this process to get to a point of making a recommendation? I'm not going to suggest we hold you to this. Is it a year, six months? What do you think we're going to have to go through to get this? Coupled with that, what's the next step to start down that path?

Commissioner Knopper: Honestly we haven't discussed that. We're talking about it right now, to have some sort of recommendation by the end of the calendar year, within the next six months after we've had the opportunity to talk to all the different stakeholders. We need some very specific information before we can move forward. The reason our ideas are "pie in the sky" is because, with regard to the creek and what is physically possible with regard to environmental constraints, what you can and cannot do there and then being able to attach costs. Some of the ideas are extremely expensive and probably out of the realm of realistic. That would be my personal desire, to be able to make a firm recommendation before the close of the year. Do you think that's realistic?

Mr. Anderson: I believe so. Although I do think we need more public outreach.

Commissioner Knopper: Yes, for sure.

Mr. Anderson: It's been just a handful of staff and two Commissioners thinking. It probably needs to be expanded a little bit more to look at the different options. As Commissioner Knopper pointed out, we could do a lot of the heavy lifting and homework before to determine the possibilities. A lot of these are taken off the plate because of the creek or the emergency evacuation route. You'd know what you're playing with and you can move pieces around and see your real opportunities. Right now those aren't defined.

Commissioner Knopper: It's important for us to have some one-on-one conversations with all the different stakeholders. We're presenting the dog off-leash. Commissioner Hetterly and I have already started meeting with stakeholders and that's really important too; so we have that valuable input when we do go for public comment, that we've

APPROVED

415 already had those one-on-ones and have all the pertinent information at that point. I
416 mean I'm certainly open to continued comment. Maybe I'll put together some sort of
417 timeline and measures against that. Then we can present that timeline to everybody in a
418 more succinct manner with specific goals ...
419

420 Vice Chair Lauing: And then maybe flesh out some of these ideas. I certainly agree with
421 your comment that now is not the time to spend money on fleshing out designs. That
422 price of \$15,000 eventually is well worth the investment. It sounds like a bargain to get a
423 comparative analyses of what each of those would cost. But it has to get more fleshed
424 out. I think the idea of doing something there rather than nothing, meaning something
425 distinctive compared to what's going on in the rest of the park, is just a grand idea. The
426 concept of a pavilion for meeting space just makes that distinctive from everything else.
427 We frankly don't need just another meadow there or just another trail. Thinking
428 creatively about that is right on target. I'm not sure about picnic space. Do we have a lot
429 of demand for more picnic space? That one, particularly near that other picnic area,
430 seemed and I don't want to dwell on that specific one. I'm trying to compare the two, the
431 creativity of a meeting area and an outside pavilion versus a couple more picnic benches.
432 That's right on target in terms of direction.
433

434 Chair Hetterly: Rob, do you wish to say something?
435

436 Rob de Geus: Council Member Schmid can correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't think
437 there's an urgency necessarily to figure out what we want to do with this space and
438 design. This is a pretty unique opportunity in syncing it with the Parks Master Plan. The
439 outreach that we're doing there makes a little more sense to me than trying to get a
440 recommendation done by the end of the calendar year. What is urgent is dedicating it as
441 parkland. We should do that as soon as possible after Council comes back from their
442 break. And then take our time with how best to use the space.
443

444 Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Crommie.
445

446 Commissioner Crommie: Thank you for the presentation. Can you give me a sense of
447 how many of the plants grown there are actually used in the City of Palo Alto versus
448 other places? I'm referring to the Acterra nursery.
449

450 Mr. Anderson: I can give you an estimate. I have the report, but not with me. It would
451 be beneficial to have Alex Von Feldt answer this one, if that would be all right with the
452 Commission.
453

454 Commissioner Crommie: Sure.
455

APPROVED

Ms. Von Feldt: Off the top of my head, about 70 percent of the plants that we grow go for our restoration projects. The bulk of the acreage is in Palo Alto. The other sites we have are Los Altos, Byrne Preserve in Los Altos Hills which is just across the way, East Palo Alto, and a little bit along San Francisquito in Menlo Park. Even if it's not in Palo Alto, it's pretty much your direct neighbors. The 30 percent that aren't for restoration projects are for farmers or for land managers or also for private citizens. When we do the plant sales with the California Plant Society at Hidden Villa, we get a lot of homeowners there, many of which are Palo Alto residents. If I were to guess at a percentage right now that were going directly into Palo Alto sites, I'd probably say something on the order of 40 percent.

Commissioner Crommie: When you say 40 percent ...

Ms. Von Feldt: Of all the plants we grow.

Commissioner Crommie: ... of everything there.

Ms. Von Feldt: Yes. I'd have to look for the exact numbers, but that's about the right scale.

Commissioner Crommie: Thank you. At some point I think we'd all like to see more information on that. I just want to point out, people probably realize this, when the land was deeded to us, I think it was back in 1981, for conservation, we didn't have a nursery there. My understanding is the Acterra nursery has been there about 10 years. Is that right?

Mr. Anderson: A little less.

Commissioner Crommie: A little less. I think the original intent of this land was to have more of an open space and not necessarily a developed area for a nursery. I'm really interested in, as plans go forward, envisioning that area with and without the Acterra nursery there. It's important for the visioning process to not assume that Acterra will be there in the future. I know we have a good relationship with them, but I don't want to limit the vision for that land. Personally I think it's shortsighted to do that with such an amazing opportunity here. It could well be that we fold that operation into the space, but I would hate to see it constraining visioning for that area.

Chair Hetterly: Any other comments or questions?

Commissioner Reckdahl: One follow up. Acterra still has a nursery down in the Baylands?

Mr. Anderson: No, that's not Acterra's. That's Save the Bay's.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Save the Bay, okay. The plants grown up in Foothills Park, can they only be grown up in the hills? If we found some spot like the Baylands, would you be able to grow the same plants there or would that not be possible?

Ms. Von Feldt: We could grow the plants wherever. Obviously a sunnier spot is easier than a really shady spot. If it was down in the Baylands, that would be feasible as well. There was some discussion about the Buckeye Creek Project, the CIP that I know is deferred. We've also been pursuing other options for funding as well. Most recently I did have a meeting with the US Fish and Wildlife Services. They're really interested in devoting some funding to studying that site, because it is in alignment not only with restoration since it's a steelhead stream, but also dealing with the sediment downstream. That is something we are continuing to pursue.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you.

Peter Jensen: I would like to add that restoration of a property of like that is definitely not the easiest thing. It fits well that the nursery does sit in that location, because the eyes of those who are actually growing the plants or will be maintaining them are very close to that location. For a long-term projection of the restoration itself, it behooves the site that the Acterra site stay there just to help the restoration. The plants that they're growing will probably be the only location where we could get those plant materials. I would consider that in the long-run development of the site. Just because it's restored, doesn't mean restored and then it's back to itself again. It will take decades probably to restore that land. It's better to have those who are invested in that to be close and have their eyes on it as much as possible.

Commissioner Reckdahl: We shouldn't be in too much of a hurry to get to the steady state. Acterra is there; they're being useful. I don't see any reason to kick them off. Even if down the road we don't want them there, I don't see any rush to get rid of them.

Council Member Schmid: Just a question from an earlier discussion. You mentioned that within 100 feet of the Buckeye Creek you probably don't want any intense use. Yet you say that the maintenance yard goes right up to the creek.

Mr. Anderson: The same is true with the Acterra nursery. It's right next to it. The Municipal Code sections that I had pointed out to me, these are 18.40.140 Stream Corridor Protection and 18.40.150, highlight a few limitations and there are exceptions, like with permission from the Planning Department Head. It calls out a few things like parking lots that shouldn't be adjacent to riparian areas. There were exceptions, and I assume that's how the shop went in. Of course that went in some 30 years ago. The

APPROVED

Acterra nursery is not in the same category as a parking lot, so I'm sure that's how it got permission. I meant to call out that there were certain limitations.

Council Member Schmid: I guess one of the key stakeholders is the public, who has not even been aware that they own the park. Maybe at some point having a weekend where the public get in and look, you might get some good feedback.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Is there any legal issue of having the public go on the 7.7? It's not parkland. There's no issues?

Commissioner Knopper: Once we dedicate it, it's parkland. It would make sense to have a welcome to ...

Commissioner Reckdahl: I think it would be a very good idea. I'm just worried about the details and the lawyers.

Council Member Schmid: Yes, security is important.

Chair Hetterly: That's a lot of information. Sounds like the next step is you'll be back to talk to us about the survey conclusions and you'll identify what further constraints there may be, and have a strategy perhaps for outreach. When do you think that might come back to us?

Commissioner Knopper: Can we get back to you on that?

Chair Hetterly: Yep, you sure can. Are there any other comments or questions or should we move on to the next?

Commissioner Crommie: I just had a point of clarification. I think you were getting at what the next steps are for the ad hoc. I'm also interested in when we're going to do the public outreach. Can you go into more detail about how you think that fits into the next steps?

Mr. Anderson: My game plan would be convene with the Commissioners working on this, lay out our timeline on when we could meet with the stakeholders. They really like that concept, sit down with the stakeholders independently first, then pull into a group where we send out invitations to all our open space-interested people. Publicly issue this and hold community meetings. Something like that. Meet down at the site where we've got staff hosting it, so people who have never been in there could, we did that at the previous Commission meeting up at Foothills Park. There were people in attendance that weren't on the Commission that we welcomed into the area. We could do the same as long as we have staff present and I get to discuss it with the neighbors before, just to be

APPROVED

582 fair. Even if that was preceding the ordinance making it dedicated parkland. The exact
583 timeline, I'm not quite sure yet. That would come after I convene with the ad hoc
584 committee and we figure that out. But yes, we'd meet with them, talk with the
585 stakeholders, hold a public community meeting onsite. That's what I'm envisioning.

586
587 Commissioner Crommie: What is the earliest you would imagine this could be approved
588 as parkland? Does the City Council have to vote on that?

589
590 Mr. Anderson: Yes.

591
592 Commissioner Crommie: So what is the earliest that would happen?

593
594 Mr. Anderson: Roughly it would be June 10th that we have the survey work completed.
595 That's if everything goes smoothly. It would go to the County for reading and analysis
596 for 20 days. We'd put together the paperwork. Director Betts and I would work on that
597 and we'd bring it to the next available Council meeting.

598
599 Mr. de Geus: August?

600
601 Mr. Anderson: Probably, to play it safe. Some of that's up in the air, but probably in
602 August. That, again, is our primary focus right now, so that'll be the first priority. Before
603 we start investigating too heavily in these other stakeholder meetings and things, my first
604 point of focus would be completing that dedication.

605
606 Commissioner Crommie: Thank you.

607
608 Chair Hetterly: Thank you.

609
610 Emily Renzel: Thank you for letting us speak. We looked at the agenda and thought we
611 had time. Chair Hetterly and members of the Commission, I'm really pleased that the
612 City Council has initiated dedication of the 7.7 acres as part of Foothills Park in
613 accordance with the express wishes of the donor. I hope that you will recommend that
614 the Council proceed with this dedication immediately and that you will take a broad look
615 at how this 7.7 acres can best be integrated into Foothills Park. It seems to me that a
616 good starting point is to review the former leaser with John Arrillaga to see if it required
617 remediation for the damage caused by their use and occupancy for many years. It would
618 also be good to review the August 1, 2005 license agreement with Acterra to understand
619 how that 0.53-acre nursery relates to both the 7.7 acres and to Foothills Park. I believe
620 that the purpose of the agreement was to have the City and Acterra cooperate in the
621 preservation, protection and enhancement of the 7.7 acres. Acterra has been there nine
622 years now, so they should be able to report the results of their efforts on the 7.7 acres.
623 Going forward, the Parks Commission should through your planning for the 7.7 acres

APPROVED

624 provide some guidance to staff and Acterra regarding necessary remediation and
625 enhancement of the parcel. It's really exciting to have this valuable addition to Foothills
626 Park. I would like to add a little aside. Do you guys not have minutes anymore?

627
628 Chair Hetterly: We do. We have verbatim minutes now.

629
630 Emily Renzel: Because on the website, it says agendas but it doesn't say agendas and ...

631
632 Chair Hetterly: It's in with the agendas. You have to go (crosstalk).

633
634 Emily Renzel: Well I clicked on the agendas and it didn't show. Anyway, I'll figure it
635 out.

636
637 Emily Renzel: Can I do the same?

638
639 Chair Hetterly: Yes.

640
641 Enid Pearson: Did you get my email that I sent you?

642
643 Enid Pearson: Okay. I'm never sure it goes through when you do stuff like that. I'm
644 asking you to please dedicate the 7.7 acres as soon as possible. It's been two months
645 since the City Council directed staff to prepare an ordinance. It's been 33 years since Lee
646 made the offer, and it's been 18 years since it could have been dedicated. We might say
647 the Palo Alto staff has been rather remiss. I would say, don't forget that this is public
648 land and that it belongs to the people, not any one group or person. If you give this 7.7
649 acres back to the people, you should hold hearings. It could be kind of fun. None of you
650 probably remember, but Palo Alto within the last 15 years was reprimanded by the grand
651 jury because Palo Alto was not seriously complying with the Charter Amendment,
652 Chapter 8, the park dedication ordinance. The Palo Alto City Manager responded very
653 positively and he said, "Oh, it won't happen again." Let's help Palo Alto do better here.
654 This is my whole file, only it's not really. There's a drawer. It's talking about the 7.7
655 acres and it includes the ordinance which was written 33 years ago when Palo Alto
656 accepted the 7.7 acres from the Lee Trust. I think Emily has said other things that I
657 would have said too. I agree with her there. I remember when we all toured the 7.7
658 acres. It wasn't very clear that any renovation of that land had occurred at all. It was
659 pretty compact and hard. I think in the nine years we should have a little more progress
660 than we saw there. Dedicate away. Thank you.

3. Public Outreach Plan for Keeping the Public Informed about Parks and Recreation Commission Discussion and Action Items.

Daren Anderson: Good evening, Daren Anderson again. The concept of putting out a policy for how we would conduct public outreach stemmed from our retreat. When we last met we discussed this idea. Are we doing it consistently and are we reaching the stakeholders and necessary parties that should be involved when we hold public meetings? A couple of people showed up at a Commission meeting and said, "Hey, wait a minute. I never heard about this. Why wasn't I notified?" That spurred this idea, if we should formalize this, make it universal, and make sure we're all applying it for every project the same. That way we could each respond whenever that comes up by saying, "This is what staff did. We sent out these mailers. We did these emails. If you want to get on this list, this is how you do it." Rather than being informal, we started this. I put together a draft that was circulated to the Commission. I believe you have a copy. With just some general ideas, a really rough draft. Then met with Commissioner Lauing and Chief Communication Officer Claudia Keith to suss this out and see if we could fine tune it. We made some edits and the edits were incorporated in the draft that you saw. Again, the real idea is to have a formula that we can use time and time again and use it universally. When Commissioner Lauing and I checked in with Claudia to see if she had any additions that she wanted to make, she briefed us that she had a social media team coming on board soon and that they might have some new information that would affect this. When I reached out to her again, she said that now they're working on a larger citywide strategy that will include how we reach out to residents at the local level. She suggested that we could have some general outreach strategies and we could add some details later. I didn't fully get the scope of what she's putting together, but I envision it will be citywide. This document was really intended to be CSD-wide. I still think it's probably a good idea. I have no idea how long they're going to take to put something out. I don't see why we couldn't have a CSD policy that might be able to fit in and mesh with whatever broader citywide scope we're going to have. I still think there's value in gathering your feedback on this draft, but knowing there might be a larger City effort to do something very similar that may affect how this is implemented and finalized.

Chair Hetterly: Go ahead, Commissioner Lauing.

Vice Chair Lauing: I'm just going to add a couple of points from the meeting. Daren stepped up as usual and did great work on putting a draft together. We did meet and do some edits. One thing I want to point out is in here we talk about large and/or significant community interest projects as opposed to anything else and didn't bother to go into a lot of wordsmithing to define that. If eventually we need to do that, we'll do that. Conceptually, there's big ones and there's small ones. The small ones aren't that big a deal. Just pointing that out at this point. Very importantly and without any edit from me as a Commissioner, on the second page it's noted in the middle "an important aspect of

APPROVED

the staff's role at community meetings is to understand and record public comment so that staff can transmit community input to decision makers." That's a critical statement of what the City is signing up to do in these kinds of meetings. Tonight is literally just to get any immediate feedback on this draft.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner comments? Commissioner Knopper.

Commissioner Knopper: Thank you for doing this. It's really great to put on paper a policy, so there's a consistent, concise methodology behind every means of communication with regard to projects that we would be working on. I like the idea that the City is thinking about it on a broader approach, so that we certainly would integrate into their system, so it is very consistent, so you don't have people feeling like they aren't communicated to in a certain way, especially neighborhood by neighborhood. The only comment that I would say, modes of outreach, maybe add a bullet point, "when appropriate in person intercepts." When we had the MIG meeting, I really loved the idea of it when it's appropriate and it makes sense. We certainly do enough wonderful community events that having people out there with clipboards and people that might be difficult to reach otherwise. At the chili cook off, they're all there. I wanted to say thank you for putting all of this good thinking behind it.

Chair Hetterly: Rob.

Rob de Geus: Thank you Daren for working on this. I think it's great too. One thing that I get stuck on is that CSD isn't always in control of the project or the public outreach. Daren, we haven't talked about this yet. As I was reading this over the weekend, I felt that Public Works and Planning and Community Services ought to adopt the same policy. At times we've been caught by surprise and maybe Public Works has too if we're doing an outreach, particularly related to parks and recreation. Because both those departments work on these items, they ought to be included in the policy.

Chair Hetterly: That makes a ton of sense. Commissioner Ashlund.

Commissioner Ashlund: I have a number of questions/comments. I'm not sure how you want to do it. If I should just go through them and we can talk about them now or talk about them later.

Chair Hetterly: We have about 15 minutes left for this topic. Why don't you do all your stuff and we'll just (crosstalk) make sure everybody gets a chance (crosstalk).

Commissioner Ashlund: Okay, great. I'll just put it out there. Starting with public outreach as the name of the policy, it seemed like the term of community outreach and public outreach were somewhat used interchangeably. I wasn't sure if one was more

APPROVED

correct than the other or if we should be consistent there. That was my first question that I wasn't sure about. In the first paragraph of the background section on the second sentence, it says "to encourage residents to follow development activity in their neighborhoods and actively participate." I really feel that residents don't just want to follow activity in their neighborhoods, but also the City as a whole is of interest to the residents of Palo Alto.

Mr. Anderson: Can you help me? I missed that, on which paragraph you're on.

Commissioner Ashlund: The very first paragraph of the background section, the second line of it is basically about following development activity in neighborhoods.

Mr. Anderson: "And broader community"?

Commissioner Ashlund: Or "and City as a whole" would ...

Vice Chair Lauing: You understand where that's coming from, which is we're not going to send out notices to everybody about every project that's in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Ashlund: Sure. So the City is committed to providing information and opportunities to encourage residents to follow development activity in their neighborhoods. For example, if something is impacting a park where you play soccer but it's not where you live or impacting Downtown or impacting where you frequently grocery shop, even our public schools, three of them are lottery schools, so people drive to them. There's a lot of things that aren't necessarily where you live in your neighborhood that residents would be very interested in following. That just seemed to be lacking to me. I'm just throwing it out there, that we want to encourage residents to follow development as a whole as opposed to just neighborhood developments. Take it as you will. This is the second question I have. In the second paragraph, dissemination of information related to development activity and to encourage early and frequent communication between City and staff. The question I had was are we encouraging communication alone as opposed to communication and response. I wasn't sure if that was something where when the public puts out communication, would we indicate a response to the communication or do we just gather it and there's no follow-up on that.

Mr. Anderson: My intent was the communication occurs on the two-way platform at a community meeting. That's where the opportunity presents itself, more so than even a Commission meeting where there's not a lot of open dialog. Whereas this opens that window as well as puts them into contact with the point person. If I'm leading the restoration at Scott Park and we have a public meeting, now they have a person, the name, a phone number, and an email to go directly to the source. That's where I was coming at with that line. If you think it should be edited, I'm (crosstalk).

Commissioner Ashlund: I feel strongly about that. That makes sense.

Mr. de Geus: I like the word "dialog." That'd be good to use.

Commissioner Crommie: You can add in "and dialog."

Mr. Anderson: After "frequent communication?" Where are we? Encourage early and ...

Mr. de Geus: Somewhere in there. Wherever you think it fits.

Commissioner Crommie: Yes, "communication and dialog."

Chair Hetterly: Let's try to do a little less wordsmithing. If we can, just get the concepts out. I'm worried about the time.

Commissioner Ashlund: Okay. Third paragraph second sentence, it says, "meet the objectives of improving communication." I'm not sure if it belongs here, but it seemed a little vague to me when we talk about improving communication without any indication of measurement. If objectives aren't quantified, I'm not sure how we can meet them. The ending of that sentence, this phrase is used more than once. It says, "provide the community with as much advance notification as possible." No, this actually says, "advanced notification of proposed projects," which is okay. Later it says, "advanced notification of community meetings." If a resident is told that six months from now there will be a meeting, but they don't hear a reminder a week or two before, it's not necessarily as much. It might be something along the lines of "as much advance notification and timely reminders" or something along those lines. If that makes sense. Under goals and objectives, it begins again with public outreach and this is where I got into is there a difference between public outreach and community outreach. Those phrases go back and forth. It says, "with the intent of involving interested parties." My suggestion would be to add "informing and involving." Sometimes you don't know if you want to be involved if you aren't informed about what the issue is. On the tail-end of that paragraph, it says, "a timely review of projects through a predictable process." I wasn't sure if we would want to say "predictable and transparent," or something like that. That was a suggestion. That one I already said. The last sentence of the purpose and intent paragraph under community meetings. It says, "provide stakeholders opportunity to be informed about decisions that may affect them." I would suggest inserting the words "informed about and contribute to decisions that may affect them." The next paragraph and maybe this is, Ed, what you were referring to when it begins with "large and/or significant"...

Vice Chair Lauing: Correct.

Commissioner Ashlund: ... that it wasn't defined. So we're leaving that until later or we're assuming that "large" is clear?

Vice Chair Lauing: That's a valid debate is what I was saying.

Mr. Anderson: It's nice to have some flexibility there. If staff is reasonably confident through our interactions with the public that a particular program would not benefit or require a public meeting, it's nice to have the flexibility not to just say, "Hey, it doesn't matter. You're holding one. That's what the policy says." So building in a little flexibility and staff discretion is advantageous.

Commissioner Ashlund: Okay. There's something that read a little strange in that sentence to me, where it said "large and/or significant community interest projects or proposals." It didn't seem that the projects themselves were community interest projects as opposed to people from the community may be interested, but the projects themselves were not necessarily community interest projects. Projects are just projects. That phrase seemed to be awkward.

Chair Hetterly: Excuse me just a second, Stacey. These seem to be a lot of word choice and meaning edits. I think it might be helpful if you could email those to Daren. It's not something we need to discuss here at the table, but if you have broader questions or comments about the gist of the document. I know it's going to be revised again and will come back before us again after the break.

Commissioner Ashlund: I think I've already hit at the things that are the gist. I'll be glad to email the rest.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The 600-foot radius seems very small to me. Parks may be a mile apart which means there's a lot of people that are going to be a half-mile away from the nearest park. I don't want to kill trees with postcards, but I would want to make that radius bigger and/or have a citywide email list. Whenever there's anything to do with parks, I would love to get a notice in my inbox. As Stacey mentioned, people go around whether they're playing soccer or dropping their kids off at school. They quite often use parks all over town. It'd be nice just to have a park mailing list and email is cheap.

Mr. Anderson: You're absolutely right. The 600 is an absolute minimum. Typically we double that. Typically it's 1,200. I did a little research to what other municipalities were doing and that was their minimum. I just borrowed it. We could certainly increase that.

APPROVED

What we actually do is probably closer to the minimum of 1,200, so we could easily change that if you'd like.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm not within 1,200 feet of any park, so I don't get notified of any park activity at all.

Mr. Anderson: Also in this I believe is that suggestion. At least Commissioner Lauing and I discussed it extensively that the email list for people who want to be notified is really the first priority. That would be the optimum mode of communication for us.

Vice Chair Lauing: That's in there at the top of page (crosstalk).

Commissioner Knopper: That might work with what you're saying, Keith. The intercepts are soliciting people to opt into email. We're not talking about a specific issue, but we're going out to the users of the parks, the constituents, and saying, "Hey, we want to talk to you and we'll only send you pertinent information. We won't spam you with needless stuff." Sorry for interrupting.

Mr. Anderson: This very meeting could very well serve as something that we have every time. If you came to a Commission meeting and you wanted to sign up for that parks email distribution list, you could opt in here. That might be a good option too. We'll continue to look for those opportunities as staff.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That's a good idea. The neighborhood associations have email lists already, so I would reach out to any neighborhood association nearby and let them broadcast it. Maybe people don't want to be on every park, but they want the neighborhood parks. That'd be a way of just getting the neighborhood informed. Thank you.

Mr. Anderson: Commissioner Lauing, we discussed that with Claudia. Do you recall her comments on that?

Vice Chair Lauing: (inaudible)

Commissioner Reckdahl: Oh, yes, very good. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: I'm really glad you're doing this. As I was reading this, I had trouble knowing what we do now versus what you're proposing. Is there something that you can highlight in here what is new in here?

APPROVED

Mr. Anderson: Yes, thank you. Good question. We don't have an email distribution list. That would be brand new. We do it per project. We have a public meeting, people sign up as they come to the meeting, and now I email that group for that project. That's the end of it. That's been a source of contention for a lot of people, saying, "Hey, I came to such-and-such meeting and I never heard back regarding everything else that's going on in the City." We said, "Okay, this is what we need then. We need a parks-wide email distribution list." That'd be new. We already do website updates. We send out the mail postcards. We do onsite meetings and notices. We put signs up in the park. Most of these are already happening. Social media will be a newer element. Typically we have not added anything to Facebook. Notice in the paper, I believe that's only been very, very large projects. I haven't participated in one where we needed to do that. That will certainly be a new one.

Commissioner Crommie: That sounds really good. Email, the top one under modes of outreach is really critical and I'm glad you're going in that direction. What will the sign-up procedure be like? How are we going to advertise this so people know they can sign up? It seems very important how you present this so that people know what they're signing up for.

Mr. Anderson: Right. What I envisioned was a document that talks about a summary of what this means, you're signing up and what this means. You're going to get email notifications for every park renovation. You're going to get emails for new park policies. There will be four examples. The no smoking in parks would be of interest. The no feeding of wildlife. All those things that aren't necessarily a park-specific one, you'd still get on the list. I'd have a bunch of examples and then an opportunity to write in your name and email and other contact information.

Commissioner Crommie: Are you going to float the idea through the neighborhood association list and advertise this new modality for communication?

Mr. Anderson: Yes.

Commissioner Crommie: That sounds really good. I also have heard on occasion certain of our stakeholders don't feel like they're followed up with. A stakeholder might not get notice of an important topic. Does this policy have to do with anything specific to stakeholders? It's a bit of a mysterious process to me how you decide who the stakeholders are. Can there be a place on our website where people can sign up as a stakeholder? I don't really know how that should work.

Mr. Anderson: It's been one of those things that's a relationship. I've interacted with people over a number of years. They've called me many times. They've offered insight and become a partner, if you will. It's a long-term commitment to a park or something.

APPROVED

Those are typically the people I've reached out to, because I know they've got a sustained interest in a particular project or area. Those have been the ones. We have had opt-in ones in the past. It just hasn't been universal. For example, there's a Friends of the Baylands Nature Preserve, and there's 25 people or so on that. I think you're probably one of them. I've had people stop in and ask to be added, so we add them to the list. It's a mix. People can opt in certainly by talking to me. If I know someone comes to all the meetings and is really interested, I reach out to them. It goes both ways.

Commissioner Crommie: It sounds like an art. It sounds like you spend a lot of time on it, which I appreciate. As you're working through this, if there's any way to codify that a little bit, it might be interesting to present it to us up to your decision on that. It might be interesting. I had one more question; it just slipped my mind. I might come back to it at the very end.

Chair Hetterly: I have a couple of questions about the email list also. It's really important that we actively invite people to opt in, don't just wait and hope that it happens. That includes all the groups that have been mentioned before. I wonder if there's any way, and I don't know technologically or labor intensiveness, to have a check box so when you opt in, I'm interested in projects and announcements about parks or just about Midtown neighborhood or just about recreation. That might create a tree, so we're not blasting everybody with all of the information, but some people who want to just have one can just get the one. I don't know how that works.

Mr. Anderson: That's an excellent point. I think you're right, that probably would be the Cadillac of email outreach versions. Unfortunately, I don't have the Cadillac. There were fancier options and maybe Claudia Keith, who I mentioned earlier was working on a bigger, citywide endeavor for outreach, might have that Cadillac. This looks more like me emailing that group every time to parcel it out per neighborhood. I get a lot of that. "I'm only interested in Scott. I don't want to hear about the other stuff." I thought, "Oh, that makes it so difficult. I've got to maintain all these subgroups." It was challenging, but not impossible. It's going to be a very heavy staff load if we implement it, at least right now, under that format. It's certainly something we could. Ms. Keith had mentioned a few programs that do this kind of public outreach for you. I think it has a higher level of discerning what you want to be involved in and selecting boxes and things. That's an option for the future, but right now probably not.

Chair Hetterly: My other question is probably also a Cadillac question. Is there any way to notify the subscribers of action by other groups, Planning and Transportation, Council, etc., on issues related to stuff that we've already blasted them emails about? That's something to think about. Finally, it would be great to also be able to email out the Commission packet each month when it goes on the website. I don't know if that's something all these groups would be interested in. They'd know what we're talking about

and they'd have the packet to understand what the issue is. If they're interested, we might get more people to come and participate in our meetings, which is a useful forum. If they know about it and come. That was it for me. Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: I was wondering, Daren, if you'd be willing to give us an example where you thought the outreach worked really well.

Mr. Anderson: Commissioner Lauing and I discussed some of those that have been beneficial. Perhaps the Lytton Noise Ordinance. That one's a good highlight of how the stakeholder system worked. I had a group of stakeholders representing the musicians and a group of stakeholders representing the surrounding business owners. That was excellent in that regard. It did not end up being one of those broadcast leaflets, because it was the downtown area and not a lot of residents in and around there. That was a good example of the stakeholder process working well. We identified those through a combination of going out there and talking to the musicians, so being onsite with that clipboard and saying, "Hey, I see you jamming out here. Are you interested? Would you be willing to work with us?" Working through the bid is how I found the other group of stakeholders, people who owned businesses who were interested. Other ones that have worked well where we did traditional outreach. Perhaps the last time we held an El Camino meeting when we had the outreach in terms of finding out how the lighting would impact people. We did a lot of sending out of everything. We emailed. We went down to the residents and talked to the residents at the condominiums that were going to be impacted by the light shining through. We didn't have a big turnout to the actual meeting itself, but I didn't have anyone come back and say, "Hey, wait a minute. I never heard about this," or "I heard after the fact." We had done our homework and we did enough outreach that people had an opportunity. We had field folks and they knew. They had all been emailed. They'd all been talked to. I think that was one where it worked well even though the end result wasn't a massive community meeting.

Peter Jensen: Rinconada works well because it's based on a stakeholder structure. We know the people have a vested interest in it. They are then tied to the project and they promote that project for their group, so their group turns out. It becomes a way to have outside groups promoting the meetings.

(inaudible)

Mr. Jensen: Right, exactly. That definitely helps out in that respect. From the Public Works standpoint, we also feel that the 600-foot radius is a very tiny area. For the projects that we've worked on, including Pardee Park, Monroe Park, we have community meetings tomorrow for King Plaza and for Bowden Park. We usually send between 1,200 and 1,500 postcards out. We usually send an email to the specific PAN neighborhood to allow that information to go out. It's also advertised twice before the

APPROVED

meeting in the newspaper. That gives a broad blanket out to the public to attend the meetings. Most of the time the meetings aren't well attended. For tomorrow's Bowden Park meeting, I believe we sent out about 1,400 postcards to the areas around there. I would guesstimate that maybe 20 people will come. It could be as few as 5 or 3. It is tough to get outreach going and to attract people to the events.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I think it would be worthwhile at the event to ask people how they heard about this. That might be good anecdotal evidence to see what's being effective.

Mr. Anderson: I just had one comment on the Rinconada meetings. That's an excellent example of incredibly robust outreach. There was a lot of community outreach and a lot of community meetings held for this Master Plan. Still people came up after the fact and said, "Hey, I never heard about," "I never got a chance." Even under the most robust one, that's still a problem. No matter how perfect this policy becomes, it's something to be cognizant of.

Vice Chair Lauing: That's very fair and needs to be taken into consideration here.

Commissioner Crommie: Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: What are our next steps here then?

Mr. Anderson: I can sit down with Commissioner Lauing, if you're available, and we can hash through this and add these edits and take any emails that come forward with this. Come back to you with a revised draft. I'll probably review it with Planning. Public Works has already seen this copy and weighed in. I'll give them a second review and see if we can get them to add their thoughts and maybe even adopt it as policy for them as well.

Vice Chair Lauing: And connect with Claudia.

Chair Hetterly: And then you'll come back to us?

Vice Chair Lauing: Yep.

Chair Hetterly: Do you think in June, July?

Mr. Anderson: June or July.

Chair Hetterly: Great, thank you.

**4. Recommend to Council a Park Improvement Ordinance for Monroe Park.
(Formerly Item Number 2)**

Peter Jensen: Good evening, Commissioners. Peter Jensen, Landscape Architect for the City of Palo Alto. I don't really have a lot to expand on as far as a presentation. The plan is the same from when we looked at it before. This is to approve the Park Improvement Ordinance. My update from our last meeting when we did look at the plan is I have been working with residents from a new development who would like to have more amenities placed in the playground. We've been working on an upgrade to a playhouse. Last week we selected the playhouse, so I sent them a few options. They've selected a playhouse. It has more interactive paneling to play with. The playground is considered to be a tot-lot playground for ages 2-5. That dictates the playhouse structure itself. There was still some wanting of a slide and a climbing apparatus. Due to fall zones and the size of the area, that is not possible. I think we came up with a good compromise and got a nice playhouse structure that adds more imaginative play to that space. Other than that, the park design is what you saw before. We are requesting the Commission adopt the Park Improvement Ordinance.

Chair Hetterly: Thanks. Do we have any questions or comments? This is basically what we saw before. I think we largely supported it. Any comments?

Commissioner Crommie: I live in this neighborhood and people were pleased by this plan. People came up to me to ask if the canopy is going to be replaced. We had ten very mature beech trees that have been cut down in this park. People are very interested in having that canopy be replaced. I've talked to Peter about the equivalence in the plan, and they seem to be good. It's going to take a lot of years, we all know. The only comment I had was on the choice of asphalt versus concrete walkway. I couldn't remember how that had been framed, if one is better than the other. There's this idea to make it blend more, because it is such a small area, to not have an eyesore jumping out, to have that pastoral experience in the park as much as possible.

Mr. Jensen: Right. The actual choice between the use of asphalt or concrete will mostly be dictated by the bids that we get back. Asphalt has normally been used in parks because it is more cost effective than concrete. However, it is not as long-lived as concrete. It has a tendency to deteriorate especially since it's so small and doesn't have an edge to it. The pricing that we have been getting for recent parks, Eleanor Pardee Park is an example. That was actually in the plan as an asphalt pathway to replace the existing asphalt. In Monroe Park, which is smaller than Eleanor Pardee Park, the cost for doing the asphalt compared to the concrete came out to be pretty much the same. That's why we went towards using concrete, because the material lasts longer and requires less maintenance over time. When the construction package is put together, it's going to have that option as well. It will be optioned as asphalt which they'll bid on. There will be a

APPROVED

bid alternate for them to supply numbers for a concrete pathway. However the prices dictate it, we'll decide on exactly what that material is going to be.

Commissioner Reckdahl: There's a lot of tree roots under the sidewalk. Is asphalt thinner than concrete or is it roughly the same surface preparation? How far do you have to dig down?

Mr. Jensen: The same preparation goes along with both materials as far as a sub-base goes. It has to have a sub-base of material between 6 inches and 4 inches thick of compacted base rock. Then the concrete or asphalt is laid on top of that. Concrete again has structural steel inside of it, which controls root growth and the pushing of it. If the roots do get big enough, the concrete will break and move around, but not as much as asphalt. Asphalt is a much softer material. The pathway is in close proximity to redwood trees, which have a shallow root system, but not large-scale roots that break concrete. I'm confident in either material. If the price does come out favorable towards concrete, we would go in that direction.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Do I have a motion? Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: Just one more comment. The tree that is farthest to the south end of the pathway, it isn't growing straight. We are just a little bit concerned in the neighborhood that some of the shade from the redwoods was blocking it. We wanted to report that.

Mr. Jensen: I can discuss that with the Urban Forester, and we can make sure that it's staked properly so it will grow straight. Beech trees are known to grow fairly straight, so it should be growing straight up.

Commissioner Crommie: Thanks.

Chair Hetterly: This is an action item to recommend to Council a Park Improvement Ordinance for Monroe Park. Do I have a motion?

Vice Chair Lauing: (inaudible)

Commissioner Crommie: I'll move that we approve this park plan for Monroe Park.

Commissioner Knopper: I'll second the motion.

APPROVED

MOTION: Commissioner Crommie moved and Commissioner Knopper seconded that the Parks and Recreation Commission recommend to the City Council a Park Improvement Ordinance for Monroe Park.

Chair Hetterly: All in favor. That's unanimous.

MOTION PASSED: 6-0

Chair Hetterly: Thank you, Peter.

5. Update on the Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Facilities Master Plan. (Formerly Item Number 4)

Chair Hetterly: The one page in your packet is just an updated version of the one we talked about at our last meeting, incorporating everybody's comments.

Peter Jensen: Good evening again. Peter Jensen, Landscape Architect for the City of Palo Alto, here to give you an update on the Parks Master Plan and what is taking place with that. Right now we're in the segment or phase of the Plan where the consultant has done a lot of the on-ground park tours, received from us all our information, the Comprehensive Plan, all City documents that affect or dictate how we use open space and our programs. They're now going through that information and breaking it apart to understand that better and then move to the phase where we can start putting together prioritizations. Basically the consultant is working on that information. When we get that information, they'll be coming back to the Commission in July to give a presentation on their findings and talk more about community meetings. The next step is community outreach. I have passed out a tentative schedule. We're working through it with the consultant to confirm all dates. It gives you a rough idea of what we're looking at as far as meetings go. It also has stakeholder meetings and Park and Recreation Commission meetings and City Council meetings. It gives a good run down of all meetings. Staff meetings aren't included in that, but it is another phase of this that is part of the list. This gives you a good rundown of what we're going to do. Those community meetings are coming up this summer, starting in August. The most pressing one with the stakeholder group will be at the end of June. Those of you on the ad hoc/stakeholder groups list will be getting a invitation very shortly. The invitation is going out to the stakeholder groups pretty soon to kick that off. The other thing that we're working on, that I handed out, is the rough template for the webpage. The webpage will coincide with the community outreach process. We'd like to get this webpage up in the next three to four weeks. We're using an outside consultant to do that. We feel that this project is large-scale and is lasting long enough that a more dynamic and aesthetically appealing webpage is necessary. I passed around an example of what that's going to look like. I also have the sample, which we can look at right now, of the Mapita aspect of the webpage, the

APPROVED

interactive part of the webpage that allows community members to access the Mapita site and give information about parks they like, things they don't like, and identify it on a plan. As you can see on the screen, this is the opening page. It's asking, "Which parks do you visit in Palo Alto?" Pressing on that allows you to maneuver this green dot around. Let's just say that Hoover Park was selected. It then asks you a few questions about that. How would you rate the overall quality of the park? You can easily move the slider around and set that. How do you usually get there? It offers these options. This helps to identify the parks that people are using, their proximity, how they're getting there, and gets them into the phase where they're interactive with this. As it goes on here ...

Rob de Geus: Select your favorite park (inaudible).

Mr. Jensen: You can also select your favorite park which may not be the one you visit the most or the one that's closest to you. It goes through those same questions as well. It gets you into other questions as you continue down the line and becomes a small survey. It asks multiple questions. How do you usually get there? Are there specific problems at this park? Do you have ideas of improvement of this park? The next page is asking you for places that you like. That doesn't have to be specific to a park. It could be a place in Palo Alto that you like. There's an opportunity to insert information about parks or problems and opportunities associated with our park system. There's a question about having any barriers. If there are constraints to you moving to a park or getting to a park, there's information about that as well, so we can resolve that as part of the Master Plan process. It then gets into survey questions, where it asks demographic questions while you're filling out this aspect of it, all pertinent information to extract how the community is using the park. It provides the opportunity to add feedback not associated to a specific question. Mapita just came online because they've been working on the maps to get it all correct. I will send the link to Rob this week, and he'll send it to you. You guys can go through it. If you have any further questions or think of things that can be added to it. This specifically is not the survey. There will be a survey independent of this. This is more to get site-specific information and to be more interactive on the webpage. When people go there, they will have something to do. It is much more dynamic that way. This could also be a good tool that we could use later on, even past the Master Plan stage. Having this as part of the Parks and Rec Commission's webpage would allow people to provide further comment. It seems to be very easy and something we could use in the future. Those are the basic things being worked on right now. As far as the schedule goes, the consultant will come and present all the things they're working on in July. I know that there will be some conversation tonight about if you are going to take a summer hiatus. We are flexible in that conversation. If you decide to take July off, then we can do it in August or vice versa. I also wanted to put that out there. I will take any questions that you guys may have right now.

Chair Hetterly: Thanks. Do we have any questions or comments? Commissioner Ashlund.

Commissioner Ashlund: Peter, is there any indication, I didn't see anything on there, can they add anything like an asterisk to indicate which questions are required or not? Sometimes people want to skip a gender or demographic question like that or even have a third option that said "decline to state" or something like that?

Mr. Jensen: None of the answers are required to be filled out for you to proceed to the next phase. If you do decide not to answer or if you only wanted to answer your favorite park and that was as far as you wanted to go, then it would be your prerogative to do that.

Commissioner Ashlund: Great, thanks.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Reckdahl..

Commissioner Reckdahl: Are the standard questions going to include communication preferences? Do you want to sign up for the email here? How do you want to get in contact if a park is being ...

Mr. Jensen: To go along with outreach that Mr. Anderson was talking about earlier, this is a prime opportunity to start building the email list that we would like to use. You will be able to sign up on the webpage itself. We'll be taking all the email addresses from those that participate in community meetings or the intercept groups. That will be a function of this process as we go along, building a mailing list composed of those truly concerned about parks.

Commissioner Reckdahl: From a communications standpoint, is there any desire to have a Twitter feed or a Facebook page and other "not old fogey" ways of communicating.

Mr. Jensen: I think Daren touched on it in the previous agenda item. Claudia Keith, our new public outreach person, has now a group looking at the social outreach aspect. We are going to have a conversation with her next week about other avenues to use, Twitter, Facebook and those things, and how they can be linked to this and all incorporated together. I imagine that will be an aspect that will link back to this page as well.

Mr. de Geus: We do have a recreation Facebook page that's pretty popular. We have a parks Facebook page. We have a Twitter feed at open space rangers that gets a lot of activity. Aquatics has a Twitter feed as well. We'll use all of those to get people to access this survey.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: Just to keep all of our surveying clear, what are we naming this survey that you went over today?

Mr. Jensen: This is Mapita.

Commissioner Crommie: It's not on our list. Is it on our list?

Mr. Jensen: No, it's not. Not on that specific list of dates. No, it is not.

Commissioner Crommie: It's called Mapita because that's the software it's using?

Mr. Jensen: Exactly. I think it's based more on a map navigational system, so that's the name they decided to give it.

Commissioner Crommie: It's really important on any survey to ask people what they like. I will email you separately once you send it to me. I just thought I would say it publicly. It's really important that people don't only get to talk about issues, problems, but we really need a database of what people like. Thank you for sending that to us. It'll be fun. We should expect that in the next month?

Mr. Jensen: No, in the next few days.

Commissioner Crommie: Next few days, okay. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Any questions? Yes, Council Member Schmid.

Council Member Schmid: If I could just put a plea in for your schedule. You say someone's asking for a meeting with the Council in the fall, and you're not sure you want to do that, what you'll have, and so on. The Council is involved in the update of the Comp Plan, Comprehensive Plan, and their deadline is the same as yours. Now it seems to me if a Master Plan has some relevance to the Comp Plan, the Comp Plan's been grappling with issues like size of the City, land use, density, congestion, funding sources. Parks and open space has to be part of that thinking process. I think if you could have some intersection between the Comprehensive Plan and your Master Plan, it would be so valuable for both sides. It doesn't have to be "oh, here's what it is." But maybe it's "here are the three big issues we're grappling with." We could do the same thing from the Comp Plan, here are the issues we're grappling with and "gee, the density says we need more parkland or more facilities" or something. Being aware of that in September is better than discovering that in January. I think it's worthwhile having whatever you call it, a preliminary meeting, an exchange of ideas, issue statements or something, I think would be very valuable for both sides.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What is the Council date for the Comp Plan?

Council Member Schmid: We're supposed to vote final approval by December of 2015. It's right after you want us to adopt the Master Plan in September or October. If there's any chance for interaction, it has to be before that or you're still grappling with the issues.

Commissioner Crommie: In that case, are we talking about two meetings before Council. I'm a little bit confused here.

Mr. de Geus: It's December of 2015. Is that right, Council Member Schmid?

Chair Hetterly: For the Comp Plan.

Mr. de Geus: Comp Plan, Yes.

Council Member Schmid: The final adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, Yes. It probably has to be ready by September to (crosstalk).

Mr. de Geus: The timing is really good, I would think, for the Parks Master Plan to feed into the update of the Comprehensive Plan.

Council Member Schmid: As a matter of fact, no. I think the draft Comp Plan has to be ready by March or April of 2015 (crosstalk) EIR process.

Commissioner Crommie: Okay, March or April.

Mr. de Geus: So it's really this calendar year that we ought to be feeding into it.

Council Member Schmid: Yes, this year, this fall.

Mr. de Geus: That's when most of the outreach ...

Council Member Schmid: (inaudible)

Commissioner Crommie: Right here, your first bullet, Peter, November 24. Are you referring back to a previous Council meeting.

Mr. Jensen: No, that would be 2014. That would be this calendar year.

Commissioner Crommie: November 2014.

Mr. Jensen: Yes.

Council Member Schmid: (crosstalk) Council requested it. That was probably 2013.

Commissioner Crommie: Yes. If you can just put a year on that first bullet point. In 2013 they requested another meeting before January 2015. Let's have years on here, because it's too confusing otherwise.

Council Member Schmid: That's very close to when we will vote the preliminary Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Crommie: In January.

Council Member Schmid: Probably February or March. If there's going to be any input, it has to take place in the fall. (crosstalk)

Commissioner Crommie: So you're requesting that they come to you in the fall of 2014?

Commissioner Reckdahl: No, March.

Commissioner Crommie: No, no. We just need years attached. We have no years on this. Can you just reiterate what year you're hoping they would come to you? Is it the fall of this year, 2014?

Council Member Schmid: Yes (inaudible)

Commissioner Crommie: In the fall.

Council Member Schmid: (inaudible) the content from the consultant in July, so maybe August or early September would be good. That would still have an impact on how we think about our issues of density and development caps.

Commissioner Crommie: Is there anything we can do as a Commission to support that calendar so that we can involve City Council earlier when it matters most?

Mr. Jensen: No, we can't just move the date up. The RFP that went out stated the dates, and the consultant put together a calendar for those dates. When we went to the Study Session with Council in February, they asked to have a meeting sooner than the January meeting. That was supposed to be the first meeting on the agenda. We are recommending now that we have one, I just threw out the date November 24. I've now discussed this with Mr. Turner, who's overseeing the Comp Plan. We can move that forward though and have it in September or earlier to give ample time to get feedback.

Council Member Schmid: Yes, both sides to learn.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The draft that's due in March, is that a 80 percent draft, a 99 percent draft?

Chair Hetterly: Of the Comp Plan?

Commissioner Reckdahl: Of the Comp Plan.

Council Member Schmid: That's an approved draft which then goes through the EIR process. Is it legal? Is it acceptable?

Commissioner Reckdahl: If there are any major changes to it, then it has to go back through the EIR again?

Council Member Schmid: No, I don't think so. There's a summary process that takes place, that accepts changes. Yes, it's not the final. That's why you have a final vote in December.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That final will go through EIR again?

Chair Hetterly: No.

Council Member Schmid: No. There's one EIR process. It deals with the issues that came up during the EIR process.

Mr. Jensen: The EIR allows people to comment on that. Those comments then must be addressed in the final draft. The final draft must discuss the comments that were made and how those comments are being addressed in the final report.

Commissioner Reckdahl: We want it to be as mature as possible just so the EIR and comments can be, we don't want to wait until the last minute and surprise people. Thank you.

Council Member Schmid: Especially if there are big issues that you are dealing with that should be dealt with inside the context of the Comp Plan. Those should be surfaced as early as possible.

Chair Hetterly: I just have one tiny thing to add pertaining to the stakeholder meetings. I'm not on that ad hoc committee. It might be useful for those committee members to

have a list of who the stakeholders are before they meet. Any other comments on this topic? Thank you, Peter.

Commissioner Crommie: I forgot one comment, because I was focused on one page. Peter, on the handout Park Priorities for the PROST Master Plan, can you have a bullet point under supply/demand issues? Can you add in community gardens and food sharing? We have an ad hoc working on that. I wanted to make sure it's represented on your list as well. Thank you.

6. Ad Hoc Committee Report on Shared-Use Parks for Dog Recreation.

Chair Hetterly: You have in your packet our ad hoc committee's work plan for how we want to tackle this issue. It lays out the objectives, tasks and timeline. We're doing research in May and June, trying to understand better what other models are looking like, what the interests are of the various stakeholders, and summarizing what we know about demands and models, and meeting with the Master Plan staff to discuss how to move forward investigating potential sites in cooperation with their outreach process. In July and August we're going to frame our findings and our pilot monitoring criteria, pros, cons and costs of potential locations. We'll come back to the Commission for discussion and do most of our public outreach there with stakeholders, neighborhood groups, field users. I think we're going to do one-on-one stakeholder meetings as well as a public forum. Then sort out the details of whatever partnership we can come up with, update our findings. In September we hope to be able to bring it back to the Commission for a recommendation to Council. In the meantime, one of the items in our objectives that we're not really sure how to get started. We'd love to have suggestions from you all if you have any thoughts on this fourth bullet, consider metrics and timeline to monitor, evaluate the success of a pilot.

Commissioner Crommie: Fourth bullet where?

Chair Hetterly: On the first page, under objectives. As we were discussing in our ad hoc group, it occurred to us that with a pilot program you have to be able to figure out whether it's been successful or not. In order to do so, we have to figure out what matters. We wanted to have suggestions from you all, if you have any. Otherwise we will continue noodling that around and come back to you.

Commissioner Knopper: You'll see the second page has interview questions that we came up with for Daren to speak with representatives from other municipalities that have shared-use dog off-leash programs. We came up with what we thought was a pretty comprehensive list of questions. One of them is if it was a pilot, what are the key measures and how long is that pilot. We are gathering that information as part of our due diligence with other municipalities. Any other ideas, again, are welcome.

Chair Hetterly: Before we open it to questions and comments, we do have a public speaker. Herb Borock.

Herb Borock: Thank you, Chair Hetterly. Two comments at this point. The first, where we do have dog parks where off-leash dog runs are allowed are all in south Palo Alto. As you had discussions previously on the Commission over the years about dog parks, you should be considering that maybe the pilot program or the first permanent one would be in north Palo Alto. The second comment is we already have an off-leash program. People figure out when the animal control officers aren't around and they run their dogs off-leash in parks and other places where they're not permitted. I believe you need to also connect with either Animal Services or maybe the dog group can be part of it; although they can't do the enforcement. If we are going to be continuing to have people on their own decide to create off-leash dog areas, then what's the sense of creating an official one, especially since the official one would probably not be limited to the people and dogs currently running off-leash in Palo Alto parks. Just as some people from Palo Alto probably go to Menlo Park's area, people will come from neighboring communities. That combination of the enforcement connected with this I think is important. Otherwise I don't see the sense of you creating this program if the other activity is going to continue to go on. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Any questions or comments from the Commission? Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: You built in a discussion with us again in July and August after you've done more information gathering. Are you looking at separation of big and small dogs? Where does that fit in as far as, if you do it, the design issues?

Chair Hetterly: That's where that would be.

Commissioner Crommie: You'll gather information on how people are doing it right now?

Chair Hetterly: Mm-hmm.

Commissioner Crommie: I don't know if I saw that in your questionnaire. You might want to make sure it's in there. It might be in there somewhere. I am sensitive to our speaker's comment about this enforcement and what it all means. He's absolutely right that many people use fields everywhere around the City for off-leash dog use. I'm sure each of us have this going on in our neighborhoods, sometimes with more problems than others. The way I look at this is if this is a successful program, as it's rolled out in more than one place, it would take care of some those issues. What's going to be hard is if you

APPROVED

roll this out in north Palo Alto, which I agree with if that's possible, there will be a disconnect because people won't notice it when they live far away from it. The enforcement is a tricky business and it does require some consideration on how to best approach that and whether you think there's anything you can do to be effective.

Chair Hetterly: I think that's definitely something that we should give a lot of thought to. I personally am somewhat skeptical that one temporary, limited hours, shared-use park is going to be adequate to eliminate unauthorized use of other spaces.

Commissioner Crommie: We have to be sensitive if it is successful. It's the only thing that would ameliorate that problem, but it will depend on the success of the program.

Vice Chair Lauing: In answer to your question about metrics, to state the obvious, first of all as the pilot is winding down, whatever you consider that timeline to be, you want to get both sides of the story. You want to do some of this outreach, intercept with both the folks that have been running their dogs and also the neighbors. If it's at all possible, move to a related point, to do two pilots in two different areas with two different neighborhoods, then there's just much better data than a standalone study in just one place. You just have much more data to make broader policy decisions. No matter how the data came out in one place, it may not be replicable. If it came out completely different in two places, that would actually give you a lot of information. Some of the challenges, those would be pretty good to do an evaluation on as well. You might say this pilot didn't quite work, by whatever definition that is, but with these little changes we ought to do phase 2 of that pilot, make those tweaks and then we think we can make it work. It doesn't seem to me like this is an all or nothing. Put it together, evaluate it. Well, it didn't quite work. We're done. It's an ongoing problem going back decades and it will be going forward decades, so let's take the time with it. While I have the floor, I just want to ask one thing. You're saying May and June for research and May is over. Are you being a little aggressive on that time table or do you think you can really get through the research in the next four weeks?

Chair Hetterly: I think we will get through most of it in the next four weeks. (crosstalk)

Commissioner Knopper: We've already met with a stakeholder group. We're plowing. I did say, for the record, that we might be pushing for a week. This might edge a month forward depending.

Vice Chair Lauing: Like some of these other issues we're talking about tonight, this is a long-term problem, so it doesn't have a hard and fast deadline. Let's get it right, because we don't want it to fail. We're going into this with expectations that it's going to be a success, that it's going to be a good add to the community.

Commissioner Knopper: Agreed.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Ashlund.

Commissioner Ashlund: I didn't see it on the questionnaire for the shared-use dog parks, a question related to have you recorded any increase or decrease in illegal off-leash use of park space.

Chair Hetterly: We don't have that on there.

Commissioner Ashlund: Seems like we might want to ask them about that.

Commissioner Knopper: What you're saying is when you have the dog pilot program, does illegal use continue?

Commissioner Ashlund: What is the impact that you've noticed if any? Has there been an increase or decrease in any off-leash use. Just to see if they're finding this to be effective in the problem that we're addressing in part.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: You talk about metrics. In a perfect world, I'd want to know does this decrease the amount of illegal off-leash traffic, but I don't think that's practical. That'd be just too difficult. It'd be very time consuming. I think it's going to be in the noise, which means you'd have to have a lot of hours of observation. I just don't think it's worth it. I think you're stuck with survey results. Ask people what they think. When you're saying both sides, I thought you were going to say ask the people who were using it but at the same time go over to the people who are off-leash and say, "Why aren't you at the dog park? Do you know about it? Is there something about this dog park that you don't like?" Maybe you get some constructive criticism that way.

Chair Hetterly: That's a great idea.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Or you may find out that your outreach isn't good enough. One of the two.

Commissioner Knopper: When you say dog park, are you talking about a specific dog park or an off-leash area?

Commissioner Reckdahl: Let's say you have shared-use that you've started up. Now you go to Hoover Park where everyone runs off-leash, or Greer, and say, "Why aren't you using the shared dog park?" Talk to the people who are illegally running their dogs and

ask them why they aren't using the new shared-use or whatever type of dog park we have for trial.

Rob de Geus: I bet I know the answer to that already.

Commissioner Ashlund: Location, location, location.

Mr. de Geus: People want to walk their dog to run their dog off-leash.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I bet if you went to the next park, wherever this trial ends up being, if you went one mile over and say, "Why aren't you using it?"

Commissioner Crommie: That's a key. Go as close as you possibly can. You can survey anyone in neighborhoods; they know where the off-leash sites are. Whatever neighborhood you go into, survey that neighborhood and you'll know where the hot spots are. Then you can find the off-leash hot spot closest to wherever you set this up. I think that would give you the best data on that question.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The dog owners are somewhat underserved. Obviously we all agree with that. I don't think we necessarily should be enforcing. We used to live next to Hoover Park, and I've spent many hours watching baseball games at Hoover Park. I've never once seen anyone enforce the off-leash. In that one area, that grassy area, there's off-leash dogs there all the time. I've never seen any enforcement at all. If we had a successful dog park, then that would be the time to step it up. You may get more people at the dog park if you start enforcing. At this point, I don't think that would necessarily be fair.

Chair Hetterly: Thanks. Any other comments? Yes.

Commissioner Crommie: Were you on the Commission when we had our community forum on dog parks?

Chair Hetterly: No, but I did go to that forum.

Commissioner Crommie: You went to it. It was a wonderful turnout, but it was out of balance. I see you have a bullet point that says hold public forum with directed outreach to get balanced participation. Can you explain some of your thoughts on how you're going to do that?

Chair Hetterly: I think that'll be once we've come up with some potential recommended locations. Then we would want to invite not only the dog group people but also the neighbors to those sites as well as the current users of the fields or whatever the space is.

Commissioner Crommie: Are you going to get any public input as you decide on these test sites? Is that part of the equation?

Commissioner Knopper: I think so, but part of the process is meeting with MIG. They're doing the broad analysis of Palo Alto parks. Taking the quantitative data that they have, we're going to rely on them to make some significant recommendations with regard to that. Obviously taking the stakeholders, we've heard the north cluster conversation before. You have to take all of it in, but it's going to be a very small list. Once you look at the specific information, the time of day, the MIG recommendations, the condition of the field, the enforcement issues, all of the operational issues, it's going to be a pretty short list of what is actually possible. Also the safety of the dogs because they're off-leash. You can't stick them right next to El Camino Real and not expect some tragedy. There's just a lot of different things when looking at locations that we have to analyze.

Commissioner Crommie: I'm a little confused about the timeline then. You're meeting with MIG, it's your last bullet point for May and June. Are they going to have data on surveying or they're just going to have their insights as consultants?

Commissioner Knopper: We're meeting with them to investigate potential sites. This is our conversation that you're looking at. This is our process for information gathering. It's not saying in May and June we're going to have specific information.

Chair Hetterly: This is not to talk to them about specific sites. This is to talk with them about how best to move forward in identifying potential sites based on what they've laid out already in terms of how they're looking at various sites.

Commissioner Crommie: I guess they have an overlay. They haven't collected any community data. I guess what confuses me is their big mandate is to take input from our community to decide these things. Yet by that time, we're talking next month, to my knowledge they will have no input whatsoever from our community.

Chair Hetterly: Right. But they'll have an idea how they're seeking their input. This is a process meeting. It's not a substance meeting about potential sites. This is how can we best work with you as we're thinking about potential uses of some places and you're thinking about potential uses of some places.

Commissioner Crommie: By the time you get to this bullet point under July and August, hold public forum with directed outreach, you're already saying by the time you do that, you're going to know your candidate sites?

Chair Hetterly: We're hoping so. It's all dependent on what comes before.

Commissioner Crommie: It sounds like part of your process to decide on your candidate locations, you're not really relying on surveying the community, from what I understand. I don't see where surveying the community comes in at all prior to when you're doing your outreach meeting on a potential site.

Chair Hetterly: I think that's probably right. Our expectation is that the challenges and constraints that we'll have to work around in order to pick a site are going to lead us to a few obvious choices. We may decide based on the research that we finish up in the next month that there's more to that and we really do need to do our public outreach first. We didn't want to do public outreach with the whole universe of possibilities. We wanted to have some ideas that weren't set in stone for the public to react to in order to revise our thinking.

Vice Chair Lauing: When you do a stakeholder outreach before neighborhood groups and so on in that timeframe, so it's not like (inaudible) ignore it.

Chair Hetterly: Right. We want to have information for them about the pros and cons and costs.

Mr. de Geus: I don't know if this makes sense or not. It strikes me that the public has told us where they're interested in this. They've found a way. Their demand has sort of found it's spot. One of those places, maybe it's Hoover where it's already happening or maybe an area where it's happening responsibly, could be a good candidate site. We already know that's where they want to be. That's where they've set up their program.

Commissioner Ashlund: Just in the directed outreach and balanced participation, I want to be sure to add to address not just the dog owners group but also perhaps some groups that are scared of dogs or have had injuries related to or are concerned about the elderly or something like that. We've banned them on the school sites for safety reasons, and those same safety reasons exist on non-school sites as well. I want to make sure that really is balanced.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Are we ready to move on? Okay.

7. Ad Hoc Committee Report on Community Gardens.

Commissioner Ashlund: I can summarize it. Deirdre and I started with our goals about identifying existing community garden space and looking at underserved areas and mapping out potential resources. The three public community gardens that exist are all shown on the map on the second page. The three stars you can see are all north of Embarcadero. Those are the Main Garden, which is behind Main Library; Eleanor

APPROVED

Pardee Garden in Eleanor Pardee Park; and Johnson Park Garden. The wait list for Main and Pardee is combined and it's never empty. The current status of Johnson Park is eight on the wait list. I believe that one is not ever empty either. Cat says hardly a day goes by where somebody doesn't call or email expressing interest in a garden plot. The three private or nonprofit or neighborhood gardens that we identified are the Ventura Community Garden, which is directly behind Keys School. It's managed by the Palo Alto Community Child Care. This is something we wanted to verify with staff, because when we spoke to them about it, they said they believed it was City land and City water that they were using. However, to both Deirdre and I, this was a very close garden to us that we didn't know existed until we started looking for it. We heard rumors. The Midtown Community Garden behind Baskin-Robbins in Midtown, Acterra financially manages it, but it's run as a nonprofit and leased to a private individual. The third one is Almost Eden at East Meadow and Middlefield, which was started by Urban Ministries Church and they were partnering with homeless and underprivileged people to job train and also donate food back to the food banks. Midtown gives priority to that neighborhood. Ventura gives priority to that neighborhood. I believe Almost Eden isn't geographically prioritized). We did put those on the map as well. They're the three triangles.

Commissioner Crommie: If I can just interject. We're not certain that Midtown gives priority for the Midtown neighborhood. While there's a uniform policy on the public-run gardens by the City, that's really easy to read up on. Each of these individual ones, we don't have all the data. We have some data which Commissioner Ashlund just highlighted in terms of the Ventura community. This one is very different from our public gardens run by the City in that it does give a neighborhood preference. To my knowledge none of the City-run gardens gives a neighborhood preference. As long as you live in the City, you're on equal footing. That's a difference that we found with Ventura. I'm not sure any kind of preference is going on, actually I think it's the opposite, in Midtown. The one individual I met there lived in Menlo Park. We didn't collect data on that. I don't have the data on Midtown. Stacey, do you have any insight into how Almost Eden runs their list?

Commissioner Ashlund: No, we don't have more information on that now. As far as geographic distribution, there's none that are on the west side of El Camino. The map shows us that. We have a list of things that we'd like more feedback from the Commission on. I doubt we're going to get through this all right now. I'm not sure how you want to proceed on this. The categories are ways that we want to gather more information, ways that we'd like to promote or expand the program that specifically relates to food sharing and resource sharing among backyard gardeners as well as community gardeners. A lot of time they share resources and food or would if they knew a way to do that. We have some areas of policy that we thought we'd like to look into.

APPROVED

Chair Hetterly, we were just saying as far as the feedback that we'd like to seek from the Commission on this, that starts on page 4, how would you like us to do that?

Chair Hetterly: However you like.

Commissioner Ashlund: The question is if anybody on the Commission right now has questions, comments, suggestions or feedback related to this, can we go through that?

Commissioner Crommie: Do people feel the need for us to go through section by section or do you all want to give us your comments?

Vice Chair Lauing: I'd suggest just comments.

Commissioner Crommie: Okay, great.

Vice Chair Lauing: I just have one. I was surprised to see this promote the production of food and food-sharing programs. I was wondering if this was relative to economics or just community sharing. What was the motivator for that? I wasn't expecting to see that.

Rob de Geus: (crosstalk) to sustainability.

Commissioner Crommie: Right. I've done some outreach. I did outreach in Barron Park and I went to their Green Team meeting, because a couple of master gardeners are part of the Barron Park Green Team. I expected these master gardeners to be a lot more interested in the community gardens themselves. They said where the trends are going now is food sharing. There's a strong interest in community gardening, but there's equally a strong interest in food sharing. That came out of our research.

Vice Chair Lauing: I'm just trying to understand it. Honey is on here. Does that mean that if somebody made it, you would look for ways for that to be shared within the community different than just selling honey out of honey stands?

Commissioner Ashlund: These are examples. If I'm growing oranges and you're growing corn and I have ...

Vice Chair Lauing: I see, okay.

Commissioner Ashlund: I know an 80-year-old who can't pick the oranges off his tree and he needs help with that and he'd like to donate them. That kind of thing. Is there a way that we can collaborate where the one who has too much of something that they're growing can share with somebody who needs that and has other things to offer in

APPROVED

exchange. Whether you're using public community garden or your own backyard, the same issues relate as far as sharing resources and the output of what you grow.

Vice Chair Lauing: That was another thing I'd written down. Is that because of overproduction? You want to be able to use food that's available.

Commissioner Crommie: It's a bartering really. Sometimes you might be better at growing one thing than the other. People overproduce on purpose in that respect.

Vice Chair Lauing: I noticed later in section 4, you say that you're going to check out demand for this as well as part of the research.

Commissioner Crommie: We're really interested in any of your feedback, but we gave you the sample letter which is on page 6. We were gearing up to send this out but we really wanted to make sure that our Commission agreed with something like this. We're uncertain how such a letter would be distributed. Although we're trying to target our research to individuals who are knowledgeable and interested in this, some neighborhood organizations are more organized than others, and some neighborhood organization chairs really have their finger on the pulse of that particular neighborhood. Other neighborhoods are not as organized. So I can imagine some of those neighborhoods might just disseminate this letter to the entire neighborhood. It could really go either way. Since I've sat on the Commission, this is the first time I'm proposing to do a survey as a Commissioner. It ties into what we're doing with our Master Plan. We want it to be integrated with that. We don't want to replace that, but we want to use this to inform what we're doing with the Master Plan surveying. We see it as a synergistic, reciprocal information-sharing between us learning how to do this and us letting them know this is an interest. I'm sorry I didn't explain that very well. I wanted to draw your attention to this because it is something we haven't done before as far as I know.

Chair Hetterly: I have a couple of comments. Did anybody else want to comment? Okay. On page 4 number 3, include the following in the Master Plan community outreach surveys. Are you both on the survey ad hoc committee for the Master Plan? Deirdre is.

Commissioner Ashlund: I think we both are.

Commissioner Crommie: We both are.

Chair Hetterly: You both may be.

Commissioner Crommie: Yes, we both are.

APPROVED

Chair Hetterly: I would raise this with Peter when you have your first ad hoc meeting just to better understand again the process of how to feed into that outreach plan. For item number 4, I think it's a great idea to list nonprofit partnership gardens on the City website under community gardening. I would just recommend that you check with somebody on staff to make sure there aren't any rules or constraints that make that ill-advised. On number 6, you say provide yard trimming grinding service to homeowners to support local organic food production. Are you suggesting offering that as a purchased City service?

Commissioner Crommie: Yes. People have spoken up on this at various public meetings. I don't know at that level yet how it would be organized. It is something that I'm noticing being spoken about in the City. We need to understand that better. We don't have a recommendation on how it would be done.

Chair Hetterly: I'm not even sure if that's the kind of thing that would be taken on by the Public Works Department or the Parks Department. That's a question to put on your list as you think about that issue more. I'm sure Rob could provide some guidance there. As for the policy questions, they're really creative ideas. I have to say I'm really happy to see the work you guys put into this. This is an issue that's been hanging in the background for this Commission for a lot of years. We've never gotten any traction on it. You did a really great job brainstorming about the issues and laying it out in a clear and useful way. For the policy questions, I would really like to hear back about more information before diving into whether we want to consider including them in the Comprehensive Plan or all these items that you've designated under the policy. I'd like to better understand what the demand is. Does that make sense?

Commissioner Crommie: Yes. I'm not sure as a Commission how we interact with the Comprehensive Plan. If we're even giving input on that or if we would just do it at the level of citizens. I really don't know.

Council Member Schmid: One of the chapters is open space.

Commissioner Crommie: The natural environment element. We have given input on that.

Council Member Schmid: But did you give everything that you wanted to?

Commissioner Crommie: Maybe not. It was a while ago.

Mr. de Geus: They're doing a little bit of a re-set. They're going to be going back to the natural environment element and the community services and facilities element. It'll be coming back through the Commission for further input.

Chair Hetterly: It will be?

Mr. de Geus: Yes.

Chair Hetterly: Okay. It was unclear to us how the new process was going to compare to the old process.

Mr. de Geus: It'll be a little different. Maybe you and I can talk offline regarding how we can insert this in the appropriate timeline.

Chair Hetterly: We can discuss it at our next meeting.

Mr. de Geus: Yes.

Commissioner Crommie: That would be really good if we have that kind of integration. Is that what you meant, that you wanted more discussion? As a Commission we would make a recommendation?

Commissioner Reckdahl: On page 4, you're talking about the churches and other places. That's a really good idea. My question would be what's the City's role. Is it that we're just encouraging them to do that? That we would offer to do the sign-up and the organization for that. When there's vacant plots, we would be the one that would fill in them. Would be helping them with construction costs? What would the City's role with the churches or other organizations be?

Commissioner Crommie: That's a really good question. Right now we have this amorphous role with our nonprofit partners. Commissioner Ashlund and I didn't really get to the bottom. Each one seems to be on a unique track that's organically developed. As we start to understand that more, we could propose more models for that. Is that what you're getting at?

Commissioner Reckdahl: Yes. I'd be curious what they're thinking. Maybe they've thought of them and said they don't want to do it because of x. If that x is the organization, I think we already have that in place. If that x is construction costs, then maybe we don't have that in place.

Commissioner Crommie: Right. We can start by looking at where we do have it in place and then go from there.

APPROVED

Commissioner Reckdahl: One major thing is organization. The City does have a very good organization for these existing gardens. Changing it from three gardens to four gardens is very little incremental cost.

Chair Hetterly: Council Member Schmid.

Council Member Schmid: Just a thought listening to the last two items. If there's a little obscure part of any park, would it make sense to have a joint proposal, a dog run and community garden? Get two very different groups and yet very passionate groups together to say that would be a good use of this obscure thing. One, you would build the political support for it. Two, you would find out how many people in the neighborhood would buy into one of these two things and support each other in order to achieve their goal.

Commissioner Crommie: That's a fabulous idea because it's different groups that can sway each other. The problem that we have is the dog parks are on different sides of the City. We have public community gardens on the north side, where we need more dog parks. We have dog parks on the south side. Right now, if you look at our map, we have so many public gardens on the north side. That's a little bit of the problem. It might not happen in phase 1 because of that. We could still consider it, just as a pilot study. Let's say we ...

Council Member Schmid: One joint use on each side. Pardee Park on one side and maybe JLS on the other. Where you take what is a dog run in one park and add a little community garden space. Then you take what's a community garden and add a little dog run. You get support from both groups for both operations.

Commissioner Crommie: Great idea. Food for thought.

Commissioner Reckdahl: This is outside our jurisdiction. That utility has a grassy area on Colorado there, right next to West Bayshore. All it does is sit there and soak up water. That would be good for a dog run. That would be good for a garden.

Mr. de Geus: How big is it?

Chair Hetterly: More than half an acre.

Commissioner Ashlund: Which location?

Commissioner Crommie: It's on Colorado Avenue near West Bayshore. It's exactly where we walked ...

Commissioner Crommie: We talked about that with Daren.

Commissioner Crommie: It's been on radar before. It's been brought up before.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Are there any other spots like that? That's the one that comes to mind when I think of non-park but City-owned land.

Commissioner Knopper: That's the utility people. They would have to give the approval.

Council Member Schmid: They use it as access to the utility line which is blocked so far.

Commissioner Knopper: That's not to say it couldn't happen.

Chair Hetterly: You're talking about the piece that fronts Colorado Avenue, that's just grass.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Right on Colorado. Just grassy area and bushes right now.

Commissioner Knopper: We're looking into what the restrictions are on that space as well.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Are there any other similar spots around? I don't know. There's the utility over by Middlefield and also by Rinconada. I don't think those have the same big grassy area the Colorado one does.

Commissioner Crommie: I notice what looks like a lot of those kinds of spots in Barron Park around Gunn and around Foothill Expressway. It's just a lot of open space. I don't understand who's jurisdiction it is.

Chair Hetterly: Are you working with Daren?

Commissioner Crommie: We haven't met with him yet. That's our next step. We met with Daren to do a walk-through on Sterling Canal. We weren't ready to report on that yet. It's a bit confusing.

Chair Hetterly: Especially since he wasn't here today, I suggest you follow up with him and get him in the loop on that.

Commissioner Crommie: Right. We'll share this document with him and then move forward.

Chair Hetterly: You had a specific question about this letter to the neighborhoods.

Commissioner Crommie: Yes.

Chair Hetterly: I think it's a great letter. My only caution is to not step on the Master Plan survey process. I would check with Daren or Peter for some guidance about that.

Mr. de Geus: We want to be careful not to lead the public to think that we can do something necessarily. There may not be resources to do it. An interesting question related to that is if there's a real appetite for this. I'm not sure that there is. Is there enough interest that folks are willing to give up some portion of a local park to allow for a community garden to exist there?

Commissioner Crommie: That's the model that we've used with the ones so far. It's worked. That's why I really want to go back and understand more about Johnson, how that came into being. Some of this is historical, because we might learn that did grow out of an interest right in that location.

Chair Hetterly: I would suggest on this sample letter that maybe the safer way to go is to not get into the level of detail of that first bullet. Since you're making your introduction to the neighborhood association, you can just ask that second bullet, who are the best contacts to learn more about our neighborhood's interests. Then you can have one-on-one conversations rather than a very public solicitation event.

Commissioner Crommie: That's the kind of input I was looking for. Both of those bullets are doing two different things. Your recommendation is to lean toward the second bullet and not try to gather the detailed information until you get that person. So do it in a tiered fashion.

Chair Hetterly: Again, you want to be sure to run it by Daren. Does that wrap it up for community gardens?

8. Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates.

i. Website

Chair Hetterly: You saw our plan last month. We did meet a few weeks ago with Catherine. It's come to our attention that the data on the site currently is all over the place. There were all sorts of bugs in the transfer from the old City system to the new City system. We've spent this month going back through the data that exists now to make sure we have the right dates for the right material and the right Commission for the right site and all that kind of detail. We have until the end of the month to finish that. I think we're on track. That pushes us out a little bit, so June we'll plan to work on the design

and setting up links. July or August we hope to get to the Commission for approval and hopefully we'll still be able to be at (inaudible).

Commissioner Crommie: I just had one comment. I was concerned when two members of the public said it was hard to find our minutes. We only learn these things when we go on the site ourselves. Would you be willing to do that as part of this website, to make sure you go back and see if that's accessible.

Chair Hetterly: That's exactly what we're doing.

Commissioner Crommie: Great. I've found it frustrating myself when I've tried to use it. Didn't we do an update a year and a half ago. Is this another one?

Rob de Geus: This is an update specifically to the Parks and Recreation website. The City has done two different updates for the City website.

V. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Rob de Geus: Did everyone get their passport? I talked about this at the last Commission meeting. I want to give a shout-out to Erin Perez. She's Greg's assistant and she does special projects and supports Greg and does a lot of marketing stuff, oversees our Enjoy! catalog. She took the lead in doing this. We had this idea of celebrating parks and recreation in July. It's the national parks and recreation month. We created this passport which has 20 different activities that we're encouraging people to participate in. As they go and participate in them, they can get a stamp. If they complete 10 of these things in the month of July, they go into a drawing for some special prizes. There's several special prizes, one of which is a fast track pass at the chili cook off next year where you don't have to stand in line. You go straight to the front of the line, which is a really awesome one. There's camping, visit the Art Center. There's a variety of snapping selfie shots in front of your favorite piece of art. The whole idea is to get outside, get involved in parks and recreation. It's a nice little marketing tool. I have some extras here. These will be available at the Lucie Stern Community Center and at the Junior Museum and the other centers, where families and kids can pick them up. I have a couple of extras if you'd like to start sharing them around.

Vice Chair Lauing: I want to comment on your announcement. I brought the Enjoy! catalog. I thought it was absolutely terrific. Absolutely terrific. I go in there and I say, "What's this passport stuff? This is awesome." Just to get people completely involved in it. Kudos.

Mr. de Geus: It should be a lot of fun. We're ramping up for summer right now and our enrollment is almost 20 percent over last year at this time. It's really terrific.

Vice Chair Lauing: It was up last year too.

Mr. de Geus: Yes, it was up last year. A lot of people are going to be participating in our summer programs, which is great. The only other thing I wanted to mention, which is not what you want to hear, is the golf course project. We don't have our permit from the Water Board yet. We've provided them with everything they need. We're awaiting their response at this point. We are ready to go. We've done the RFP. We've selected the contractor. We've negotiated a contract and an amount. It's ready to go to Council in June as soon as we get a little more clarity on the permit from the Water Board.

Commissioner Reckdahl: This permit, is it required to do anything or only to do certain things? Could we start some aspect of the construction without the permit?

Mr. de Geus: Can't start without it.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Can't do anything.

Mr. de Geus: We've been very responsive to the Water Board. Our City Manager's been terrific in working with the Chief Executive there. We're cautiously hopeful that something's going to break loose pretty soon.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Are they being responsive to us when we give inputs? Do they sit on the desk for two weeks or do they respond back?

Mr. de Geus: No, not entirely. There does not appear to be a sense of urgency on their part despite our sense of urgency and calling and indicating that it's really the public that's hurting or losing money at the golf course, so we need to begin. They don't seem terribly concerned about that.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Is the Water Board a state agency or where does it flow down?

Mr. de Geus: I don't know how many, but I want to say there's 13 regional water boards and then there's the state. They all report to a state board.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The only way to get them pressure is through the state government?

Mr. de Geus: Right. We've issued some correspondence to the state board that takes legal issue with some of the decision making at the regional level. We have also let the state board know that we are working with the regional board and are hopeful that something's going to come through, to hold this in abeyance rather than to pursue a legal

2165 course of action, which we really don't want to do. There's a lot of common interests
2166 between the Water Board and what we're doing at the golf course.

2167
2168 Commissioner Reckdahl: Have our representatives been helping at all?

2169
2170 Mr. de Geus: We've been in contact with local representatives. The City Council's been
2171 very involved. But we're not there yet. We're getting close.

2172
2173 Commissioner Crommie: You're held up for a set of reasons that are operating in parallel
2174 to you. Is there any movement on that other front?

2175
2176 Mr. de Geus: There is. The Water Board has officially given us a letter that said they
2177 have separated the golf course project from the levee project. They're saying they're not
2178 looking at those together at this point any more. Their issue isn't with the golf course
2179 design and project. It's with the levee project; they'd like to see some changes there. For
2180 quite some time, they were holding them together. While they are companion projects,
2181 the golf course project can very well be a standalone project. It accomplishes a lot of the
2182 mission goals that the Water Board has. They've agreed to that and they recognize that.
2183 We've provided them with all the information they need, on three or four different
2184 occasions now with letters back and forth. The ball is back in their court now and they
2185 need to respond. They've had the latest correspondence two weeks now from us. We're
2186 hoping to hear this week or next.

2187
2188 Commissioner Crommie: Are you making any changes to design through this discussion
2189 or not?

2190
2191 Mr. de Geus: No.

2192
2193 Commissioner Crommie: If you do, it'd be interesting to hear about that. You would let
2194 us know, I presume.

2195
2196 Mr. de Geus: Commissioner Crommie, that's a good question. Their interest is not in
2197 design changes at the golf course. It's at the levee project. As it takes that turn and then
2198 heads toward the airport, the other side of that levee is the Fabre Tract. Do you know that
2199 area? That part of the levee system isn't changing very much in the levee design. The
2200 golf course design has actually some room there that would allow that levee system to
2201 change a little bit. It could widen the channel a little bit if they felt like it was necessary
2202 and good for flood control and good for the environment. I think the Water Board would
2203 like to see that happen. I think the Joint Powers Authority doesn't think it's necessary and
2204 will not help. They're not aligned there. From the golf course project, we're saying if
2205 that is something that needs to happen in the future, it can happen with the current design
2206 of the golf course which has been helpful.

Commissioner Crommie: That seems like a good way forward and then negotiations. I was interested in that.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Are we continuing to stockpile dirt or has that stopped?

Mr. de Geus: It's going very well. We're stockpiling every day. We're looking good there in terms of getting all the soil we need, which is a lot. It comes with revenue to support the project, \$1.3 million. We're looking like we'll be able to achieve that.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Raise it up. The more dirt the better.

Vice Chair Lauing: As Council Member Schmid noted, I have been around golf courses recently, one of which has been the muni. I don't know why I was surprised, but I was. People who come in to ask about the course are just absolutely all over the board. No one knows what's happening. We barely know what's happening. One guy came in and said, "When is this thing going to get started?" I expected that. Another guy came in a different day and said, "Is the course done now?" Literally, and everything in between. I've heard four different comments on four different occasions with people walking in the door. There's nothing you can do about that now. When we get a final date and what we're going to do, we should have a little brochure there. Maybe not as elaborate as this. So staff can hand it out and say, "Here's the real scoop. Pass it around. Go viral with this."

Mr. de Geus: It's been a challenge not having the date and that moving. And not just for City staff but also Brad Lazaros, who's out there, and Valley Crest, our contractors out there. They're trying to hold their staff on board, because they thought we'd be closed by now. I hear your point.

Chair Hetterly: I have a comment about the passport. I'm happy to see take a selfie at the Duck Pond made the list.

Mr. de Geus: It doesn't show anyone feeding ducks, does it?

Chair Hetterly: No. There is a duck, but no feeding of it. I was just going to suggest since the feeding wildlife and feral animals ordinance is on the Consent Calendar for June 9th, there ought to be plenty of time between June 9th and the first of July to make sure you get some signage out there about the new ordinance. You wouldn't want to be inviting people out and have them feeding ducks immediately after we ban it.

Mr. de Geus: Instead of getting a stamp, they'll get a ticket. That wouldn't be good.

Commissioner Ashlund: Silly question about the selfies. Were people encouraged to bring them rather than submit them online? They can't post them somewhere? They're selfies, they're on your phone.

Mr. de Geus: We're asking people to come in and bring their passport and they're going to get stamps on this thing.

Commissioner Ashlund: Okay, so the whole thing is in person.

Mr. de Geus: Yes. We did talk about trying to collect the selfies and is there some piece of art work or something we could do online with all these different pictures of people visiting parks and art.

Commissioner Knopper: We talked about the passport project for the Mitchell Park opening.

Vice Chair Lauing: That's for next summer.

Commissioner Knopper: We were talking about posting a selfie wall there (inaudible) go to the library.

Mr. de Geus: You could test it. See how it works.

Vice Chair Lauing: I wanted to point out that three Commissioners went to the dedication of the redwoods in the park. It was a very lovely ceremony, and the Mayor made a few remarks. It was great to see the park that full of people and also to see that many policemen in one place and it wasn't an emergency. It was lovely. They were just supporting fellow officers who some of them had never met, because of the camaraderie and the brotherhood of that organization. The Chief made some comments. It was really lovely.

Chair Hetterly: Any other comments or announcements? Okay.

VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR JUNE 24, 2014 MEETING

Chair Hetterly: We'll have some ad hoc updates. If there are any ad hoc committees who want an agenda item for fuller discussion, please let me know. We'll work that in. Rob, did you have anything else for the agenda for June?

Rob de Geus: I don't have anything specific that I have listed here. I'd have to go back and look and talk to Greg and Daren and Peter to see if they have something coming forward.

2291
2292 Chair Hetterly: This raises the question of should we take a month off this summer. We
2293 have our joint Council session in August, and we have the Master Plan consultants
2294 coming in July. It would be nice to have a meeting in July to prep for the Council
2295 meeting as well as to hear the MIG report. I would recommend that if we do take a
2296 month off, that it be either June or August. I don't know what else is pending in the
2297 pipeline.

2298
2299 Commissioner Crommie: Can we have a show of hands to make sure that people are
2300 going to be here for that joint meeting? That's an important meeting.

2301
2302 Chair Hetterly: August 11th. I see no objection.

2303
2304 Mr. de Geus: It looks like August might be the better month, because you're already
2305 meeting in August with the joint session.

2306
2307 Chair Hetterly: What do you all think?

2308
2309 Commissioner Knopper: (inaudible)

2310
2311 Chair Hetterly: If we had an August meeting?

2312
2313 Commissioner Knopper: Yes. The following week.

2314
2315 Mr. de Geus: It would be the 26th of August, which everyone's back at school by that
2316 point. I don't know if that makes sense for the Commission to have that month off.
2317 Would it be better to have June?

2318
2319 Commissioner Knopper: I did hear Peter say, for the record, that meeting in July with the
2320 consultants could be moved.

2321
2322 Chair Hetterly: Yes, that's right.

2323
2324 Commissioner Knopper: He could move it to August. I know you want that prep.

2325
2326 Chair Hetterly: We definitely have to prep for the joint Council session. We could try to
2327 do that in June instead of July if that's everybody's preference. That would be next
2328 month.

2329
2330 Mr. de Geus: June 22nd.

2331
2332 Commissioner Knopper: 24th.

Mr. de Geus: I'm in July. You're right, June 24th.

Commissioner Knopper: You know how I feel.

Chair Hetterly: (crosstalk) work for you.

Commissioner Knopper: That's not true. I can make them all work. Preference wise I would like July off, but I can make it work.

Commissioner Crommie: We need to be mindful of the Master Plan process, so that we are meeting when necessary to get input to Council by September. That will come up really fast.

Chair Hetterly: Peter did say they were flexible for when the consultant came, but it sounded to me as though there's more information later. I thought it might be more productive to meet with them in either July or August than in June.

Mr. de Geus: They won't be ready in June. They confirmed that today.

Chair Hetterly: You did?

Mr. de Geus: Yes. With enough information that would make it worthwhile.

Commissioner Crommie: Based on that, it seems like we should take June off if we're going to take one off. I know July is enticing, but I don't want to miss the boat with some of the Master Plan work that we need to do.

Vice Chair Lauing: Why don't we come back to the issue of do we want to take one off?

Chair Hetterly: I was just going to say we don't have to.

Vice Chair Lauing: Right. If we have a short meeting in June because we have three ad hoc committee reports but that moves it along, that's not so bad.

Commissioner Ashlund: I wish I actually knew my summer travel plans, but we might not have any.

Commissioner Crommie: I know I'm available for all of them. We are traveling; it's in the beginning of the months rather than the end. Do you know your calendar, when you're in town?

APPROVED

Commissioner Knopper: Yes. I can come in June; I just have a house full of company. July, I could make work; although, I might (inaudible). August, I'm around; the 26th I'm around (inaudible) school.

Vice Chair Lauing: I don't think it's optimal to be planning for an August 11th meeting on June 24th. Keeping our regular meeting in July which is still a couple of weeks.

Mr. de Geus: Meeting MIG and the consultants and seeing some of the work already and having some dialog with them in advance of the Study Session with Council strikes me as something that would be good.

Vice Chair Lauing: Definitely. I would just say the default is we don't take a break this year. If it's a short meeting ...

Commissioner Ashlund: We have a meeting.

Vice Chair Lauing: That's the way I set it up the last five years.

Commissioner Crommie: We never do take one.

Commissioner Knopper: (crosstalk) have a short meeting. Will everybody raise their hand? I have to leave.

Chair Hetterly: Does that work for everybody?

Vice Chair Lauing: If we're missing somebody, we're missing somebody.

Chair Hetterly: All right. That's the plan.

Commissioner Ashlund: If one of us knows we have to miss a meeting, can we submit comments in advance in some form? Is that doable?

Chair Hetterly: Of course.

Vice Chair Lauing: Are we done for the agenda for next month? I don't think it's too early to talk about possible topics for the joint session.

Mr. de Geus: That's true, Yes.

Vice Chair Lauing: That should be on there.

Chair Hetterly: For next month?

Vice Chair Lauing: Yes.

Chair Hetterly: I agree.

Vice Chair Lauing: I didn't hear that mentioned.

Chair Hetterly: I didn't mention it.

Commissioner Crommie: I didn't hear much on the agenda for next month yet. Are we still getting there?

Vice Chair Lauing: You've got a big report to give. You've got plenty to do.

Chair Hetterly: Yes.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned on motion by Commissioner Reckdahl and second by Commissioner Ashlund at 9:58 p.m. Passed 6-0