



Approved

**MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
September 23, 2014
CITY HALL
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California**

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

Commissioners Absent:

Others Present:

Staff Present: Daren Anderson, Rob de Geus, Peter Jensen, Lacee Kortsen, Matthew Krupp

I. ROLL CALL CONDUCTED BY: Rob de Geus

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS:

Chair Hetterly: I do have one change to the agenda. I'd like to make Item Number 5, Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Facilities Master Plan, we have down here for 20 minutes. We did get a pretty thick packet from MIG on that. I'd like to change that to an hour, if that's all right with everybody.

Vice Chair Lauing: If needed.

Chair Hetterly: Right. We don't have to spend an hour. Do we have to act on it?

Vice Chair Lauing: Not if everybody agrees on it.

Chair Hetterly: All right. We're going to change Item Number 5 to an hour. Any other agenda changes? No, all right.



III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

IV. BUSINESS:

1. Approval of Draft August 26, 2014 Minutes.

Approval of the draft August 26, 2014 Minutes as amended was moved by Commissioner Markevitch and seconded by Commissioner Reckdahl . Passed 7-0.

2. Recreation Summer Camps and Aquatics Review.

Rob de Geus: Let me introduce Lacey Kortsen. You've met her before. She's come and presented maybe a year ago. Was it about a year ago? Lacey does a whole lot of things for the Recreation Division. I'll just run through a couple of them. One really exciting one is she's going to be the manager of the new Mitchell Park Community Center. She's going to be great. As you know, we're going to open pretty soon. We hope to move in October 2nd or close to there. We have a grand opening on December 6th. Lacey's going to be the manager onsite. She also oversees our summer camp program. She's going to be taking over the responsibility of the middle school athletic program and also adult sports. She also does a lot of marketing across the division and technology upgrades and special projects. Great employee. Happy to have her here to share with you our experience this past summer.

Lacey Kortsen: Hello. Thank you for having me here today. The Recreation Division, as many of you know, offers hundreds of summer camps and aquatics programs each summer. I just want to highlight a couple of those for you. The first one is one of our special interest camps. It's called Communication Academy. This is disguised learning at its best. It's a camp that makes both parents and kids very happy to participate in. There's things such as public speaking, debate, academic writing, book club and math camps. This year over 220 students participated in those camps. They continue, like I said, to be a very popular camp choice for many reasons and grow every single year. The next one that we have is Brain—oops. Oh, this is a cute little testimonial that we have from one of our parents of Samira, a child enrolled in debate camp. "She (talking about the debate coach) was awesome, very articulate, thorough, ran the camp professionally. Our thanks to her for a great camp." Brain Vine is our provider for LEGO Robotics. LEGO Robotics is something that has taken the country by storm. Being the Palo Altans that we are, we not only took on a LEGO Robotics provider, but we took it a step further and had Brain Vine offer camps that were unique, had a unique twist. There's Girl Power, LEGO Robotics focused and geared towards girls. Books and Bricks to encourage people to read books while also building LEGO Robotics. Then Brick Films,

where they would build LEGO Robotics and then create films with their creations. Very fun camp. It was the first year offering it, and it was very successful. We offered 11 camps in nine weeks, and 230 campers enrolled. We completely sold out. Very successful offering. Here's a testimonial again from a parent of a camper. "Tom enjoyed making the movies and the free play. He voted this as the best camp he has done this year. He enjoyed all the learning and the company of the new friends he made this week." Chess Wizards. If you don't know what a fianchetto or English opening is, then clearly you missed out on this camp. Big bummer. It'll be around next summer. We created over 100 new chess wizards this summer. They had a blast. Over \$11,500 in revenue with our Chess Wizards camp. This is a testimonial from one of our campers themselves. "Mr. Chris is so funny. He makes chess so fun to learn. I had so much fun." Not many people say that about chess, so I think we're doing a good job. Next we'd like to talk about our aquatics program. As you know, we operate a year-round aquatics program at Rinconada Pool. In the summer time, we also operate a satellite site at JLS Middle School. This year the swim lesson season ran from June 9th to August 7th. We taught over 1,500 people to swim or to swim better. We offer a variety of lessons for all ages, infants to adults. Our offering that is the most popular and continues to be the most popular is our private swim lessons. They like that one-on-one attention. A very successful summer of swim lessons. Recreation swim. Many of you probably grew up going to recreation swim at Rinconada Pool. People come from all over the Bay area to attend recreation swim, probably because of that gorgeous wading pool that you see in the picture there. This year during the recreation swim season, which ran May 10th to August 15th, we brought in over \$164,000 in revenue. It's very popular. Unfortunately we sometimes have to turn people away because we don't have all the staff needed to make it a safe pool. Having a packed pool clearly shows that we are doing what we are supposed to do and providing a wonderful recreational opportunity for people in the summer time. Speaking from experience, if you have a summer birthday as a child, sometimes it can be a bummer because you don't have your kids at school that you can hand invitations to. Luckily for people in Palo Alto, you have another option. These are private pool parties at Rinconada Pool. A very popular place to go. We hosted over 55 private parties and brought in over \$22,000 in revenue. New this year, we gave those people free passes to recreation swim as a token of our appreciation for choosing us as a place to host their party. Now to the camps that are near and dear to my heart, the ones that I manage directly and have for the past three years, the recreation camps. We have a variety of camps, and we've tried to set it up so that there's more of a flow, if you will. There's something for every single age, and it's a pathway. You start in Camp Palo Alto for preschoolers and you go on to Foothills Fun Camp, Foothills Day Camp. When you can't be a camper any more, we'll put you to work in the CIT program and Junior Lifeguards program. Then we also offer pre- and post-camp as convenience for our families that participate. Camp by the Numbers. These are some tidbits of information. We had 671 campers in recreation camps. Look at that number, 4,100 hours volunteered by our Counselors in Training. They're not paid; they're 13 and 14 year olds. They do an

Approved

incredible job and are a key part of the success of our recreation summer camp program. Ghost, our awesome CIT, volunteered 177 hours this summer, the highest of any CIT in our program. We generated over \$283,000; that's \$20,000 more than last year. 99 percent of our campers or parents, depending on who's actually filling out the survey, would recommend the camp to a friend. We consider that to be a trademark customer service question. If you will refer us to a friend, we know that we're doing our job. A whopping 99 percent of our participants said they would. Some other highlights. This year we did for the first time a back to camp night, especially for Foothills Day Campers. When we have the overnight the second Thursday of each session, parents can get nervous and have lots of questions, so we gave them an opportunity to come in to meet the staff ahead of time, to walk through a typical overnight, get all those questions out of the way. It was very successful. We had over 80 percent say that this made them feel much more comfortable about coming to camp this year if it was their first time. We're going to continue doing that and make it a tradition. Another thing that was really neat that I wanted to talk about today is we were able to make some special accommodations for campers this summer that we maybe haven't been able to in the past due to liability restrictions and attorney office restrictions. We had a camper who is insulin dependent, to the point where her insulin has to be monitored every 5 to 10 minutes and occasionally we had to administer insulin. We were able to get special permission from the attorney's office to train our staff on how to monitor those levels and how to administer the medication appropriately. It was seven pages of instructions. It made me very nervous, because our staff are typically high school and college students. I'm happy to say I got an email from the parent afterwards thanking us and saying that they did a better job monitoring her daughter's insulin than even she does. She could see the graph. It was the first time that her child had been able to attend a camp without the parent having to go out every 15-20 minutes. It was a very special moment for us and we were excited to give her that opportunity. Again, just the \$20,000 increase in revenue for recreation camps from last year is a big jump. We're hoping to continue that trend. Looking forward, we are going to implement a new Foothills Teen Camp. Right now there's a gap between our Foothills Day Camp for 8-10 year olds and our CIT program for 13 year olds. For people who love that Foothills Camp experience, there was nowhere for us to have them go when they're 11 and 12. We decided to create this Foothills Teen Camp for 11 and 12 years olds and we are going to launch that next summer. We are also going to put a new twist on our old camp Teen Extreme and make it more of a Foothills survival camp, where they learn how to build shelters, create fire, that kind of thing. It's something that we've received feedback on over the years. We decided finally to go for it. Also Mitchell Park Community Center is going to be open. We're very excited about that. There will be summer camps in every single room of that building, Monday through Friday during the summer time. I really encourage you all to come take a peek. Thank you so much for your time. Questions.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Markevitch.

Commissioner Markevitch: I love the improvements you've made to these programs. It seemed stale for a number of years, but it's really jumped up. I'm really excited about the Teen Camp, because there was a void. That's really exciting. Thank you for doing that.

Ms. Kortsen: You're welcome. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Other questions or comments? Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What percentage of the classes were filled, was the take up?

Ms. Kortsen: Foothills Camp was full almost all sessions, except for one, with waiting lists. We had 51 campers on the wait list for Foothills Camps. Our Camp Palo Alto for preschoolers, the first two sessions were a little low but we quickly turned that around and ended up maxing out for the rest of the sessions. I know our LEGO Robotics class were full with waiting lists from the minute we started accepting registration. Beyond those, I don't have the numbers on top of my head.

Mr. de Geus: For aquatics and the swim lessons, they were also filled to capacity.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What limits the number of classes that we offer? For swimming, I assume that you can only fit so many kids in the pool at one time. What about the other classes? Is it that you don't have the people to teach the classes or you don't have the classroom space? What's limiting us?

Mr. de Geus: It's probably a little bit of both. Definitely at the pool, it's the location. People want lessons mostly at Rinconada Pool, so we're limited there. There is some limitation on staffing for camps. I think we hired 200+ college kids, mostly Palo Alto kids. There is a limit and they have choices to work elsewhere. There is definitely some limits there. With regard to our sports camp program, we didn't talk much about that today, there are limits to gym availability. For instance, we only have access to two gyms at Cubberley and we use them all summer for our basketball and volleyball camps.

Commissioner Reckdahl: How does it work? When you take registration, do you have the counselors lined up yet? What order is that decided?

Mr. de Geus: Good question too. Not entirely because parents want to arrange their summer camps very early and they need to. I've got kids so I understand that too. College kids and high school kids don't arrange six months in advance of what they're going to do in the summer. It's a bit of a challenge. We definitely try and hire early. We stay in touch with our camp counselors and life guards throughout the year. When they're back at college, we try and get them to sign up again. By January or February

when we do the registration for summer camps, we're probably 50 percent staffed at that point.

Commissioner Reckdahl: And crossing the fingers.

Mr. de Geus: Yeah. We always get there.

Commissioner Reckdahl: If you have kids on wait lists, if you were able to get more staff, could you offer more classes and open up the wait list?

Mr. de Geus: We try and do that when we can. There's a lot of planning that has to go into creating a camp and designing the curriculum and other things. We don't typically ...

Commissioner Reckdahl: Can you make a carbon copy of another camp that's already existing?

Mr. de Geus: Not usually when it's the location. A lot of the camps are ...

Commissioner Reckdahl: You're limited by classroom space.

Mr. de Geus: ... designed around the location. Yeah. More for middle school athletics, when we have wait lists, we can add an additional team if we can get an additional coach. We definitely do that. Adding camps at the last minute, not so much. We do look at the capacity. Can we increase the camp size by a few extra campers? We look at that.

Commissioner Reckdahl: OK. The classes up at Foothills, those are full?

Mr. de Geus: They do very well. We are going to add an additional camp next year which will have a capacity of 55, like the other two?

Ms. Kortsen: Twenty-five to start with.

Mr. de Geus: Twenty-five.

Ms. Kortsen: We're testing the market a little bit. Something else that we're restrained by with Foothills and the numbers is bus transportation. We have to have a bus that takes the campers up every day. That can fit about 55 plus staff. We would have to be able to pay for an entire extra bus if we wanted to add another section of it.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: Thank you for everything you do. It's a wonderful program. I love how you integrate the 13 and 14 year olds for the CIT program. How many 15 year olds were you able to hire this year?

Ms. Kortsen: Well, at 15 you're actually able to become a counselor. That's the route that most of these CITs, the ones that are really engaged and really enjoy the program, that's the route they take. We do make special exceptions. If people think that they just aren't ready yet to be considered for employment or want to go that route, we'll make special exceptions. I would say we do that one to two times a year. Generally, they move on to becoming paid staff at that point.

Commissioner Crommie: How many were you able to hire this year or last summer?

Ms. Kortsen: Oh my goodness.

Commissioner Crommie: I know that sometimes there aren't many spots for the 15 year olds.

Ms. Kortsen: Mm-hmm.

Commissioner Crommie: I know that you have kids that come back once they're in the system. I'm just wondering how many kids you're able to integrate coming out of that CIT program.

Ms. Kortsen: This year we had five that we ended up hiring for the recreation camps.

Commissioner Crommie: Is that an area where you can expand, when you say you're waiting for the high school students to come back? I guess you have certain ratios that you need of all the different age groups. Do you feel like you can broaden it out starting at age 15 and bring in more kids through the pipeline?

Ms. Kortsen: I think there's a couple of things at play there. Yes, we would absolutely love to put more in the pipeline. Parents are concerned if they drop their child off and they see what seems to be to them 15 and 16 and 17 year olds watching their children. We do get people asking, "What's the age of your counselors?" We need to make sure that we do have some seasoned staff that are there, specifically our site directors and assistant site directors. We try to balance it out that way. I know that we're not the only ones hiring the camp counselors outside of recreation camps. There's other divisions and other groups that also hire staff.

Commissioner Crommie: The reason I'm asking is because if those kids don't get hired at age 15 coming out of the CIT program, I don't know if then they move into other jobs and don't circle back again. I don't know about those statistics. I was just thinking that it's important not to lose those kids as they're coming out.

Ms. Kortsen: That's a good point.

Chair Hetterly: Other questions or comments? Commissioner Lauing.

Vice Chair Lauing: I just wanted to say that, first of all, it was a really great presentation. Very concise, good content, and you answered my questions in advance. That's always good. You're on top of that. You obviously have a very cool job. It sounds wonderful. You bring a special enthusiasm to it that's just terrific. Thanks and keep it up.

Ms. Kortsen: Thank you very much.

Chair Hetterly: I don't think I can add to that. Thank you so much for coming. That was a great presentation.

Ms. Kortsen: Thank you.

3. Byxbee Park Capital Improvement Plan.

Daren Anderson: Good evening. I'm Daren Anderson. I'm with Open Space, Parks and Golf. With me tonight I've got a few City staff members. From Public Works, I'd like to introduce Matthew Krupp. He's the Zero Waste Administrator from Public Works. Also in the audience is Ron Arp, who's the Zero Waste Manager. We've also got our contractors who are helping with this project. That's Tay Peterson and Robin Dakin from Thomas Reid and Associates and Michael Cripe from Oasis. They'll be able to answer any technical questions about the plan itself. Matt will be facilitating tonight's discussion and I'll turn it over to him.

Matthew Krupp: Thanks, Daren. It's a pleasure to be here with the Parks and Recreation Commission. We'll have a short presentation and then we'll entertain questions afterwards. First off, the Byxbee Park Hills Interim Park Plan. Why are we doing it? What is the purpose of the plan? The main function of the parkland is to provide access for our ongoing maintenance staff for the legacy landfill activities. The landfill has a leachate system. Leachate is, for lack of a better word, landfill juice that is generated by the landfill. We have a system to collect that. We also have a methane gas collection system. It's vitally important that our staff can reach those wells with heavy equipment to access that. That's one of the purposes of this Interim Park Plan, to allow for that access. But of course part of what we're doing here, a huge part, is providing full access to the

trails and open space of Byxbee Park Hills, which has been a long time coming. We'll talk a little bit about the history of Byxbee Park as well. We believe that this is going to provide wonderful new vistas for the residents and visitors of Palo Alto to see huge portions of the south Bay in ways that they've never seen before. We're really, really excited about those opportunities. In addition, there are numerous habitat opportunities on Byxbee Park Hills that can provide habitat for a number of different plant species as well as some burrowing habitat creatures which will include the fantastic western burrowing owl, which we'll talk about shortly. That's an overview of why we're doing this presentation. Let's go to an outline of the presentation here. We're going to talk a little bit about the landfill closure and what's happening with the progress there. Then we're going to talk about the Interim Park Plan itself and some of the features and amenities that we see in that park plan. Then finally we'll talk about the next steps of the plan. For those of you not familiar with Byxbee Park Hills, which I'm sure that you all are and you're all regular visitors to the Baylands, the closed Palo Alto landfill in Byxbee Park Hills is really at the heart of the Baylands system. This is the site that we're talking about, right in the middle of the Baylands. A very important spot for our park system. This is from the 2008 Baylands Master Plan Update. Some of the names that you see are actually changed from what they're called now. This is just a direct shot from that. How has the progress been going on the closure of the landfill and opening up to the public? Remember the landfill originally began in 1930 as a sanitary landfill and was slated to be closed in the 1970s to be part of a passive park as part of the Baylands Park System. Back in the early 1990s, we were able to open up Phase 1, which you can see in the top left corner of the image over here, to park users as the first part of Byxbee Park Hills. In 2011 we were able to open up additional acreage, over 46 acres of Phases 2A and 2B to members of the public to enjoy the trails and the vistas on that portion of Byxbee Park Hills. You can see the white area is Phase 2C. That is the area that we're currently in the process of capping. Our goal is to complete the capping of Phase 2C by the completion of the year. As we'll talk about later, some of the limitations are due to weather. We're optimistic and hopeful that we can complete the capping by the end of this year. We always talk about how we're torn. On one hand, we don't want the rain to come because we want to finish the project; but on the other hand, we do have a bad drought and we desperately want the rain to come. We're hoping that the rain comes. If that happens, then this project will be completed in 2015. Once it is completed, an additional 51 acres of Byxbee Park will be capped and opened up to the public. We're very excited about that. This plan is about how we can provide access to the public. We wanted to make sure that we weren't operating in a vacuum, and we had a targeted stakeholder meeting on July 10th of this year. Some of the comments that we heard from our initial drafts that were produced by our consultants, TRA and Oasis, was that there were actually too many trails. There was an interest in seeing some more uninterrupted open space and habitat areas where people could be further away from potentially some of the habitats. That was something that we heard quite a bit, and we did reduce the number of trails on the map that you guys have as part of your packet. We also looked at opportunities to

provide more interconnected habitat. There was a question about whether we can provide an uninterrupted habitat area between Byxbee Park Hills and Renzel Marsh without any trails or access. We looked at that carefully and unfortunately due to the needs of landfill maintenance staff we were not able to accommodate that request. It was something we looked at and we do want to provide as many opportunities for habitat linkages throughout the Baylands as we can. Unfortunately we weren't able to accommodate that with this particular Interim Park Plan. Lastly, this is something that we will work on in the future and work with our friends with parks and transportation to make sure that folks and users all around the Baylands actually know how to get to Byxbee Park Hills and how to get to it from the new bridge connecting the bulk of Palo Alto to the Baylands. That's important. Wayfinding signs and connecting to the larger Bay network. Those are some comments that we heard and things that we'll be working on. Some things we were able to incorporate with this iteration and some things that we have not been able to do yet. I wanted to show you this image which looks like a crazy origami image that doesn't make a lot of sense. I wanted to show you this because it is an example of the intricacy of what's happening underneath the surface of Byxbee Park Hills in terms of the maintenance for the closed landfill. These are leachate lines and gas lines to make sure that we can keep that closed landfill safe and in compliance with all of our regulations. We're under a very tight order by our regulators to make sure that we don't emit any methane that comes off of the landfill. We have to be very careful about what happens over there. It's important that the landfill is in compliance and safe for visitors to Byxbee Park Hills. I have to say as staff we have been working on this site, which we often refer to as the landfill, the closed landfill, Byxbee Park Hills. If I do slip up in any way and call it one thing or the other, a sincere apology. We're excited about this becoming fully Byxbee Park Hills in the future. Again, if I do refer to it as the landfill, that's only because my brain is working sometimes in a legacy from an earlier time. We are really excited about what this plan can offer and what the park can become. Let's take a look at the Interim Park Plan itself. Before I move into the actual specifics of the Interim Park Plan, I want to emphasize the interim nature of this document that we have. We're going to propose a number of different amenities, plant species and opportunities on Byxbee Park Hills. Truly we're not sure what is going to take and what isn't going to take. We'll talk a little bit about the maintenance regime in a bit for the different habitat and landscape areas. Some plants do better under different irrigation systems. Some do worse. We're going to be learning about what works and what doesn't work. This is truly an interim plan to find out what the best opportunities are, so that when we come back to you guys and the Council in 2017 working on an updated Baylands Master Plan, we can finalize what this park will look like. The interim nature is really to show that this is an experimental, adaptive plan to try to respond to a change in conditions and us being able to learn about how best to manage Byxbee Park Hills on a complicated environment on a closed landfill. Let's dive into the plan itself and look at some of the amenities. I'm going to highlight first one of our gathering nodes. You can see that is in the top, right corner. We're going to zoom in here. This is an opportunity. The Interim Park Plan is

showing opportunity areas. We're looking here at a compass rose and that could be made with steel and it could become a great meeting place on top of Byxbee Park Hills for people to great views, see habitat and other areas. This is one example of something that can be created on this site. Let's take a look at some other areas. We're going to zoom in to the oldest area of Byxbee Park Hills which is over part of the initial Phase 1A in the top, left corner. We're going to zoom in here and look at some of these amenities. The first thing we're going to look at is another example of these gathering nodes. The gathering nodes, again, are designed to bring people and plants and habitat together to enjoy in one spot. Now let's take a look at some of the park benches. These park benches are designed to fit in with the current Baylands landscape. Daren has a program of memorial benches out there. You can see this one is a memorial bench. There are a number of different places where we've proposed putting benches along the trails. You can see that's on Number 3. While we're looking at the trail system, you can see that there are different colors for the trails. You might say, "Why are there different colors?" The yellow trails are trails designed for all users, all park users. They're fully compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act, accessible trails. You can see the bluish trails over there. We're calling those trails maintenance access roads. They're actually available for all the users of the park to use, but they're at a slope of greater than 5 percent which technically puts them out of compliance with ADA. The trail system does allow for all park users with all levels of mobility to access the park and enjoy the parklands. There's one last color over there which is reddish-orange. That's the perimeter trail that can hold heavier uses. One thing that's important with all of these trails is that they're designed for dual use. For use for our maintenance workers to be able to access the wells and the other closed landfill systems, and it's also designed for the trail users which could be pedestrians, joggers, bikers and the like, dog walkers. They are dual-use trails. Let's look at a couple more amenities. You can see we're looking down over Number 7 and Number 2 which is a bridge that's located over a rock drainage with riprap. If you're out there on Byxbee Park Hills now, you can see examples of this bridge design. Really quite lovely and actually designed by one of our ongoing closed landfill staff workers. He designed that. Just pretty great. Homegrown design. Last on this image that's the western burrowing owl. It's a species of special concern in the state of California and is generally considered threatened or endangered within Santa Clara County. There are only a few locations where these owls are found. We've identified three areas on your map where we believe that we can provide suitable habitat for burrowing owls by putting in artificial burrows and also allowing for ground squirrel activity in specifically those areas. There's one major caveat to this plan: one of our regulators has not approved the possibility of burrowing habitat on the closed landfill itself. Remember our obligation is to keep the integrity of the landfill cap. There is some concern from one of our regulators that allowing for burrowing activity might threaten the viability of the cap. We believe that's not the case. We as the City and Public Works and CSD believe that it's a real opportunity to have burrowing owl habitat on Byxbee Park Hills. We will continue to aggressively pursue that. I want you guys, the Commission, to understand that this could

be out of our hands and it might not be something we can do through the regulatory regime that's in place right now. We do have in your packet an extensive burrowing owl plan. We really believe that this is a great opportunity. I want to highlight a couple of other amenities here that I think you'll find interesting. First is signage. For those of you out in the Baylands, you might say, "Boy, this sign doesn't really look like anything we have out there right now." This is actually one of the new signs that is in compliance with the current design standard and is a possibility that this group can entertain as a different look for Byxbee Park Hills, that's a little bit different from the other Baylands sites. If the Commission and the Council wants to go with a more traditional look, that's something that we could design as well. On the bottom is the park interpretative signage which can show maps, "you are here," and give people a sense of what's going on. Those are located strategically around the park. Over here, one of the emphases that we have in this Interim Park Plan is looking at vegetative islands, where we can isolate certain areas to provide more opportunities for habitat. We've created a mix of different plants that can provide robust habitat. One thing that we don't know, again, is which plants will work best under the closed landfill conditions, what will work well under different irrigation schemes. There's no irrigation right now on Byxbee Park Hills, so we would have to truck the water up and have it stored on site. We do have a way to distribute some of the water on the park. We're truly testing out different opportunities in terms of what's going to work and what isn't going to work. We're really excited about that. We're looking at somewhere between three and five different habitat islands to start out, to test to see what will take on Byxbee Park Hills. Here are some other examples of plants. I unfortunately cannot name any of them. In the spirit of the Interim Plan, there are a number of things that we have put in place in terms of maintenance that will provide us with some guidance moving forward, how often we should mow different areas. On your map you'll see that some of the sloped areas on Byxbee Park Hills are a little greener. We're looking at opportunities for less mowing or mowing more infrequently or even not mowing at all, letting it go wild, so to speak. There's some interesting opportunities there. Again this plan is about learning and adaptive management in trying to find the best opportunities to move forward to have a safe and functional park for the visitors and residents of Palo Alto. Lastly, next steps, we're hoping to get comments from you guys to help shape and modify this plan as appropriate. We'd like to return in November of this year for a Park Improvement Ordinance. Then we would like to finish the capping of the landfill. Again, we're hoping to get that done by December of this year. If the weather does not comply with our capping activities, that may go into 2015. As far as the plan itself, we'd like to return to Council with the Park Improvement Ordinance in February 2015. By the middle of 2015, all of the park including Phase 2C and the new trail system, we would like to have open to the public. By fall of 2015 we would like to have many of these interim improvements in place for park users to see and enjoy. That's the presentation. I'll leave this slide up here. We'll take questions and all of us will be happy to field questions.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you very much. Before we go to questions, we do have two public comment cards. We'll have 3 minutes each for comments. First is Emily Renzel, followed by Mark Weiss. If anyone else out there is interested in speaking on any item on the agenda, please grab a card and give it to Rob. Hi.

Emily Renzel: Staff has done a really good job in coming up with this Interim Plan. I was part of the group that met to see what this proposed plan was and make comments. There are three concerns I have, partly with this interim and partly going on long term. One is that all the trails are going to be base rock. If it's properly rolled, it can be a fairly decent surface to walk on. When these trucks tear around on it, it kicks up the rocks and then you have inch-thick rocks that you're always having to be careful about. Having taken a few falls and had two knee surgeries, I don't really want to have to do that again. If there's any way to make sure at least the primarily pedestrian trails are kept in some kind of smaller-grained rock, that would be good. There's mention of the deadly herbicides in here. If we can avoid using particularly Roundup but any herbicides, because this is a natural area that is adjoining a body of water that's very important. To the extent we can avoid that, that's important. The same is true of mowing. If we don't have to mow, we should leave it alone. This is supposed to be a natural area. I appreciate that these habitat islands have been put in. They are very isolated from each other, and it'll probably be difficult to get them populated when they don't have connections. Certainly as you go into a longer-term plan, I hope you'll push for more vegetation and vegetative cover. To the extent that the maintenance issues can be programmed, maybe they can get smaller vehicles to go up for these maintenance issues with the leachate and the gas, so that it doesn't tear up the trails as much. It would be nice to have this feel more like a park than a landfill. I appreciate that. I don't want to stay and comment on this other one, but on this thing about Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Master Plan, it says the City has 32 parks and open space preserves covering approximately 137.5 acres. Byxbee Park alone is that. There's some number problem on that one. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: What is that document you're looking at?

Ms. Renzel: It's this one about the Public Works Community ...

Chair Hetterly: Oh, right.

Ms. Renzel: ... Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Master Plan.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you.

Ms. Renzel: Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Mark Weiss.

Mark Weiss: Good evening, Commissioners, Board Members. I'm Mark Weiss. I live at 1788 Oak Creek Drive in Palo Alto. I'm like Ms. Renzel and her colleague, Ms. Pearson. We're excited to see this park taking such beautiful shape. A minor point on this. Although it is in Item Number 5 on the Byxbee Park Hills Draft Maintenance Overview about the art features, I am a minimalist in these areas. I think less is more. I'd rather see slightly less public art and slightly better public art sometimes. I just wanted to read a quote that I've found very useful. It was in the Chronicle eight years ago. Kenneth Baker writing about Donald Judd, who is the founder of the Marfa Public Art Camp and many other collections. It says, "The precision of Judd's sculpture has led people to see an idealizing impulse behind it. But Judd saw himself as empiricist and his work as sharpening the perceptions of a public addled by encountering falseness daily on every front, from advertising to architecture." It's hard to come up with public art here that people all really like. We saw that with Greer Park, moving some art around. We saw that even with the Fletcher Benton at our soccer fields. I think people don't like him. I'm curious. It's a little off topic, but why isn't it illuminated? The fields are illuminated, but Fletcher Benton's a wonderful regional artist. His work isn't illuminated. Anyways, as we proceed, I'm interested to see all the design elements and the compass rose and the benches and stuff. But I think less is more and let's be careful with that area. Congratulations.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. That's it for public comment. Do we have any questions or comments from the Commission? Commission Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you. You mentioned about habitat linkage between this and the wetlands. What do you mean by that? What would you do to link the habitat?

Mr. Krupp: There was a comment that came from one of the community members. Maybe I can go to the map so I can show you a little bit more clearly. One of the questions was, can we link whatever is happening over here on Byxbee Park Hills to the Renzel Wetlands to create a more seamless, upland habitat connection. We looked at that, but unfortunately what we found is that this particular path which is one of the main paths that goes around and circumnavigates the closed landfill and the park is really essential for us to be able to access in terms of our facilities, Public Works' ongoing maintenance of the closed landfill and also for fire protection of the site. We were hoping to be able to create some additional linkages between those two areas. It's not a very long path. It's not a road or anything like that. Not being a biologist, I wouldn't want to speculate whether the critters would be able to make it back and forth. They're pretty resilient. But there was a sense of trying to make a connection, where they could not have to interfere.

Commissioner Reckdahl: So they wouldn't have to cross a path, that was the issue?

Mr. Krupp: Exactly.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I don't think that'd be a big deal, but I'm not a biologist either. You mentioned about the sign. I like the new sign. I like it better than the classic design, but that's my two cents. You also mentioned this is a learning experience. I would encourage you to take chances. If we plant things that don't work out, we can replant new ones. Nothing ventured, nothing gained. That's my advice. In the package, you talk about the BUOW, which I guess is lingo for burrowing owl. I guess that's what the teenagers do when they text about burrowing owls. They just use BUOW. That is not defined anywhere in the packet and it wasn't obvious right away. I didn't know if that was something else unrelated. Please define that in the package. If you had a high area like this that's not a wetland but it's near the Bay, and this was just a naturally occurring high area, what kind of vegetation would be there?

Mr. Krupp: I'm going to see if one of our consultants can help assist with the answer to that. If they can't, I'm sure Daren would be happy to weigh in on that as well.

Tay Peterson: This is Tay Peterson with TRA Environmental Sciences. We worked with Oasis Landscape with some of the biology behind their Interim Park Plan. We also prepared the burrowing owl management plan. If that was just to vegetate without having to worry about a landfill, it most likely would be some sort of a scrub, like baccharis, coyote brush and maybe some sage. That type of (crosstalk).

Commissioner Reckdahl: It would be similar plants that we see in the wetlands or would they be distinct from what is down low?

Ms. Peterson: It would not be a wetland. No, it wouldn't be.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Along the wetlands, around this trail, if you go on the top link there. There's a lot of scrub between the path and the wetlands there. It would be that type of brush or it would be a distinct ...

Ms. Peterson: Yeah, that type of brush. I think there's baccharis there. In fact, the landfill has to control the baccharis. They have to take it out all the time. It wants to be there. It has deep roots, and that provides a way for water to get into the landfill and compromise the landfill cover.

Commissioner Reckdahl: When you have something so high, do you have to worry about, if this again was not a landfill and was just a naturally occurring feature, do plants have to survive on less water?

Ms. Peterson: Yes.

Commissioner Reckdahl: It's going to have more drainage up there.

Ms. Peterson: Right. Typically drier plants, drought-tolerant plants.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The type of animals that would live in that environment, would that be similar to the type of animals that would live in this environment?

Ms. Peterson: Yes.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you.

Ms. Peterson: Mm-hmm.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I went out there this morning to check it out. It's been a while since I've been there. At the very top, the view is awesome. It's really impressive. You can see for a long ways. You have a nice view of both the valley, but also the marsh areas. It's a very nice view. I'm really looking forward to this. It's going to be a very nice park. It's going to be a very nice complement to the existing Baylands. The Baylands is beautiful in its own way, but you're right down next to it. Here you have a totally different view. I really like it. I like the view. I think people will love it. It still looks very ugly and artificial right now. I'm hoping that this plan, once we get all the vegetation on it, it will have enough color and enough shrubbery that it won't look so artificial and so ugly. I'm looking forward to getting that planted. Another thing, when I talk to people about the Baylands in general, not Byxbee Hills specifically but the Baylands in general, one of the most common comments is, "Oh, there's no shade." Especially if you go there on the weekend in the middle of the summer at 3:00, it is really hot and there's no way to escape it. It would be really nice in Byxbee and in the Baylands to have some areas where you have some benches. If you plant trees around it, plant a couple of trees so you get some shade. If it's on Byxbee, have an arbor or something that breaks up the sun. It's not desirable or practical to make the whole thing shaded, but to have little oases of shade. If you're a senior and you're out there walking and you're getting hot, you can sit down and cool off a little bit. If you're a young kid, same story. You can sit in the shade. I would really encourage you to look at places to have a few isolated spots scattered around there that have some shade just to allow people to rest and cool down a little bit. In the packet, you talk about putting an additional cap in there to allow more space so the owls are burrowing or the ground squirrels that are burrowing don't enter that. I would encourage considering if there are larger bushes that would give you more variety of look on it, if you could add additional cap to support larger bushes here and there, I think that would be worth the hassle of hauling that extra dirt in. Again,

it'd be nice to have some variety on this area. When you get all these trails in, you are going to get a lot of people running on this. There's a lot of runners in the Baylands, but the Baylands is virtually totally flat. I think you'll find a lot of people who want to do some hill work will do this. I think there's some spots that would be very good for stairs. A lot of runners like to do stair work. Especially in this map on the left side, right by the parking lot, that's a pretty steep hill going up. If you put some stairs going up, that would be practical because it would link the parking lot right up to the trail. A lot of people who just want to walk would do that and the people who want to work out and do some stair work. At the JCC, you'll see people in the morning just doing stairs. I think that would be a popular attraction if you could add that to at least part of Byxbee Hills. Another thing I'm concerned about is connectivity with the rest of the Baylands. You had mentioned that. In this diagram right now, straight down is the Oregon Avenue bike path. I really want to encourage you to make that path to get to Byxbee Hills as easy as possible. Right now they'd have to take a right when they cross the bike bridge and go down the frontage road and then turn. They'd be coming in on the far right of this diagram. Instead, if on the far left by the water treatment center as that curves down, there's maybe a quarter mile that's just fence rows right now. It is a fence that divides the wetlands from the parking lots. If you put a path right along that fence, you wouldn't be interrupting the wetlands because there's a fence there already and a parking lot on the other side, that would link up, again only about a quarter mile, to an existing bike path that would really make it much easier to get to Byxbee and also to get to the Baylands. Right now when I bike out to the Baylands, I cross the bridge and then I have to go down by Ming's and sit at that light and then cross over. It interrupts the whole getting away from development. It'd be really nice to be able to cut straight through Byxbee. Even from here, then you could go around and go out to the ranger station and other places. It's only about a quarter mile to make that a path to allow that to connect in. The last thing is interpretative signs. Really make sure that we have a lot of interpretative signs for the nature and also for the art. If we have public art up there, we should have a little plaque that says who designed this, what are they thinking, is there something the artist would want to convey. If kids are out there, they can appreciate the art; they just don't walk by it. It'll break it up and give them a reason to look at it. That's it. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: We are now 10 minutes over our time, so I'd just like to ask Commissioners to not repeat comments that have already gone before and maybe we can move through this. I don't want to shut down anybody's input while we have staff here to answer questions. Go ahead, Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: Hi. Can you tell me your name again?

Mr. Krupp: Sure. It's Matthew Krupp. Like the coffee machine.

Commissioner Crommie: Crump, C-R-U-M-P?

Mr. Krupp: I guess like the coffee machine didn't help. So it's K-R-U-P-P.

Commissioner Crommie: Who are you with?

Mr. Krupp: I'm sorry. I'm with Public Works, Zero Waste. I'm co-managing this project with Daren. It's a really fantastic partnership between Public Works and CSD.

Commissioner Crommie: Great. I wanted to talk a little bit more about the biological side of things, the habitat. I understand the consultant group was tasked with laying out biological requirements for this area. What I don't really see in the report are commentary on biological rationales for or against having trees in this habitat. I'm sort of missing that piece. I'm also missing the tie-in with the CIP for the habitat vegetation islands that I thought you had money for, Daren. This report did not come together for me biologically. I understand there's a piece of it that's on the burrowing owl. I was struggling to see where all the recommendations are for how the planting should be done and the need for irrigation to get it to take hold. I know we haven't been very successful in getting the plantings to take hold. It's tantamount that we approach this in the best possible way that we can and that we don't shortchange it. Can you just tell me where that's described in this report?

Mr. Anderson: Sure. Let me back up and address the first question you asked about the trees. That one was debated by both our stakeholder group and our environmental consultant, TRA (Thomas Reid and Associates), and staff. There isn't a real clear answer on the best environmental practice. There's a mixing between protecting the species down in the wetlands. When you put in trees, you create purchase for birds of prey, but you've got endangered species that they could prey upon. There's a balance there. We've heard some best management practices from other landfills that are also adjacent to wetlands saying, "That's not what we recommend. As we went through the same process, we learned that we shouldn't do that." However, there are other arguments in favor of it and there are benefits from having trees in some areas. There's that conundrum or balance between those two competing issues. There's also the challenge of irrigating and keeping a tree alive on there. In the vegetative islands, there is an option of keeping trees up there. Thomas Reid and Associates gave us a palette that could include some small trees, that might fit up there, provide shade for the seating areas that you saw adjacent to the planting areas. That's very much in play. It's just striking that right balance. This is still a draft, so it's figuring those things out and fine tuning it. The other question you asked about the funding. The CIP is for the trails; it's for the vegetation; it's for the benches, the signage. It's all one CIP. The pot of money goes to all that. The vegetative islands are funded through that same CIP.

Commissioner Crommie: Is that described in this report?

Mr. Anderson: If it didn't, it was a shortcoming on my behalf.

Commissioner Crommie: From my previous knowledge of what you've said about the habitat, the vegetative islands, when I was reading this report that did not come together for me. I just felt the biological piece was very heavily focused on the burrowing owls, which is amazing that we're going to try to go that direction, but then I heard also that we might have a problem there. That seems like it's not completely clear cut. Then I was missing some of the information on how we're going to get the plants to grow in this habitat, what we're going to do to make sure that it's just not a moonscape. Personally, I think the public needs to understand that trees are not that compatible with that habitat. I don't think that message is getting out. We need to do what we can to get the kind of vegetation that we need there and have a strong enough effort so that we can get that to work.

Mr. Anderson: I agree wholeheartedly. Hence this whole rationale of saying, "Let's do a pilot program and not do what everyone always does which is come in and hydroseed and get about 20 percent efficacy on germination and then have to mow a giant field of weeds. Let's try something new and put in specific targeted areas where we can try different vegetation types. Higher quality that we can put in as 5-gallon plants." That's the whole principle behind this concept of a vegetative island, so we can manicure it by hand. Those will be hand pulled weeds, not crudely mowed with a giant mower. They will be irrigated. It's the only chance we really have of getting it going. TRA and Oasis came up with some good ideas. Essentially the current concept is that we'd have a water bladder, a 500-gallon water bladder subgrade that would have some drainage coming down and irrigating some of these plants. That's the idea. Another concept is we could have one island with that; another one that perhaps gets an initial watering with a product called DriWater, where you put in a package around the plant that essentially is a slow release of water. That would be another idea. What we want to do is learn from these. These are small islands and we eventually want to vegetate the whole area that way. That's the principle, that gradually these islands would expand and increase our vegetation to the whole landscape up there.

Commissioner Crommie: Good. I really like all those ideas. I might have missed it, but I'd like to see that description in the report.

Mr. Anderson: Sure.

Commissioner Crommie: I'm wondering if we can get a commitment from Public Works to not use big trucks there, because we're just going in circles with the damage that comes from all the maintenance needed for the landfill. I feel like we're just going round and round and round. We just need once and for all to set things up so that we're minimizing

any damage possible. Work with environmental groups, work with the biologists, get everyone working together and use a different kind of truck if necessary. I've been aware of ongoing issues on Baylands Park for over eight years, the entire time I've been engaged with this Commission. I've seen a lot of good work undone by damage. I cannot say strongly enough to get Public Works on board with the environmentalists, the biologists to get it so that we're not wasting money time and time again. Thank you.

Mr. Anderson: Can I reply real quickly to that one? That's such a critical need. You're absolutely right. For the last 20 years we had a trail system with wooden header boards on an oyster shell trail with heavy tractors and trucks going over it. It was bound to fail. It couldn't possibly succeed with heavy vehicles crossing over it. With this current system, we'll follow the exact process you're talking about. With Public Works, CSD and trained biologists all working together to say, "If we have to have a trail system in here, how can we construct it so we don't have vehicles going off-road, crossing things, creating broken header boards and all those problems?" We've done a pretty good job of balancing that. The current plan does have that and we have good cooperation. As Matt pointed out, the partnership with CSD and Public Works has been excellent. Ron Arp and Matt have been fantastic partners, are really privy to the problems we've faced in the past, and are eager to make sure that we don't have that. In the past, they would have to come out at my bequest and say, "Again the trails are damaged. Can you fix it again?" They were eager too to get it right. I think we've got that.

Commissioner Crommie: Great. Thank you.

Vice Chair Lauing: I just have a couple. I was actually very interested in that discussion about the owl. I learned a lot from that. Just so we understand the basis of the dispute that's going on out there, to put it in layman's terms, you think a 3-foot cap is enough and they think you need more or a 6-foot cap would still not be enough. Please clarify the dispute.

Mr. Krupp: I'm going to call up Ron Arp to give the full detail. He's been working directly with the regulators on this issue.

Ron Arp: Hi, Ron Arp, Zero Waste Manager. We really have three agencies that oversee the landfill. Two of them have been satisfied with our plan. Our plan is basically to add a few more feet of soil in these gray areas so that squirrels and other burrowers could live in these areas. CalRecycle oversees the landfill closure also. They're concerned that if protected species spread onto other areas, it may prevent us from doing maintenance or repairs of leachate wells, gas wells and that sort of thing in other areas.

Vice Chair Lauing: It's not about the cap; it's about the maintenance?

Mr. Arp: They would probably be okay with a thickened cap section. If you ever had a problem and maybe you had to get in and fix it, maybe some subsidence or something like that, they would be concerned that these protected species would be problematic. That we would not be able to get in there and fix the landfill surface in accordance with regulations. That's what their concern is. They can be convinced. We have a lot of safeguards, but we're not quite there yet. They haven't agreed to it yet.

Vice Chair Lauing: If you offer to put a 10-foot cap, that's not going to solve the problem?

Mr. Arp: That's not it.

Vice Chair Lauing: That's what I wanted clarity on. At the end, you talk about still controlling the ground squirrels. I think that means letting them loose where we want the owls and not having so much where we don't have the owls. Is there a new system other than the one that was described in here which is no longer in use to control the squirrel population?

Mr. Krupp: No. We're still planning to use the same squirrel abatement program that we're currently using on the non-burrowing areas indicated on the plan.

Vice Chair Lauing: With respect to the signs which is a question you asked, it seems to me that something that states what's there and gives the information but blends in is better. I realize this was just a sketch, but bright orange doesn't seem to be the natural color. That's the only thing I would say about that. We're not trying to interfere with what's going on up there. We're supposed to just identify it. I think that was the last one. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: I just have a couple of comments. Returning to Commissioner Reckdahl's concern about the connection at the bottom of the map. If you come in from the bike path, you're on the bottom left. If that yellow line that goes horizontally were open, you could go across and up to access the hill. On the left side there's that blue line right where the yellow begins on the bottom. Is that an access road that will be open to the public, so folks coming in from the bike bridge can get up on the hill without having to go all the way around? [Response not audible.] All right, thank you. My other question was, one of the things that stakeholders consistently bring up is the importance of some dead-end viewing stations. I don't see any of those on this map here. Why is that?

Mr. Krupp: That was a comment that came up in the community meeting. We looked at a few stub-outs, and we think that's possible to integrate into a future plan. Again, the trail scheme was designed primarily around the access to the different landfill control

876 systems. For the maintenance workers, it was important to be able to access the different
877 points. There are likely a number of opportunities to be able to provide some stub-outs
878 that don't necessarily provide connections. It's a challenging problem. We always try to
879 find connectivity. Sometimes we try to identify places of non-connectivity. Trying to get
880 that right balance, we don't always get it right on the head. There probably are some
881 opportunities that we could find on the map to do that.

882
883 Mr. Anderson: If I could tack onto that one. There's also adaptive management in that
884 we've had this open since 1991. The previous design did have stub-outs. Every single
885 one of those stub-outs that were dead-ended had an illegal trail that tapered down in six
886 different directions. According to our maintenance plan, we're supposed to try to re-
887 vegetate those. Incredibly difficult. The original hope was to get rid of those. That's
888 another balance of practicality versus a request I heard from that same stakeholders
889 meeting that there were benefits to birders. I would argue that there are certain areas,
890 though it's still a rounded edge, you could stop and gain that same perspective and enjoy
891 the birds from different views. I don't know that you can't accomplish the same thing
892 with the plan we have here.

893
894 Chair Hetterly: Let me just have a follow-up question on that. Around the right-hand
895 curve, the existing road as you come up next to the creek has a number of sites where you
896 can walk a little ways off the trail and there's a wooden deck. Is that something that
897 might be able to meet that purpose on the edge of one of those hills? Off that yellow trail
898 that's on the top, maybe you could have five steps down to a viewing platform just like
899 you do on the existing levee. Is that feasible or is that problematic where it is now? Do
900 you have any reaction to that?

901
902 Mr. Anderson: I don't believe it's problematic where it is now. The difference is we have
903 settlement issues on top of Byxbee where we don't down there. It may be possible. It's
904 certainly something we could talk about.

905
906 Mr. Krupp: Something else. We were generally looking to avoid the placement of any
907 structures given the nature of this interim plan which goes to the comment before from
908 Commissioner Reckdahl about shading opportunities. We did investigate that along with
909 some of these other possibilities. We elected to go with things that could essentially be
910 moved, like benches and other things like that. It's definitely an opportunity moving
911 forward for the final plan, which we should definitely investigate.

912
913 Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Final question. You're hoping to come back to us for
914 approval of a Park Improvement Ordinance in November, I think it said. I'm wondering
915 what that is going to cover. What is the ordinance going to accomplish?

Mr. Anderson: The ordinance would seek your recommendation that Council approve and issue a Park Improvement Ordinance for all the changes that you see from the existing design. It would be that trail system. It would be the signage proposals, the vegetative islands and that sign.

Chair Hetterly: It doesn't incorporate the burrowing owls piece or the maintenance facilities?

Mr. Anderson: That would be part of the plan too. It would be the entire plan. It would include the maintenance and the burrowing owl plan as well. That would all be part of it.

Chair Hetterly: Just a second. When it comes back us, it would be very helpful if you could send us in the mail this particular map which isn't in our package, that gives the full picture.

Mr. Anderson: Which map? I'm sorry. Oh, the one you're looking at.

Chair Hetterly: That one you have up there, yeah. By email or however you can get it to us. It would be nice to have that.

Mr. Anderson: We'll email you that ASAP.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Go ahead, Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: I had one thing I just wanted to add. When I have looked at Shoreline Park and looked at where they've had some success with burrowing owls, one thing I noticed is that they have some brick areas that can provide hiding places for animals. They also have logs down. Can we try to emulate some of those things that they've done over there to be successful?

Mr. Anderson: Yeah. We have to apologize. These map pages had all sorts of details and it called out those very things you're looking at. That is probably why some of the things you were confused about were actually in the plan, but they're held on this map that you got a zoomed-in image of. I'll send that out via email. I apologize.

Commissioner Reckdahl: It's on the website right now. (inaudible)

Mr. Anderson: It does include those very things. We borrowed best management practices from Mountain View. Basically we're creating a habitat for the animals that the owls and other species would prey upon, so you want these piles of rock or mulch or wood chips. All three of those play elements in there. It specified where they'd go and how they should be maintained. That's all in this plan.

Commissioner Markevitch: The very last page.

Mr. Krupp: Our consultants are hard at work looking at providing the plan which will accompany this document when we come back in November. They'll provide more detail, especially on the specs for the vegetative islands and the habitat areas, so you'll have a little bit more detail on that than what we've provided you here. We very much appreciate your comments. They'll help create a better plan. Thank you.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I have one more question.

Chair Hetterly: Yes.

Commissioner Reckdahl: If you have a packet in front of you, on page 43 towards the back, the one with the colors. I guess they're not labeled. On the electronic version it was.

Commissioner Crommie: Figure 6.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Oh, yeah, figure 6. Thank you. There's some structures on the left side there. What are those structures? I assume those are City structures.

Mr. Anderson: Those structures are from the ITT property. They're part of that old radio system, the ship to shore.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That's not part of the park?

Mr. Anderson: It is on a lease. It was formerly owned by the company that ran that ITT. Forgive me; I don't know what the acronym stands for anymore. They sold it to the City, but they still have a lease to operate that.

Commissioner Reckdahl: So it's still being used?

Mr. Anderson: Yes.

Commissioner Reckdahl: How long is the lease, do you know?

Mr. Anderson: I don't know.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Eventually that will become parkland?

Mr. Anderson: To tell you the truth, I'm not sure what the conditions were of that lease.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Krupp: One of our citizens, Emily Renzel, can answer the question about the ITT lease.

Ms. Renzel: I believe that KLM or some name like that took over the International Telephone and Telegraph building. They sent their last message in like 2004. They are no longer there. The City bought out their remainder interest, and it's fee title to the City of Palo Alto and could be dedicated as park.

Mr. Anderson: I've been in the building since that time, and there was still staff in there from that company. I'm not sure if that's exactly the full story.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you very much.

4. Opportunities for Off-Leash Dog Exercise.

Chair Hetterly: This is a report of the ad hoc committee. We have one public speaker, Howard Hoffman. Would you like to speak now?

Howard Hoffman: (inaudible)

Chair Hetterly: Okay. You have in your packet a memo from the ad hoc group that summarizes the key considerations we should be thinking about in designing a shared-use dog pilot. I'm not going back through them in the interest of time. Anybody in the audience who needs a copy, they should be out at the table. It basically lays out safety issues, size issues, location issues, cost issues, enforceability, long-term use, metrics and rules. What I'd like to do for discussion today is outline the discussion and then go to public comment and then start the discussion. I'd like to hear your thoughts on the three potential locations that we've described in here, whether you have any other pros or cons to add to the chart about what we should be thinking about in those areas. Concerns about creating habitual off-leash use at a site by starting a pilot have been repeated by other cities quite vigorously. We think it's worth some serious thought on our part. These locations that we've identified here are all in that mid-town, east/west corridor. They don't meet the needs of getting to north Palo Alto or south Palo Alto, where we really do need more dog parks. A shared-use dog park is largely determined by where there's another use in a large space, so we don't have a lot of other options besides these for pilot sites. The ad hoc would like to hear your thoughts about whether we should look more closely at alternative sites that might be better located for a future, permanent shared used, if it were to come to that, and also talk about enforcement. One of the things about a pilot that's short-term and temporary is you really want to be able to close it down

at the end if it's not successful. Given that our enforcement of the leash law citywide is fairly negligible already, we don't want to create an additional problem for folks who are burdened by unauthorized off-leash use. We'd like to hear your thoughts about enforcement, which is also outlined in the memo. There's a list of metrics attached. Do you think those are the right metrics? Do you have any thoughts about who could and how to collect them. Finally, outreach. That's the scope of what we'd like to cover. We'll open it to public comment now.

Commissioner Knopper: May I just add one last thing?

Chair Hetterly: Yes, go ahead.

Commissioner Knopper: The one thing that we didn't have when we created this document were actual costs associated with fencing the three locations. I wanted to give you that note before your comments. The Baylands Athletic Center, it would be an additional fencing cost of \$1,000. Greer Park, it would be an additional cost to fence of \$21,350.

Commissioner Reckdahl: (inaudible) \$21,000 ...

Commissioner Knopper: \$21,350. Hoover Park would need additional fencing of approximately \$4,000.

Chair Hetterly: That includes the double gate for all of those.

Commissioner Knopper: Yes, and that includes a double gate. People would have to enter this fenced area.

Chair Hetterly: Now we'll go out to public comment. Howard Hoffman followed by Daria Walsh.

Mr. Hoffman: Thank you, Members of Commission. Howard Hoffman, President of Palo Alto Dog Owners. I live on Waverley Street in Palo Alto. Our group is very pleased that the Commission is considering having a shared-use facility. We would be happy with any of these frankly. The little bit of feedback we've got from our members so far is the Bay site is not near where people live. Even though it would be the least costly to do, one of the other sites would be more to people's interests. There was one question on the Hoover site, whether that was to be shared space inside the baseball fence that was recently constructed or on the outside. I'm not sure what the intent was. Was that on the outside?

Chair Hetterly: It's the inside.

Mr. Hoffman: The inside. That's part of how the cost ...

Chair Hetterly: Exactly. And that's why the area is quite a bit smaller.

Mr. Hoffman: In terms of having a reasonable place to play with a dog or dogs and to have grass be able to survive, this is obviously one answer to that. We're pleased with that. We don't feel that this is going to be the total solution, but we're very happy to see something. We know that the City's in the middle of a major effort doing a new Master Plan for the parks. We hope that's going to include some other opportunities for dog recreation, particularly since this doesn't address anything north of Oregon Expressway. I guess the Bay site you could say does, but again it's not really near where people live. With that, if anybody has any questions for us—oh, one other thing. In the information it said that we represent 100 dog owners, that's 300.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you very much.

Mr. Hoffman: Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Daria Walsh.

Daria Walsh: Good evening, Commission. I'm Daria Walsh, 810 Fielding Drive. I wasn't planning to speak tonight, but you know there are thousands of dog owners in Palo Alto. I don't need to tell you how important recreational opportunities are for dog owners. It's always hard to get dog owners here. In fact, I think dog owners often act more like cats when it comes to something like this. If the dog owners were here, there would be thousands wagging their tails. There's a lot of enthusiasm for this proposal. I know that people don't always show up. I want to make sure that you know that there are a lot of people who really value this proposal. Recreational dog facilities allow a deep connection between people. I've seen it hundreds of times when I go out with my dogs and have a chance to meet other dog owners. It's just a way that you connect with people that is beyond a lot of other options in this City. In terms of the memo presented, I just have a couple of comments. Obviously like a lot of other people, I would prefer a neighborhood location like a lot of you, but I understand the complexity of that. You've covered that pretty well in the memo, the complexity of having something in the neighborhood as opposed to something in the Baylands which is maybe a little bit more neighbor friendly because there are no neighbors there. Having something in the neighborhood not only provides an easy gathering place but also that exercise opportunity which the Commission is aware of and would like to promote. The one other site in Greer Park that is possible that I don't think was discussed in the memo is the area around the skate bowl there. That actually turns out to be a pretty good area for a shared use. Right now the skate bowl is surrounded by a pretty ugly, tall chain-link fence, but it's an

area that's really used only after school. Sometimes you'll find someone there in the morning, but generally it's used after school. It's an area where it would be nice to upgrade that fence, because it is pretty ugly. It's on a sloped area that's not that usable for the field. That's just one option to look at. The last thing I'd like to say is that while I admire what Menlo Park has done with their funding for the shared dog facility that they have, I don't think the City should expect that. For people who use this facility, it's probably the only City facility they use. We rake the playgrounds every morning, the sandboxes. We maintain baseball fields. We maintain trails. I don't think it's that much to ask for the City to establish and maintain a recreational opportunity for dog owners. Thanks for bringing this up. I'm happy to see it on the agenda again. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Any questions or comments? Commissioner Markevitch.

Commissioner Markevitch: Of the three sites, weighing the fencing costs and the proximity, my vote would be for Hoover. It's in the middle there. It's not the most expensive and it's also not way out in the Baylands. That would be my first choice for this pilot program.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Lauing.

Vice Chair Lauing: I'd love to hear a little bit more of the consideration that the ad hoc took on choosing one instead of two sites. In every market study, it's better to have two variables that you're testing instead of one. For example, if this works, then we can do a lot of analysis about why it worked or we can decide where we're going to roll it out. If it doesn't work, we don't have anything right now to compare it to, something else that would have worked. I know you considered this thoroughly and the report is terrific. If you could just tell us why, for example, you didn't want to try Baylands versus Hoover because it's a big park, different neighbor consideration, and the walk versus drive issue.

Chair Hetterly: We did think about it, and I don't think we came out adamantly opposed to more than one. Since they were all three in that same corridor, we thought the greatest benefit to having more than one would be to have one in different parts of town. Certainly the Athletic Center could provide a counterpoint to either of the other two. I don't think it makes sense to have a pilot at Greer and at Hoover. Those are the same community to begin with. One of the things that made us think, "Nah, maybe not both," is that the Baylands Athletic Center, because of the golf course and the flood control project, seemed like it might not be operable in the same timeframe as we could do it at one of the other parks. That's another consideration. We're certainly open to the Commission's input.

Vice Chair Lauing: This pilot will be over before the golf course even starts, so I'm not sure that's a ...

Commissioner Knopper: Hopefully. Not for the golf course but for the dogs.

Vice Chair Lauing: Thus far, and I want to hear the rest of the debate, I would argue for an A-B test so that we're testing both things, recognizing that it's twice the management, potentially twice the cost in maintenance and so on. At least then we've got alternatives to compare. Eventually this has to go to Council, and if Council sees one alternative that maybe worked or didn't depending on surveys, that's just a lot different than if they see two quite different ones. One where a lot of people do have to drive, but the Baylands is closer than Arastradero, so maybe that's still okay. It is bigger, so bigger dogs can run compared to smaller dogs. There's a lot of variables that might get two entirely different sets of feedback once we do the ex post facto surveys on that.

Chair Hetterly: That's a good point.

Vice Chair Lauing: Just one other comment I wanted to make in general here. We're taking a risk, so let's just take the risk. Let's not worry too much about collateral damage and things like that. Let's just try this thing out. We're going into it saying this is different and we're going to step on some toes and we're going to make some people happy. That's why we're doing it. We just need to take some risks. Some of these concerns are quite valid and they should be part and parcel of the evaluation process. I don't think we should not do them because they're a little bit risky. I'll stop there. Thanks.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Reckdahl:

Commissioner Reckdahl: Menlo Park went to a professional cleaning. Is that because people didn't want to or they weren't doing a good enough job? Do you know the story behind that?

Chair Hetterly: It was handled entirely by the dog owners group. They had initially done a sector-by-sector cleanup afterwards and then decided to make a switch. I don't know why. I think they were in touch with their users and thought it would be easy to raise funds to hire a professional cleaner. That leaves the dog group to do just the oversight as opposed to the on-the-ground.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The dog cleaners come in every day then, after every use?

Commissioner Knopper: Yeah, I think so.

Chair Hetterly: Yeah, every day.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Okay. You mentioned that at Hoover the outfield fence is only 4 feet tall. Is that adequate or would you have to extend that outfield fence?

Chair Hetterly: It depends on the dog. It's not adequate for mine.

Commissioner Knopper: It's adequate for mine.

Chair Hetterly: (crosstalk)

Commissioner Knopper: Going to what we just talked about, there's some things that aren't going to be the perfect scenario, but you have to try it to see what works. For some dogs, 4 feet might not be enough. For the majority of dogs, it probably is. That goes to owner responsibility for managing their dog and understanding that their dog likes to jump over 6-foot fences. Some dogs like to dig. A lot of this has to be given to the trust of the owners for self-policing and monitoring.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What is the height of the Hoover dog park fence right now?

Vice Chair Lauing: It's 3 feet.

Chair Hetterly: About 3.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Three feet, okay. So we get an extra foot over that.

Chair Hetterly: That 4 feet is the same as the Greer dog park.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What is the thinking? If this shared use is successful at Hoover, then we would have a shared use and a dog park. The dog park would be still attractive because it'd be there 24 hours a day or whenever the park is open.

Chair Hetterly: We haven't considered that because this would be a temporary pilot, and we don't want to assume that it would become permanent at that location. We just want to see if we can ..

Commissioner Reckdahl: See if a pilot works.

Chair Hetterly: ... succeed with a pilot. If we do, then we should look more broadly and identify the most well-suited (crosstalk).

Commissioner Knopper: When you look at the metrics and compliance, there's a lot of different things we have to measure against; self-policing, dog behavior and picking up dog waste. Also we have to measure it based on what the City is going to be dealing with

1253 regarding turf issues and the condition of the turf before and after and how much
1254 additional costs and maintenance and people hours it's going to take to maintain those
1255 fields so other users are happy too. Again, it's really about taking a six-month period of
1256 time and looking at it in the totality and then weighing and measuring the benefits and
1257 some of the failures, the good and the bad, and say, "Is this worth going to a more
1258 permanent solution possibly where we do the pilot or somewhere else in Palo Alto,
1259 multiple locations, etc.?"

1260
1261 Chair Hetterly: During the pilot, it would make sense not to change the existing dog
1262 park. One of the other benefits of that is it gives you an opportunity to see if Hoover's the
1263 place, whether small dogs might want to use the existing dog park while the big dogs are
1264 running in the bigger space. It's hard to know how that might play out, but it does
1265 provide another data point.

1266
1267 Commissioner Reckdahl: What about artificial turf fields? Is that in play at all or is that
1268 no-go?

1269
1270 Commissioner Knopper: No. No.

1271
1272 Commissioner Reckdahl: Why is that? Is it that the dogs don't like it or is it a waste
1273 issue?

1274
1275 Daren Anderson: If I may. There's a couple of reasons. One, the cost of patching that
1276 turf is very expensive, if dogs dig it up. Secondly, we don't irrigate our turf fields. We
1277 don't have a system to sanitize.

1278
1279 Commissioner Reckdahl: Oh, you don't spray it down at all.

1280
1281 Mr. Anderson: Which is one of the big values; you're not spending that \$22,000 a year
1282 on irrigating that you would if it were natural grass. Especially poignant in the drought.

1283
1284 Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Crommie.

1285
1286 Commissioner Crommie: At Hoover Park, how does the proposed shared-use site
1287 compare to the existing small dog park, in terms of acreage?

1288
1289 Commissioner Knopper: I have that information somewhere.

1290
1291 Chair Hetterly: The shared-use site would be 0.9 acres, and the existing site is 0.14 or
1292 something like that.

1293
1294 Commissioner Knopper: Yeah, it's significantly bigger.

Commissioner Crommie: Wow. So that's a huge difference. I do bring my dog to the dog park, and I have a big dog who does fine running there. We're going from 0.1-something to 0.9?

Chair Hetterly: Yeah, and that's the smallest of the three options.

Commissioner Crommie: And that's the smallest of the three. First of all, I'm really glad we're finally going to do this. I think it's great. I'm really in support of this trial. If we're only going to do one trial, we want to make sure that we're not setting ourselves up for any kind of failure in terms of selecting one that's too small. That will have a higher impact on the grass. As it gets into a smaller space, per square foot there's going to be more dog travel and human travel. I just don't want us to get trapped. We know we want to go into neighborhoods with this plan. If we think that's an average amount of space within the neighborhood locations, I would be in support of just one and I would lean toward Hoover, if that mimics the other places we would go in neighborhoods. If there are bigger places to go in other neighborhoods, then maybe there's a rationale to go to the Baylands and get that bigger space. I'd hate to see us have to nix this because of impact when we might not have seen that with a bigger place. I don't know how to pitch that. Another potential problem is when we have field closures, the sports groups have hotlines that they call when games and practices get canceled. Post-rain is a time when a field is at a very vulnerable state. I need to understand a little bit more how the users of this proposed shared-use field would know not to go. Is someone going to physically post a sign?

Chair Hetterly: We might want to include on the existing signs that with rain closures, call the hotline. It's the same number that sports users are going to call.

Commissioner Crommie: That's going to be really important. If people don't have kids that play sports, they're not trained to think about that. I don't know about the demographics. I assume we're drawing on a wide cross-section here so people can help each other out.

Chair Hetterly: Do you have any other suggestions about how to do that?

Commissioner Crommie: When it gets opened, there needs to be some educational sessions maybe.

Commissioner Knopper: Also if you look at the rules that we drafted. Number 12 does say if there is a field closure, there will be no off-leash dog usage until the City of Palo Alto notifies that the field is reopened. It will be posted on the rules. That may be a nuance thing that we could talk to Daren about with regard to how many times or when

1337 their planned maintenance is there. Do they post a sign and then take it down? To Chair
1338 Hetterly's point, there absolutely would be signage posted directing people or we include
1339 it in the literature and just make an edict upfront that when the field is wet, there is no
1340 off-leash dog hours.

1341
1342 Commissioner Crommie: What people don't understand is it's really a long period after
1343 the rain is over. It's just a very serious issue. People are going to walk over there with
1344 their dog. What if they don't have their cell phone with them to call the hotline when
1345 they're standing there with their dog? I don't know. That's one thing I'm quite concerned
1346 about.

1347
1348 Vice Chair Lauing: If it's two locations, in the short term we can just make sure that
1349 signs are posted at both those locations and then taken down when it's not closed
1350 anymore.

1351
1352 Commissioner Crommie: If signs can be posted that the field is closed, that is ideal.
1353 There is a City staff member who's in charge of posting the closure on the hotline. I don't
1354 know if we could ask that person to drive over and physically post a sign. Maybe we can
1355 get the volunteer dog groups involved in doing that, especially those of them who have
1356 soccer players or other sports players. Has the ad hoc looked at any kind of
1357 environmental issues in terms of opening this up at the Baylands? Were there any
1358 stakeholders that you contacted about that?

1359
1360 Chair Hetterly: No, we didn't. In fact that was something we had in our notes to add to
1361 the cons, because we don't know what the impact might be, though it is fully fenced and
1362 it's limited hours and it's a locked facility. We didn't expect anything significant but,
1363 you're right, we do need to step forward on that.

1364
1365 Commissioner Crommie: It might be good just to bring those folks into this through a
1366 conversation if we decide to go for a second location. It sounds to me like we haven't
1367 heard from every Commissioner, but it might be that we favor Hoover if there's one
1368 place. If we can do two, open it up to the Baylands. I'd like to make that contingent on
1369 getting some buy-in from some of those stakeholders.

1370
1371 Chair Hetterly: We're definitely not looking to choose a place tonight. We're just trying
1372 to identify the pros and cons. We still need to go through a whole outreach process
1373 before we get to that point.

1374
1375 Commissioner Crommie: The other issue for me is I did take exception to seeing that the
1376 dog group does have to finance this. I don't like that. It's setting the wrong precedent
1377 here. Those people who own dogs are fully entitled to services within our City as we
1378 decide we can do them. I feel like it's a bit of a slippery slope. I'd want a dialog with

1379 them more about it. I don't want to decide for that group. It didn't sit with me as well
1380 when I read that.

1381
1382 Chair Hetterly: Okay. Commissioner Ashlund.

1383
1384 Commissioner Ashlund: We talked a little bit about if we're going to do a pilot whether
1385 to do one location or two and having two would give us data points to compare. I just
1386 want to raise that starting a pilot sets that expectation that's harder to remove. It would be
1387 better to go with one site as a pilot and see what we can learn from that. It doesn't mean
1388 we won't do another phase of the pilot. On the composting pilot study that was done in
1389 Green Meadow, I think it's called, surely that's not the end of the City's work in figuring
1390 out how to do curbside compost pick up. They picked the one location and started there.
1391 That would be a better way just because it would set that expectation. I will definitely
1392 leave it more to the dog experts to decide which site. I'm glad you said there's more
1393 outreach. As a non-dog owner, one of the things that comes to mind is there's a lot of
1394 requests for this from the north side of the community. Since Rinconada is such a big
1395 and centrally located location, is that even in consideration?

1396
1397 Chair Hetterly: It is not in consideration for the pilot.

1398
1399 Commissioner Knopper: Because there's no fence. We only chose areas that already had
1400 fence and we just need extensions of the fence.

1401
1402 Commissioner Ashlund: Okay. That was the other question. When you gave the costs
1403 for the fencing, were those temporary fencing costs or were they permanent?

1404
1405 Mr. Anderson: That was permanent fencing. My hunch is the temporary fencing, which
1406 I haven't had a chance to cost out, would probably be close to the same price.

1407
1408 Commissioner Ashlund: Again, if it's permanent fencing, that's even more of a setting of
1409 the expectation that it's really going to be at that location. We need to look at that
1410 carefully like you're going to do with more outreach as well. I think those are my
1411 questions. Thanks.

1412
1413 Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Markevitch.

1414
1415 Commissioner Markevitch: To the point of Commissioner Crommie regarding the dog
1416 group's paying for this, the soccer teams pay for the maintenance of the fields that they
1417 use through their fees. I don't see a difference on that. My other question was for
1418 Hoover, you already have an existing dog park there and it's fairly small. During this
1419 pilot, would it be feasible to take the smaller one and use it for small dogs only and then

the larger one for large dogs to even out the wear during the pilot program? I didn't know if you'd looked into that or not.

Commissioner Knopper: The one issue is this would only be two hours in the morning Monday through Friday. It's very limited hours. It would almost be a caste system with dogs. It would be difficult to stop a person who had the wrong size dog, because people walk their dogs and exercise their dogs when they can. If they know that there's off-leash hours from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. Monday through Friday, that's what they're going to do. That might be a little difficult to manage from a staff perspective, to monitor that and oversee that. That's just my opinion.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: I'm glad you brought up the hours. I forgot to comment on that. If we are doing this as a pilot and we're going to be monitoring wear and tear on the fields for such limited hours, if the pilot is successful and we try to roll it out, is that the concept on this Commission, that it would be such limited hours?

Commissioner Knopper: Yes.

Chair Hetterly: Yes.

Commissioner Crommie: In Menlo Park did they not have any evening hours?

Chair Hetterly: No.

Commissioner Knopper: No.

Commissioner Crommie: We have to really mimic what we're hoping to roll out.

Commissioner Knopper: We looked at the cities that have off-leash dog hours up and down the Peninsula, San Mateo County, Santa Clara County. It seems for the most part very uniform that there's very limited off-leash, not to say that they don't have enclosed dog parks that are open all day or night. This is specifically off-leash and they all have very limited hours, because the fields are used other times of day. We've chosen a lot of fields that are used in the evening, so that's why we chose those hours.

Commissioner Crommie: I would just throw out it seems really limited to me. I don't understand why we wouldn't have any hours like noon to 2:00 or something like that.

Commissioner Knopper: Because there's a high population of park users at that time. Again this is managing expectation of the community as a whole. I have a lovely dog.

He can walk up to any little kid and just lick him, but not every dog is like that. Noon to 2:00 is peak park hours for people who have young children. Dogs might get freaked out with that many people or little kids. You don't want dogs running around without leashes during high park usage hours.

Commissioner Crommie: I don't quite get that argument, because the dogs would be walking to the fenced-in area on their leash and then they'd be off leash once they're inside the fence. I'm not going to make a big deal about this. I think it's the role of the dog advocates. I don't get that argument.

Commissioner Reckdahl: My guess is that part of the reason for the limited hours is if you were doing the manual sweep yourself, then you'd have to stay there for the end. You don't want a four-hour period because then you have to stay there to the very end to do the sweep. If you have professionals coming in, you can go in at the beginning, at the first hour and then you go back home. While you're back at home, the professionals are doing the sweep. If you did have professionals doing the sweep, you could open it up and have a four-hour window. That would be certainly reasonable at least when school's in session.

Chair Hetterly: Let's move on since we're behind on time. Enforcement, we suggest talking to other city departments about what it would entail to have some increased enforcement during the pilot period. Is that something you all would like us to do, don't think it's worth doing? Any input on that? No, okay. Then how about the metrics? That's Attachment A. Do you think we're on the right track with these kinds of questions?

Commissioner Reckdahl: One thing that's going to take some work is to convince the baseball people that their field is going to be in good condition. You addressed it here; taking before and after pictures. Our point to them is if the field is going to be damaged, we will find a way to stop that damage or stop the program. Bad things could happen, but it's a risk worth taking.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: Could we get anyone to blog on this? It'd be so great to have that going just to get ...

Chair Hetterly: (inaudible)

Commissioner Crommie: I was wondering if we could get anyone to blog on how this is going, from one of the groups. It would be really nice to get that kind of running commentary.

Commissioner Knopper: Do you mean with regard to the Menlo Park group?

Commissioner Crommie: No, blog on our trial, if we run this trial pilot. It'd be neat to have some voice commenting on a regular basis how they think things are going.

Chair Hetterly: How would you go about doing that?

Commissioner Crommie: Ask someone if they'll do it.

Chair Hetterly: Someone, a dog owner, a neighbor, a Commissioner, staff?

Commissioner Crommie: I wouldn't want to put this on staff. I'd want to put this on a resident. It'd be really interesting if we could get multiple perspectives. A person who owns a dog and is invested in this pilot might want to spend the time on a blog. It would be lovely for someone who is not a dog owner to also comment on it; someone who's a really heavy park user, a parent who brings children to the park at that time of day. Again if it's just from 8:00 to 10:00, I don't know who the competing users are. They might be people who are doing athletic workouts before they go to work who are not dog owners. I would ask someone from the dog advocacy community. Also notify people during public outreach that if someone wants to do that, the Commission would be interested.

Chair Hetterly: How about Number 2, spot monitor onsite during designated off-leash hours to track compliance? That seems like a great idea. The question is who would do it and how often would be appropriate for that kind of thing. I don't think we need to rely on the dog owners' group to do daily oversight, but maybe we want a Commissioner or staff person or somebody to be on a regular schedule once a week, twice week to check in and have a diverse perspective.

Commissioner Knopper: It's very reasonable because this Commission has been talking about this since before my tenure started. It's very reasonable to put some sort of rotating schedule together with Commissioners, City people, dog group participants and do that spot monitor. That's what Menlo Park does; they consider it self-policing. When a group of people sees someone that's noncompliant, they let them know this is what you need to do, these are the rules of engagement because we'll lose the privilege if you don't engage. They said they've been extremely successful with the regular users of off-leash dog hours of bringing in anyone new and saying, "We don't want to lose this privilege, so this is how it goes."

Chair Hetterly: The other question we struggled with is Number 8, who will collect complaints and how many complaints are too many. How do we figure out what the

measure of success is? Is that something we do in advance? Is that something we do as we're going along by however it feels or the nature of the complaints? Is that something we need to flesh out more before we start talking to people more broadly about it? Commissioner Ashlund.

Commissioner Ashlund: Do you have any information from these other cities about complaint to happiness ratios so we would know what to expect? I know complainers are more likely to log it than happy people. Since this has been in such demand from the dog owners, maybe there's something we can use from these guys that we know what to expect in terms of complaint to happiness ratio? Do you know what I'm saying? The people who write in and say thank you.

Chair Hetterly: I don't think they tallied the happiness reports. I think they've only ...

Commissioner Ashlund: They haven't, okay.

Chair Hetterly: I don't know that they get any. They didn't talk about happiness reports. They only talked about complaints.

Commissioner Ashlund: Since we have such an active dog owners community, it might be worth it to tally that information. Then the dog owners can get out the news to other dog owners to say, "If you like this, send your thanks." If we're not tracking it or if there are only a few complaints but they're lengthy, it doesn't really give us information. Maybe we can try to track it both ways that way.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I don't quite understand the question. Did you say how many complaints are too many? Is that to say that the pilot is unsuccessful or that we should shut it down?

Chair Hetterly: The point of the metrics is to establish some data points so that we can decide at the end of the pilot whether it was sufficiently successful that we want either to continue it or to create a permanent (crosstalk).

Commissioner Reckdahl: You want the criteria defined ahead of time saying ...

Chair Hetterly: That's the question ...

Commissioner Knopper: Yes.

Chair Hetterly: ... do we define it ahead of time.

Commissioner Knopper: You need the data baseline. You have to have a baseline. The metrics for evaluation that we included in this packet are for us to think about and to measure the data as it comes in. It seems very reasonable and logical that whenever you implement a new initiative, in the first month or two or three, you're going to have a lot more interest and a lot more highly opinionated people. Once people settle in and realize maybe it's not so bad, it will taper off. That's certainly my expectation.

Chair Hetterly: But we wouldn't want to set, if we get 50 complaints, then we shut down. I don't think we want to have a fixed target like that. The question is how do we think about it in terms of evaluating.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm not sure if you can do that ahead of time. There certainly will be complaints at the beginning. If we rectify those and then towards the end we have very little, you don't want to just add up the complaints over the period because they were all during the transition and in a steady state they were all happy.

Vice Chair Lauing: I would totally agree that ten metrics to evaluate success or failure is totally appropriate. In this case, it doesn't have too much to do with the number of complaints. It's really more important what the content of the complaints are once they happen. If the content is from neighbors saying it's too loud, we have to evaluate that in one way. If the other one is that every baseball manager says, "Every time I go out there my kids have to clean up stuff," that's a little bit different. It's the volume of contents, not a certain number, and the content of the complaints during the pilot. Just to underscore it because I think it's been said here, if we're doing a six-month pilot, we are doing a six-month pilot. We're not going to stop it in month 4 or 5 or 5 1/2, because we're committed to six months unless there's some major safety disaster. We need to let the pilot play out to get the data to then do the evaluation. I would not say the number of complaints for success or failure needs to be set up in advance in this case.

Commissioner Reckdahl: If the field is really being damaged significantly and we can't mitigate that, I don't think we want to commit to having this go six months.

Vice Chair Lauing: That's fair if the dogs are digging it up every night.

Chair Hetterly: Yeah, if there's flagrant violation of the rules.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I don't think we want to on the first problem shut it down; we have to try to mitigate it. If we can't, we can't just let the dogs ...

Vice Chair Lauing: Totally fair, totally fair.

Approved

Commissioner Knopper: Obviously this has to go to City Council and they have to commit to the six-month period. In essence they are saying, "We are going to maintain that field in an acceptable condition for soccer, baseball, etc." As a City, we have to commit to maintaining it even if we have a lot of noncompliance. However, we do have 300+ very vocal participants in our dog group. They will probably do their best to help us maintain compliance, and we'll certainly be depending on them to do that as well.

Commissioner Crommie: As far as the timing goes, are we going to make sure we overlap with the right sports seasons to fully evaluate this?

Chair Hetterly: We thought with the six-month pilot we would overlap all the sports seasons.

Commissioner Crommie: I think that's really important to get that situated.

Chair Hetterly: Rob.

Rob de Geus: I just want to make a couple of comments. I was talking to a Council Member recently, because I knew that we were going to talk about this. The way he talked about it was we already have shared use, because this is happening all over town. To the point of let's take a risk, I don't know how big a risk it is because it is happening already. This is just doing it in a more controlled way and with some boundaries around it. It's worth giving it a try. Obviously Council does have to recommend it. On the point of whether dog owners should pay something towards this, that's an interesting one. I favor some contribution. It's actually helpful because it sends a message to the field users that the dog owners are organized and committed and contributing to supporting the athletic fields as sports group do. For the dog owners themselves, they'll take more ownership if they're paying something for it. That would be important. I do have some concern about staff resources and the impact on our parks. We struggle to keep up with the athletic fields as they are. If you've been out there, you know some of them are not at a standard that we're comfortable with. At some point we probably need to talk to the City Council about adding more resources to the parks budget just so we can keep up with new interests and demands like this one.

Chair Hetterly: We're now 15 minutes over our allotted time on this item. In the last 1 minute, are there any burning suggestions about outreach process?

Commissioner Crommie: Can you say quickly what you have in mind for that? Is it written into the document?

Chair Hetterly: No.

Commissioner Crommie: What does the ad hoc have in mind? How many sessions? What's really important is to have a means of doing some back and forth, which we can't do at our Commission meeting. We did that when we had a community meeting on dogs. I thought that was really valuable when we had that meeting long ago, where we could talk back and forth with people. What are the ideas on the table?

Chair Hetterly: We haven't really talked about it as an ad hoc. We're looking for your ideas so we can come up with a plan. It may look something like presenting this kind of information fleshed out a little more, the pros and cons based on our discussion tonight and other concerns as well as enforcement, whatever we learn from our consultation on enforcement options and refining the metrics and the rules. We would want that whole picture framed for a broad outreach. In the interim, it may make sense to have targeted outreach with the direct user groups on a smaller scale to make sure that we are understanding their concerns and integrating them into the framework that we present to the larger public.

Commissioner Crommie: You're saying the targeted outreach would be with a group of stakeholders?

Chair Hetterly: Yeah, either together or separate.

Commissioner Crommie: We just have to model this after something that we've found to be successful in the past. We've all been part of different outreach processes. I find it desirable to have everyone in the same room if we think they can handle it and to invite some stakeholders and get them to talk in detail about some of these issues. It's a tricky process to already know where we as a Commission might want to put this and then ask the neighborhood for permission. We have to get straight on that. What do you want to get out of the outreach? What are the goals of the outreach? Stakeholder buy-in seems really important.

Chair Hetterly: I don't know if stakeholder buy-in is a realistic goal, but we certainly would want to understand their concerns and do our best to mitigate them in whatever proposal we put forward.

Commissioner Crommie: That's well said. At the very least we need to do that. Whenever we do a park renovation, we usually try to have some notification to that neighborhood to get their ideas on a park renovation. It seems to me we should do the big outreach once we've decided on the place and get some feedback on that.

Chair Hetterly: Okay, thanks. Any other final comments? All right. Thank you, everybody, for your input.

5. **Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Facilities Master Plan.**

Chair Hetterly: This is a discussion, and we have a big packet and public comment. Peter, are you going to do a presentation or intro? We'll do comment after that.

Peter Jensen: Sure. Peter Jensen, Landscape Architect, City of Palo Alto. Good evening, Commissioners. As you can see by the package you got this week, the consultant, MIG, is now starting to produce a large amount of analysis data that they're giving to us to review. Staff is reviewing it and opening it up to the Parks and Rec Commission for review as well. There are multiple documents. The list includes a demographic analysis, the planning and environmental summary. Those two are the large-scale items of the package. An intercept group summary, notes taken from the stakeholder advisory group meeting held a few months ago, and the sustainability summary draft which is how that segment is going to be laid out and will be given to us for review. The end of the demographic analysis has some poignant questions that the consultant is going to try to answer. We'd like to open that to a discussion with the Commission. We don't have to resolve or answer all those today. This is going to be an ongoing conversation, but we can start delving into some of those things so we can prepare to give feedback to the consultant. If there are any other items that we want to discuss, we can do that. With that, we can get into that demographic analysis. On the final page of that, they start to lay out the conclusions and questions that they will review. We can have a discussion about that aspect of it. If you have questions about the other aspects of it, we can discuss that. I have a list from the consultant of a few things that they want to solidify. Those are the dates for the community meetings, so we can get that on the calendar. We can discuss that as well. Rob, do you have anything to add about the demographic analysis?

Rob de Geus: Yeah. There's also an inventory list in there. We'd like to get your reaction to that. If it's easy to read, is something missing, that type of thing. We talked about it and I talked to Chair Hetterly. It does seem like a discussion around the demographic analysis and those questions, whether they're the right questions or should there be other questions and how might the Commission have a collective response to those questions to support MIG's work. The planning environment document, they provide emphasis in certain areas and less emphasis in other areas. I was curious whether the Commission had an opinion about that, is it the right balance of emphasis. About the community meetings, do we have dates? The last week of October, October 28th and 29th, if we can find space in south Palo Alto and north Palo Alto for two meetings, one after the other. We're still trying to secure the space.

Mr. Jensen: I understand that this is quite a bit of information that you received. If this conversation continues to the next meeting or the meeting after that, that is perfectly fine as far as the feedback goes. If there are things in this that you spend time in the next

week or two looking through, then we can address those things in meetings coming up. This is a start of this analysis review and a vetting of whether they are asking the right questions or if there is anything missing from the analysis, so they can tackle those things as well.

Chair Hetterly: We have one member of the public who'd like to speak to this topic. Mark Weiss.

Mark Weiss: In my 3 minutes, Commissioner ...

Chair Hetterly: Yeah.

Mr. Weiss: ... Commissioner Chair, I'm going to use a new communications protocol called Bluf, B-L-U-F. I got this from Stanford grad, Rhodes Scholar, Hoover Fellow and former ambassador of the U.S. to Russia, Michael McFaul, M-C-F-A-U-L, who I also think of as a very rocking guy with a good ear. Bluf, he says, means bottom line up front. So my bottom line is a new park in Ventura on the Fry's property. I meant to say this at 7:00 but I was in another meeting. I think it fits here, because in your meeting summary from June 25, Item Number 4, careful use of small parks and places is important since the City is built out. Number 9, look at the distribution of the parks throughout the City and consider underserved neighborhoods. I believe I spoke about this topic to your Commission before and a couple of other places. If I quoted Kenneth Baker on Donald Judd, I'm going to use a little rock lyric. My shadow is the only one that walks beside me. My shallow heart's the only thing that's beating. Sometimes I wish someone out there will find me. 'Til then I walk alone. But I think there is community interest in this. It was consistent with the White Paper you guys issued about the Comp Plan and the per capita. What I find quite strange is that official documents seem to presuppose that Fry's, after meetings with Sobrato, is definitely in the Housing Element. It's definitely in the new Comp Plan as 200 housing units at 17.6 units per acre. Who makes these pre-decisions? People are getting pretty fed up with all these pre-decisions, especially from consultants. I did meet the consultants in the parks at the Cogswell Plaza concert series. I thought they were pretty decent. I'm curious how much we spent on them. For example, we spent \$1.7 million, \$1.7 million to review our Comp Plan. I thought Commissioners write Comp Plans. Part of this is directed at you. Part of this is just the general morass we're in. We have a real leadership crisis, with due respect, Rob and Daren and Mr. Jensen. We want a park in Ventura. Who cares how much Sobrato paid for the land?

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Let's open it up to questions and comments from Commissioners. Do you want to go with one document at a time? Start with the inventory. Commissioner Markevitch.

Commissioner Markevitch: On page 2 of the inventory, you left out a school. Addison is not on there. There's 17 schools. I had a question why the field ratings are mostly Es and Cs. Is it because of the heavy usage?

Mr. Jensen: I'd have to get feedback from the consultant about that. I would say, yes, that is what they're responding to.

Commissioner Markevitch: Thanks. That was it.

Chair Hetterly: Other Commissioners? Comments on the inventory? All right. I have a couple. Also on page 2 of the inventory, you have all the schools listed, but none of them are checked for use of gym space. I think we use Terman gym. We use all the middle school gyms for after school sports, which is a City program. So those should be checked for gym use. It would be handy to have some sort of indication of when public availability of the various school sites is for whatever uses the City uses them for. Does that make sense? Also, there are a lot of gaps. We don't have quality ratings for a lot of these. Is that something that's yet to come, this is the first round or is that because we couldn't make a quality determination?

Mr. Jensen: No, it is still to come.

Chair Hetterly: As far as missing things that I would love to see on an inventory, it would be nice to have not only the existing developed facilities but also any City-held easements or vacant City property that could be used. Obviously you couldn't check the boxes because it's not being currently used. That seems like an inventory category that would be nice to represent. Yes?

Commissioner Markevitch: With regard to the listing of the schools, we have a number of them that while the School District is not using them, they still own them. They're leased out, such as Garland, the one up in Los Altos Hills which Pinewood is using. I think there's four schools, four or five, that probably should be on this list but noted that they are not being used by PAUSD at this time. In the future they may, so it would be good to have them on this list.

Chair Hetterly: I don't know how you would do this, but I'm going to throw out the thing that I would like to do if some genius can figure it out. I would like the inventory to have some notation of neighborhoods that are underserved for parkland. We have the inventory here, but the map is the only geographic representation and there's no connection between the types of amenities that are available in a park. If I point to the map and see there's this big gap here where there's not a single park of size to show up on this map, I would like to know if that's true for recreation services as well so we can identify the areas where we're underserved for particular types of amenities.

Mr. Jensen: The consultant is working on that in a easy-to-view mapping software that looks at the access to parks. We've seen the preliminary plan of that. You can see distinct areas of the City where nothing overlaps. There is no color there for the axis. Being generated with their analysis now are those types of things that we will start to look at either at the next meeting or the meeting after that.

Chair Hetterly: The visual picture, you can pretty much figure that out. I would like to go a step further than that to be able to know that for any particular category of amenity, are there areas of town that are less well served than others in a significant way. We have tennis courts at Mitchell Park. We have tennis courts at Rinconada and we have tennis courts at Gunn and Terman, er, Cubberley, sorry. I don't know if we have tennis courts anywhere else in town. You'd be able to look at the inventory, but you wouldn't (crosstalk).

Commissioner Ashlund: Yes, Terman as well.

Chair Hetterly: I'm not being very clear about what I'm looking for here. I'll try to articulate better and send you an email.

Mr. Jensen: No, I think you're being clear on it. You're discussing specific amenities and then showing on a map who has access to them and who doesn't.

Chair Hetterly: Yeah, the who doesn't.

Mr. Jensen: As a way to determine if we need more of those amenities and the specific part of town where they would be at because they're not being served at this point.

Chair Hetterly: Yes. That's it for me. Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: I am a little bit concerned that there's not enough differentiation in this quality rating. I'm wondering can we ever get an A or B? The way this is set up, do we need to have no time restrictions to be A or B? I don't quite understand that. Aren't we always going to have time restrictions in this City with the number of athletes, number of teens, demand on the fields? I don't think that metric differentiates the fields well enough. It seems like it's an impediment. It just seems unattainable to me. You basically just cut off half of the range by having what seems like an unattainable goal.

Mr. de Geus: The lights in particular?

Commissioner Crommie: There's this thing about time restrictions. The only way you can get an A rating is to have high quality turf and few time restrictions. I can imagine that we'll have areas that have high quality turf with restrictions.

Mr. de Geus: That's true.

Commissioner Crommie: I think restrictions are inevitable. I don't quite know how time restrictions are defined.

Mr. de Geus: We'll talk to them about that. (inaudible) could be tightened up a little bit.

Commissioner Crommie: You can run into the same problem with bathrooms being a criteria. It looks like you can get an A rating if you don't have a bathroom. The bathroom, I think, is a bit misleading to put it in there at all maybe.

Vice Chair Lauing: Yeah. In some places we intentionally don't want to put bathrooms in. That's a good point.

Mr. de Geus: Yeah. It's interesting how it relates to our fields policy. The field policy, brokering policy that you helped draft also has a rating of fields. In that case we had things like proximity to homes and it was more related to how much we could broker that particular field given parking, bathrooms, proximity to homes.

Vice Chair Lauing: Maybe we can sync them a little bit more.

Mr. de Geus: What's that?

Vice Chair Lauing: Maybe we can sync them up a little bit more.

Mr. de Geus: Yeah, they ought to be synced up a little more.

Commissioner Crommie: A rating is useful, but it has to make sense to us.

Vice Chair Lauing: Any other comments on this document?

Commissioner Markevitch: It seems to me you're missing something on some of these fields, the ones that have tracks. Paly has a track. Jordan has a new track around its field. You might want to add that, because it's important.

Vice Chair Lauing: Yes?

Commissioner Ashlund: A couple of things on the inventory. The land acres column is all blank. I'm on the back page of the inventory. For the schools, the acres are not listed there. It would be nice to have that per school. Also the soccer field column, none of the elementary schools are checked off as having soccer fields, but I was under the impression they were used by the younger age groups in the leagues. The tennis court, it's marked at Paly and Gunn and Jordan and JLS. Terman isn't marked as having tennis courts, which it does have that are City courts. Only one of the schools is listed as having a pool; that's Gunn. Paly, Terman and JLS and Jordan all have pools that are used by the City. As Lacee told us, JLS is used in the summer. The play area column is all blank. I would assume that all the elementary schools would get one for having the play area available to the public not during school hours. I just don't understand the building column. I guess that means it's not available to the public, but I'm not really sure what that building column means for the schools. Ventura has it, is the only one marked.

Mr. de Geus: I think it relates to a community center. Is that what it would be?

Commissioner Ashlund: Yeah. It says Ventura Community Center building only and it has a one in the building column, but Ventura is also on the park list on the first page. I don't really know what that means. The schools are available for rent by Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts. That's unclear to me what that rental policy is to the public.

Mr. Jensen: That's under the School District. The Ventura Community Center is a facility controlled by the City, so we actually rent that out and not the schools.

Commissioner Ashlund: Yeah. What Chair Hetterly was saying, I wanted to add onto about having the tie-in with the map. Ideally what we'd have is a cross-referencing with the demographics, so we would have the numbers. The population per neighborhood for example, so when we're looking on the map we can say this is underserved because it's got a small park in terms of acreage and a large number in terms of residents or workers or however we count population in the demographics. Sometimes it could look like an underserved area on a map, but demographically it's not. It would be nice to see that in a chart. I think that's it. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Let's move on to the next document, the demographic analysis. Do we have any comments or questions about that? In that one, there's the body of the analysis and at the end are the policy questions that Rob referred to earlier, conclusions of policy questions. I think they're looking for input from us about whether those are the right questions, if others should be added. We can start to reflect on what they have here. This section will be part of an ongoing review by us as time allows in future meetings.

Vice Chair Lauing: I have a couple of questions.

Chair Hetterly: Yes, Commissioner Lauing.

Vice Chair Lauing: This is great and it really needs to be a core part and parcel of this study, because it says where things are going that we have to plan for. I'm intrigued that the school-age children are forecast to go down over time, which has some impact for things like fields. That's on K-12 at least. On page 4, I just wonder if there was a discrepancy here. It first says that there's preschool about 18 percent and school age 22 percent. That makes 40 percent. The next column said that childbearing people 18 to 44 are dropping. Who's having all these babies? Maybe it's just an overlay that we're not looking at here.

Chair Hetterly: Maybe they're moving in.

Vice Chair Lauing: They're moving in, okay. There's something that wasn't working in the math there. One question I didn't understand in the list of policy questions, the third one, should level of service standards for parks vary by neighborhood. The two dependencies that are listed are density and land use. I don't understand the question.

Commissioner Ashlund: What page are you on?

Vice Chair Lauing: Page 13. It's the third question down. What would be the density or land use that would require a different standard? I'm not objecting to it. I just don't understand the question.

Chair Hetterly: I didn't get that one either.

Mr. de Geus: I don't know the answer to that, but we will ask them about that. You guys want to hazard a guess?

Vice Chair Lauing: The first part starts to get me nervous about different standards for different communities.

Mr. de Geus: Yeah, me too.

Vice Chair Lauing: But then I don't know actually what it's referencing, because it's only referencing density and land use.

Chair Hetterly: Let's not speculate (crosstalk).

Mr. de Geus: We'll go back to them.

Vice Chair Lauing: Right. That's all I have.

Commissioner Knopper: To that point, maybe the bullet point below, how should fees and charges policies provide premium experiences for wealthier park users. I understand what they're trying to articulate; however, that language is very tricky. That question needs to be completely rewritten. It's a problem question.

Commissioner Markevitch: I agree. (inaudible)

Vice Chair Lauing: It's more like how do we provide and pay for services period.

Commissioner Knopper: That's right. Not based on income.

Commissioner Markevitch: (crosstalk) toward wealthier.

Commissioner Knopper: Right, right.

Chair Hetterly: Public services are exactly that. Commissioner Ashlund.

Commissioner Ashlund: I love demographics; I actually do. On page 4 under residents with disabilities, the last sentence of that paragraph says there's almost 1,100 students enrolled in the schools with special needs. I know that that percentage is around 10 percent. From the chart above at the top of that page, where it says school age for 2010 was 11,000. That would fit. My question is on the next page, page 6, under population disability status for under 18 years, it says Palo Alto has 2 percent. There's something funky going on there, because it should be closer to 10. I'm not sure how that 2 percent makes sense or if it was a typo or something.

Chair Hetterly: Any other questions or comments on this document? I have a couple. Same question I keep asking in different ways. I would like to know if there are area-specific spikes among the demographic user groups. For example, we know the senior population is growing. We know the kid population is growing. Are there parts of town where that's more acute than in other parts of town? The reason I ask is just to know whether we should be targeting specialized services to certain areas as opposed to across the whole City. That would go for seniors, for kids, for dogs if we know that kind of information, where are the dog owners. I liked on page 9 that it calls out the importance of recognizing diverse subgroups within the senior population, that different seniors have different needs. That's certainly been proven true with this latest generation of seniors in a way that a lot of cities haven't been prepared for. I'm glad to see that in here. Policy questions, most of these questions are good. I don't have any comments on those yet. Maybe that's something we need to think about more in the future. Other comments, questions on the demographic analysis? All right. Next one is the planning environment summary. Anybody want to start? Commissioner Markevitch.

Commissioner Markevitch: On page 2 under related plans and programs, it would be interesting to see if you can include the Airport Master Plan that was worked on about eight years ago. It is recreation for some people and it's out in the Baylands, so it'd make sense to include it.

Chair Hetterly: Any other comments, questions? I have a couple. Getting back to easements. I wonder if this planning summary is an appropriate place to include limitations or guidelines for how the City obtains or uses easements adjacent to public facilities. Also, on page 5, the third paragraph down, seventh line. It says spaces and access to these places via active transportation. It's talking about parks, trails and open spaces. I would like substantively to have inclusion of community centers and recreation facilities, not just parks and open spaces. That was a problem with some of the sections of the bike plan. It would be great in our document if we included all the relevant services.

Mr. Jensen: Tell me what page that is on.

Chair Hetterly: Page 5 under related plans and programs, the Bike and Pedestrian Transportation Plan. Fifth line down halfway through the line it says, "The parks and recreation plan will support this objective by considering the connectivity of parks, trails and open spaces and access to those places via active transportation." I want to include "as well as community centers and recreation facilities." I had a question on page 6. The second paragraph with all the bullets, last bullet. I didn't really understand what this was all about. Recognize the importance of courtyards, pedestrian alleys and public rights-of-way, streets for their contributions to the parks, trails and open space system through development of a policy. A policy to do what? That was not clear to me. Maybe it was just late at night. I don't have any other specific comments to make now. Overall I thought that this particular piece gave a nice big picture view of the planning environment and how the various documents overlap around parks and recreation interests and values. That's something that this Commission has spent a lot of time working on as long as I've been here. Trying to insert ourselves in other planning processes that we felt like had bearing on our interests. I'm happy to see somebody putting it all together, and I'm hoping we won't have to feel like we're crashing the party because other people will be thinking about it as well. It's a really great first step. Any other comments or questions or are we done?

Commissioner Crommie: I just had one under the guiding documents. Just a small point. Under the Comprehensive Plan, the second sentence says, "The Comprehensive Plan's community services and facilities land use map show an urban environment and transportation." Is there a section in the Comp Plan called natural and urban

environment? I've seen the one called natural environment. I was just a little bit confused by how that was named. Is it called the natural and urban environment?

Mr. de Geus: I don't think that's right. I know it was initially called the natural environment. It has changed. I'll have to go back and look. It's not urban, but it has changed.

Commissioner Crommie: The last time I looked at it, it was NEE, natural environment element which is a very important document that our Commission has had input on and it wasn't just lobbed in. It was on its own. Also, can we comment on this next month as well? I had trouble digesting all of this.

Chair Hetterly: Yes.

Commissioner Crommie: This is a very important document obviously. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Let's move on to the intercept survey summary draft.

Commissioner Ashlund: I'm sorry. Can I jump in with more on that?

Chair Hetterly: Yep.

Commissioner Ashlund: On page 11 under recreation programming. The first sentence talks about the diverse range of programs that are available to individuals of all ages. Can we add to that ages "and abilities"? We do have one, maybe more, that serves individuals specifically with disabilities. I don't know if you want to talk about things like Lacee talked to us about in our rec programs; the move towards inclusion. It's not separate programs but ages and abilities in an inclusive setting. It seemed to dangle without that mention. Thanks.

Chair Hetterly: Any comments on the intercept survey summary draft?

Commissioner Markevitch: I found it interesting that most of the surveys were done in the north. It looked to me like there was only two done in south Palo Alto if you have Oregon Expressway as the dividing line, Mitchell and California. The farmers market was probably in the north. Was it the north or was it the one on California Avenue?

Commissioner Crommie: Both.

Mr. Jensen: It was both actually.

Commissioner Markevitch: It seemed pretty loaded towards the north.

Commissioner Reckdahl: You see that in some of the results where they say, "Where are you from?" Forty-nine percent were from north Palo Alto and only 31 percent were from south Palo Alto.

Mr. Jensen: The intercept groups centered around events that were held in parks, Rinconada, the farmers market and Mitchell Park. It was not solely divided into north and south. It was predicated on where events were held.

Commissioner Crommie: Was Cogswell Plaza done twice? I wasn't aware of that.

Mr. Jensen: No, it was only done once.

Commissioner Crommie: I think it's listed twice in here.

Chair Hetterly: It is.

Commissioner Crommie: Yeah, it's listed as Numbers 3 and 4.

Commissioner Knopper: It's listed twice.

Chair Hetterly: Three and five.

Commissioner Crommie: I'm sorry, 3 and 5. I think we did do it on August 14th. I'm not sure about the earlier one.

Commissioner Knopper: May I? I think the one thing to keep in mind is that there were 200 participants. This was just qualitative, trying to get people participatory in the process, but it's such a low sample size. It's great anecdotally but it's completely not reliable in my opinion just from looking at research over the years. It's just too small a sample size. It's interesting and I liked looking at it. In the pie chart, looking at that 10 percent off-leash dog area, that's valuable to see, but such a small sampling.

Vice Chair Lauing: And you get community bias in the subgroups here. It wasn't probably a shock that the people at the farmers market really loved community gardens.

Commissioner Knopper: Right, exactly.

Vice Chair Lauing: That's not obscure; that's obvious so that'll be cut away. In the same graph, I was encouraged to get data on what we've been saying anecdotally, that we aren't sure that fields is such a big deal in terms of needs. At least with this small sample size, which I agree with you on, it ranked dead last in order of concern to folks.

Commissioner Ashlund: You said we targeted based on events. We added Mitchell Park because of the Twilight Concern there. At Rinconada Park, even though I was there I can't recall what the event was. Isn't soccer the biggest use of our fields? I don't know if that counts as an event. I would think we would need to do outreach in the south end of Palo Alto and also doing it at events like soccer that happen on a regular basis.

Mr. Jensen: The intercept groups are used as an overview to get a feeling of what the community feels are the main aspects of parks and recreation that the consultant should focus on. It's basically an overview to get a sense of the community and their feedback to specific questions. It is a small thing as far as the number of participants. The consultant understands that and they're using that as a general overview to get a sense of what the community wants. As they start to delve into these things, they'll have a general understanding of the feeling of the community. There is no set up for another intercept group, so we're done with those at this point.

Commissioner Ashlund: We've talked about it. With two farmers markets and two Cogswell Plazas, it's like didn't we go to the parks to get park feedback. Did we do that on purpose to go elsewhere and talk about the parks?

Mr. Jensen: The intercept groups are also meant to go into environments that can capture other feedback from groups that normally wouldn't be associated with being at the park for soccer or those types of things.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: The last thing you said was my concept of how the intercepts worked. They just got a population of people that might not be represented by a very organized stakeholders group. We know we have that with the field users, and we have it with a few other groups. This was to have this around input. Standing there, I was always a little bit surprised that people didn't speak up more on the fields. I was at three or four of these. It really was true; people were not commenting on that. As we held up those posters, we weren't capturing that group of people, but we can't say they don't exist. We all know that.

Chair Hetterly: Shall we move on to sustainability review summary and the stakeholder advisory group meeting summary? The first is an outline of what we can look forward to from the sustainability review. The other is a report back from the stakeholder meeting on the highlights of issues that were identified. Are there any questions or comments on either of these two?

Mr. de Geus: I did have just a comment. I did look up the Comprehensive Plan and the renaming of that particular element. I'm surprised because it was the natural environment. The new title in the draft, and we may have some comments about this, is the natural and urban environment and safety element which is odd. (crosstalk)

Commissioner Crommie: I have some concerns about that. Definitely. How do we address those concerns?

Mr. de Geus: We're going to review both of those elements in some detail over the fall and probably into the new calendar year as well. We'll have to take a close look at that and see if they're trying to put too much into that one element. It sounds like it. I'd have to have another look at it.

Vice Chair Lauing: The process question on the one that was the feedback from the stakeholders group, was every bullet point just a comment that someone made? There's no rank order here. If one person made the comment, it's on here. It didn't need to get two red dots or something in order to be included? It's just comments. Okay. Thanks.

Chair Hetterly: I had one comment on the sustainability review summary. It would be nice to have some description or some mention of an expectation that the habitat impacts of transitions to more sustainable practices will be evaluated or considered. That's it for me. Any other comments? That's a wrap.

Commissioner Markevitch: I have a question before the two of you gentlemen leave. I had made a note on my agenda. October 28th and 29th, which one of you mentioned those dates?

Mr. de Geus: They're tentative dates for the community meetings, one in south Palo Alto and one in north Palo Alto.

Commissioner Markevitch: For?

Mr. de Geus: The Parks Master Plan.

Commissioner Markevitch: The 28th, we have a Commission meeting.

Mr. de Geus: I know. We're going to talk about that at the end of the agenda.

Commissioner Markevitch: Thank you.

Mr. Jensen: The Mapita survey summary, the geographic analysis, those site plans that we talked about, and a needs analysis are the next things that will be coming from the

consultants. That'll be probably in the next package of items. When you have this further conversation about the meeting next month and establishing when those community workshops are, I will be sending you that information. The consultant would like your help in getting out the word for those meetings and trying to get a good community turnout. I'll be sending you more information about that. They did ask me to highlight that we will need your help in advertising those things.

Mr. de Geus: The Commission's curious about the survey and the development of the survey and when the survey's going out. I did talk to the consultant again today as Peter did last week. They'd like to have these community workshops first to inform the survey they put together. They've learned that through doing many of these plans. It does cause a bit of a time crunch. If the workshops are at the end of October, we really want to be doing these surveys in November. The turnaround time after the workshops to develop the surveys is going to be fairly tight. We may need to talk about that. I don't know if that will require a special meeting.

Chair Hetterly: Surely some initial work can be done on the surveys in advance of the community outreach that is then supplemented by what is learned during those community meetings.

Mr. de Geus: I mentioned that, and we'll see if we can get that going.

Chair Hetterly: There's Thanksgiving and Christmas. If we don't get that survey out at the beginning of November at the latest, we're not going to get anything back.

Mr. de Geus: We're concerned about the timing of the survey too.

Commissioner Ashlund: Commissioner Crommie and I, I think we're the ad hoc for that survey work, so we need to follow up on that anyway.

6. Plan for the November Joint Commission/Council Study Session.

Chair Hetterly: Maybe you can confirm for me, Rob, is it November ...

Rob de Geus: November 10th.

Chair Hetterly: I thought it was the 11th. November 10th. I would love any input, suggestions from the Commission on what you would like to cover at that joint session and if there's any particular format that you'd like, new or different or the same as what we've done in the past. Commissioner Knopper.

Commissioner Knopper: I have never been to one. If you could give me a 60-second version of what this looks like, so I can contribute comments that are productive.

Chair Hetterly: The last couple of years, we have prepared in advance a laundry list of things we thought were important work on the horizon or that had just completed for the Commission. Mostly the looking forward work, we wanted their reaction to. Is this an avenue that you'd like us to pursue or wouldn't like us to pursue? Do you have any significant concerns in this area or that area that we should keep in mind? Last year, we did dog parks, the 10 acres at the golf course, Foothills Park.

Commissioner Crommie: Did we do Cubberley?

Chair Hetterly: We did Cubberley maybe—no, we didn't do the 7.7 acres.

Commissioner Crommie: No, no, we didn't do that one. We did the golf course.

Vice Chair Lauing: We picked a few things that are up and coming that we thought might be important. A couple of those were our own initiatives. They always like to hear about new stuff in advance of finally seeing it in their packet six months from now.

Commissioner Markevitch: For example, this one we could easily talk about the Baylands Master Plan, the Comp Plan, 7.7 acres. That would take up the whole space right there.

Vice Chair Lauing: I don't think we want to talk about the 7.7 acres, because I don't think in three weeks we're going to be ready for that one.

Commissioner Markevitch: You can mention it as a "we are working on this," just to reassure them that it's ...

Chair Hetterly: Manage their expectations perhaps.

Commissioner Knopper: By then we will have had a public meeting. We're having a public meeting in October, so we'll have some preliminary information. Just to mention it because it is top of mind for several of the Council people, three specifically. The off-leash dog pilot is well fleshed out.

Chair Hetterly: For the Master Plan, I think we went around and around on this the last time we talked about it when we were trying to do it in August. What do you all have in mind for what we would talk about in the Master Plan? Reacting to the data that's starting to come in? They're going to get a report in October or November from the consultant, is that true still? They had asked for one.

Peter Jensen: Yes. It's a written report in November.

Chair Hetterly: So the consultant's not going to talk to them?

Mr. Jensen: They're going to summarize the information and analysis they're doing now. There really is nothing as far as the consultants making recommendations to solicit feedback from the Council. It's just to give them an update of the process and what has been going on to date. There's really not going to be any information to share with them until the first of the year.

Chair Hetterly: They're not going to get this information that we discussed tonight?

Mr. Jensen: We can provide that to them in their packet. I can talk about that with the consultant. No, not at this point.

Chair Hetterly: Let's talk about that later this week.

Vice Chair Lauing: I don't think we want to get too far ahead of the consultants with the Council on that one.

Chair Hetterly: I agree.

Vice Chair Lauing: If we took 7.7 acres and dog parks and said, "Here's two things that we've been working on, one of which we forecast last year and here's the status of it. This is preliminary because we haven't done public outreach." That's going to take up the 50 minutes that we get. Because both of those are so meaty, we probably wouldn't want to tackle more than those two. If we're going to use that format. If we want to blast it through and say, "Here's six things and we want to give you a 2-minute version of each." That's a different format, but that seems a little shallow.

Chair Hetterly: We have talked about dog parks with them. Last year and possibly the year before that.

Commissioner Crommie: Not shared use. Shared use is new.

Vice Chair Lauing: Right. The shared use, we briefed the Mayor and the Vice Mayor on that before that meeting and then said we're going to do it. Now we're going to have a status. It's a bit further along and it's going out to the public. That's why I think it's timely to spend some time on that. Maybe not exclusively.

Commissioner Ashlund: At the joint session last year, I recall the Council Members expressing dismay that they were so uninvolved in the Master Plan. Was that the last?

Chair Hetterly: That was different. That was a subsequent meeting when we had that joint meeting about the Master Plan.

Commissioner Ashlund: That was a separate meeting. Okay.

Commissioner Crommie: I kind of agree. Don't you think we should touch on the Master Plan, some part of it?

Chair Hetterly: What would we say?

Commissioner Markevitch: (inaudible) it's moving forward.

Commissioner Knopper: They know it's happening.

Vice Chair Lauing: We're mostly just commenting on the documents from the consultant.

Commissioner Knopper: It's so preliminary, what's come in thus far. If we say something that changes, that would be problematic.

Commissioner Crommie: Should we go over the calendar of the Master Plan with them at all ...

Commissioner Knopper: No.

Commissioner Crommie: ... so they know what's coming? Tell them when we're ..

Chair Hetterly: It sounds like that's what the consultant is going to do at the Council meeting when they make their report.

Mr. de Geus: I don't know how much discussion there would be on the Master Plan. I do think it's important to bring it up and mention how much time the Commission is working on this with various ad hoc committees and reviewing the reports. By that time, we'll have had two community workshops which you'll participate in.

Chair Hetterly: We could do an update.

Commissioner Crommie: Yeah, just an update.

2422 Chair Hetterly: This is our work vis-a-vis the process.

2423
2424 Vice Chair Lauing: Do you mean pick out six or eight things that we're working on and
2425 then go into two of them? That kind of approach?

2426
2427 Chair Hetterly: On the Master Plan?

2428
2429 Vice Chair Lauing: No, in general. Say, "We're working on the Master Plan, 7.7 acres,
2430 dogs, this and that. Two things we want to talk with you tonight about are A and B
2431 because that's all we have time for. They're interesting because of how we've moved
2432 forward on them."

2433
2434 Commissioner Crommie: That's a great idea.

2435
2436 Chair Hetterly: That sounds good.

2437
2438 Vice Chair Lauing: I would say one of those two things is not the Master Plan.

2439
2440 Chair Hetterly: Right.

2441
2442 Vice Chair Lauing: I wouldn't vote for that.

2443
2444 Chair Hetterly: Any other votes for what those two things ought to be? We have 7.7
2445 acres and dog parks on the table so far.

2446
2447 Commissioner Reckdahl: The golf course is a big issue, but I don't think we want to go
2448 into that because we don't have any information.

2449
2450 Vice Chair Lauing: They've already voted. They've done all they can on that.

2451
2452 Commissioner Reckdahl: The 7.7 acres and the dog parks are things we could talk about
2453 and inform them. They aren't the biggest issues we're dealing with. They're just two
2454 things that we can talk about.

2455
2456 Vice Chair Lauing: Thinking a little bit more broadly and more risk taking, we could
2457 with some help from staff put together a plea for more resources for parks starting with
2458 staffing. I think you said you were talking to one Council Member and said, "We're not
2459 going to get to all these things that are on the CIP list." The answer was, "Why not?"
2460 The answer back is, "Because we don't have staff to do it." There was a bit of surprise
2461 there as I understand it. Maybe they need to realize that this does take man and woman
2462 power to get it done. If there's a way we could do that, that could be helpful to the
2463 overall cause.

Commissioner Crommie: I would second that.

Daren Anderson: For what it's worth, that's something I had talked about with Ryan from MIG. If after analyzing the entire park system and privy to our capital budget, our operating budget, our staffing and everything, if there was any way the plan could address that very issue much like our Trail Master Plan for Arastradero had. It had commented specifically saying, "You should have x number more rangers to deal with this." Council didn't choose to act on it. It adds a lot of value having it tied to a community vetted, Commission vetted, and a Council approved plan and then strengthened perhaps from a memo or endorsement from Commission concurrent with that plan.

Mr. Jensen: This is already being set up in the environmental summary. There is a section that talks about the increased population and our limited size and the parks that we have now. More people are going to be using those parks, so it's going to take more maintenance and more money to keep them in the shape that they are now. It's not just the capital improvement projects that we're working on, but also it takes a chunk of money to keep those parks properly maintained.

Mr. de Geus: As much as I believe we do need some additional resources to keep up and meet standards, I'm not sure that a study session is the right forum for making the plea for additional resources. The Master Plan, if tied into that, is a good thing. We have a budget process that we go through. During that period, the Commission could weigh in. It's make more sense than a study session. That's just my instinctual reaction.

Chair Hetterly: There's not usually a mechanism for us to weigh in on the budget process. Maybe you can help us find a way.

Mr. de Geus: Yeah.

Commissioner Crommie: Byxbee Park, I'd like that to be on the list at least for consideration.

Chair Hetterly: That's a discussion we just had.

Commissioner Crommie: Could that be one of the topics we'd talk about at the joint session?

Chair Hetterly: Yeah. I'm wondering what about Byxbee Park do you want to talk about.

Commissioner Crommie: Yes, just the plans about opening Section 2C, Phase 2C. It's a high profile topic with the bridge going up. We're increasing access to Byxbee, and it relates to this idea of connectivity. It seems we might be a bit remiss not to talk about it. It'd be on that list of things we're doing.

Commissioner Knopper: Maybe that's an opportunity to talk about the resources needed to do it right, just looping back to the conversation that we just had with regard to the increased maintenance and planting of it.

Commissioner Markevitch: Rob said that wasn't appropriate here.

Commissioner Knopper: I know, but just in the context of Byxbee Park. The importance of thinking about the resources needed to implement it properly.

Commissioner Crommie: It's an example of us creating new parkland. It's already been dedicated, but it hasn't been opened to the public for this long time. This is huge that it's an increased public park use area.

Commissioner Knopper: It takes a lot of resources.

Commissioner Crommie: It takes extra resources. It's really our biggest example of opening up some acreage.

Vice Chair Lauing: Maybe that could be one of the preliminary things before we get into the couple of topics. It could just be a comment that we are adding new parkland with Byxbee, and we have renovations on the boards and we can't do much of that at all unless we have resources to do the implementation and maintenance on an ongoing basis. By definition, just so you know, Council, when you approve these things, the maintenance budget and staffing, etc., has to go up. At least that's our view.

Commissioner Crommie: It also ties into how much of that park improvement budget we used on El Camino Park. To remind them about that. It's a powerful statistic to use.

Vice Chair Lauing: Yeah, we got that in our last memo that's going out to Council. We referenced that on the notes relative to growth.

Commissioner Ashlund: I thought we wanted to present briefly this is what we've done over the past year and give a good chunk of time for them to air their thoughts about what they want us to look into going forward.

Vice Chair Lauing: That's an approach. I don't think it's a required approach.

Commissioner Ashlund: Since I've done this a couple of times, I thought that's what we wanted out of it. That's really up to you.

Chair Hetterly: We always give them a look-back list of this is what we've done over the last year. In some years we've just talked about the things on the list and was everybody happy with what we'd done. In recent years, we've tried to make it a more productive discussion to focus on issues where they may have some thoughts.

Mr. de Geus: It's good that the Commission takes the lead in putting a frame around the discussion. The Council doesn't have a pre-session to talk among themselves about what they should tell the Parks and Recreation Commission to work on. It would be really helpful in some ways. What happens sometimes at these study sessions is you get nine different directions. It's hard to find consensus sometimes. If the Commission frames the discussion, it can be helpful.

Vice Chair Lauing: To further answer your original question, sometimes Council walks in from another session and sits down and goes, "What are we going to do now?" They're expecting us to lead it, because this is just another agenda item, which I say with complete respect. We need to help them with that.

Commissioner Crommie: I'd also add on our list community gardens even though Stacey and I have some work we're going to do this month. I'd like that on the list of what we're actively doing even though we haven't been as active as we had hoped.

Chair Hetterly: If folks have other ideas of things you want to be sure are on the list, you can send them to me or to Rob. Otherwise, we'll put together a list and bring it back next month to have a final talk. See who wants to do what next month.

7. Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates.

i. Foothills Park 7.7 acres.

Commissioner Markevitch: We went up to Foothills Park, Daren and Abbie and myself, to visit the Acterra nursery and to see what they're doing up there. We were brainstorming with them on various issues of the 7.7 acres. What came out of that was this public meeting that you're now looking at. We want people to come up and look at the parcel and give us their ideas and get as much outreach from that meeting as we can. Did you have anything to add to that?

Commissioner Knopper: Yeah. The most important thing that we discussed was that we wanted people to have a framework of what is realistic and what isn't realistic based on the existing confines of the actual 7.7 acres. Daren put a fact list together which he passed out, and he can talk about it in a moment if he'd like. There's 2.1 acres that are

usable. The rest are not for various reasons, all of which are bullet pointed. One of the things we talked about with Acterra was that people don't know what's going on behind the gate. There's a lot of speculation and far-fetched ideas that are coming in. We all decided that having people tour it and the Acterra people set up times when their volunteers are there to take people through for a short period so people can get a feel of what it looks like. We are planning on having a public meeting on Saturday, October 18th. That's a typo. At 10:00 a.m. People who want to come can also tour at 9:00 a.m. before the meeting. That's a great opportunity for us to hear what everybody's saying. Hopefully people will take advantage of the open hours with the rangers and the Acterra staff.

Chair Hetterly: I have a comment. It's a great idea to do this. My only hesitation is that this should not be an advertisement for Acterra continuing in that spot exclusively. You want to make sure that you're inviting people to give their thoughts on other ideas. If they go for a tour and the only people they come into contact with are the Acterra people who are rightfully big on their project, it's not a balanced perspective and it doesn't welcome input on other ideas. I want to make sure that's part of the plan.

Commissioner Knopper: Yep, understandable. There are park ranger tours. It's just that they happen to be there and we want to open up as many days and times as possible. But absolutely noted. That's a valid point.

Commissioner Crommie: I want to second that.

Mr. Anderson: My intention is to have a—I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Commissioner Crommie: I have that same concern. I was wondering if we could get a couple of other stakeholders up there.

Commissioner Knopper: They're not going to be the tour guides, so what stakeholder?

Commissioner Crommie: We have Audubon.

Commissioner Knopper: Audubon has their opinion just like Acterra has their opinion. They don't have access to that land openly right now.

Mr. Anderson: If I can address this. I'm sensitive to the same issue. We thought the same thing. We didn't want a spiel to come from Acterra. This is an opportunity for someone to walk in there and look around and see what's there. How can I envision what will happen? The fact sheet is really the talking points. It will be explained to Acterra, you can answer any questions they ask, just like our staff will. However, this is not the time to make the plea of the importance of the nursery and to give them a full spiel.

Please stick to the fact sheet and you can answer questions if they want. We're also looking at the possibility of some staff being present, though not for the entire time window. They've got 11:00 to 3:00 p.m. on some of their workdays. I can't have a staff person for all of that. I could have a staff person stop by on different days and see how that's going, to make sure that it is unbiased.

Commissioner Crommie: I was just wondering if we should eliminate Acterra staff and just have the ranger give the tour in that area.

Commissioner Knopper: Then we would have to have much more limited access. Daren, this is your purview. He doesn't have the staff hours to dedicate that much time. Acterra is already there, so they can easily say, "There you go."

Chair Hetterly: You're saying they're going to be scripted.

Mr. Anderson: My intent was, this is still draft, to send this to Acterra and say, "This is our game plan. This is what we'd like to do. Here's the rules of the agreement. I don't want you giving a spiel. You're there to essentially escort them in." I don't want them randomly cruising around because we don't have fences around the adjacent landowners' homes. It's not like walk in and help yourself. I need somebody with these people. Acterra is there and it made sense. It's just making sure that they're on page with us. This is our talking points. Here are the constraints. Please look at the site and figure out for yourself what you could envision being here.

Commissioner Knopper: If you guys feel strongly though, we can remove those dates and options and just have specific ranger times. Daren has laid out four days, this weekend and the following weekend. If you feel strongly about it. To Daren's point, there are no fences. You can't let the general public wander onto private land. It's a little tricky up there.

Commissioner Crommie: (inaudible) for the tours. It's good to have it organized.

Commissioner Markevitch: I'm also concerned that we don't want people coming in there when Acterra's not there and they're going through the greenhouse and messing around with the nursery. That needs to be off limits.

Chair Hetterly: That's what the ranger's there for on the other days, right?

Commissioner Markevitch: Right. It's tricky.

Commissioner Ashlund: I know it's limited and I wish we could do more. It makes sense to do ranger-led tours and keep it as newly dedicated parkland. On the last bullet on the

fact sheet, Daren, could we add when the lease is set to expire? It mentions that Acterra has a lease.

Mr. Anderson: Yes.

Chair Hetterly: 2015, it says.

Commissioner Ashlund: It does. Thank you.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Also in that last bullet, for another five-year period, we could delete those last five words because that is meaningless. If Acterra and the City agreed to do it for three years or two years or whatever period they want, it wouldn't necessarily have to be five years.

Mr. Anderson: It's called out in the existing lease. That you may opt into an additional five years. That's the language in the existing lease.

Chair Hetterly: Otherwise, you have to renegotiate the details of the lease, or you could renegotiate the details of the lease.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Either case, both sides have to agree. What's the difference if both sides agree to continue the current lease for another five years or both sides will do the same lease but change it to three years?

Commissioner Knopper: This is just a fact sheet for what is currently happening. There's a current lease with that language. Based on these tour dates, nothing can be renegotiated prior to that. That language has to stay as it is whether the City and Acterra come to some sort of agreement at a later point and say, "While we're figuring things out, we'll give you another two years." That's a completely different conversation.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I don't see the distinction, but it's fine.

Commissioner Crommie: The issue I have with this last bullet point is it's not completely accurate. My understanding is that the reason that Acterra got permission to put their garden there is that they were going to do some rehabilitation of that very location. They never did that. That's a sore point with some people. I feel like all this description bolsters Acterra which is obviously a fabulous organization that does all kinds of things. To me it's this issue of accountability that I'm concerned about. I think we're saying too much there. We should shorten this bullet point and get to the bottom line that they have a lease where they've set up a garden. This is going to expire such-and-such date but can be renegotiated. That's what I feel most comfortable with.

Commissioner Markevitch: Are you saying take out the second sentence?

Commissioner Crommie: Yeah, maybe that's good. Maybe the second and third sentences.

Chair Hetterly: I have another suggestion. It would be great if you could have comment cards and a box available right at the gate where you come in and go out. After people take their tour, on their way out they can write a note saying, "This is what I think we should do with the 7.7 acres."

Commissioner Crommie: Just make sure that on the tours you don't list the date of the public meeting. It's a little bit confusing right now. To really highlight that we hope people are going to attend this public meeting. I wonder if you can say something like, "For your own edification, prior to the meeting please consider these tours." To really have the thrust of this be please come to this public meeting.

Chair Hetterly: Let's move on.

Mr. Anderson: Can I just clarify? Was that then a recommendation to remove the Acterra tours? Is that what I understood?

Commissioner Markevitch: Yep.

Commissioner Crommie: But allow the rangers to go to the Acterra space.

Commissioner Knopper: Saturday, Sunday, September 27 and 28, October 4 and 5 at 1:00 and October 18th, the day of the actual public meeting, at 9:00 a.m. That's it.

Mr. Anderson: Mm-hmm. I'll confer with the ad hoc committee tomorrow and then (inaudible).

Commissioner Ashlund: When we toured this property, I think there were workers or equipment or something still on that land. Can something about that be added to the fact sheet of what the status of that is?

Mr. Anderson: I think there was a giant mulch pile and there was some equipment. It's long since been removed. It was the caretaker's equipment.

Commissioner Markevitch: (inaudible)

Mr. Anderson: Yeah.

Commissioner Knopper: The purpose of these facts is that when people come to the public meeting, they understand the framework of what is possible and what isn't possible. If somebody comes and says, "I want a trail that goes all the way through." It's not possible based on the realities of the geography. That's the reason that we have facts that they'll be getting during their tours.

Chair Hetterly: This is a great first start. I'm really glad you guys have gotten together and worked out a next step. I think you have everybody's comments, so you can integrate them as you see fit as the ad hoc. We do have one public comment from Herb Borock. Let's take a couple of minutes to do that.

Herb Borock: Thank you, Chair Hetterly. Good evening, Commissioners. I was just next door at the Policy and Services Committee meeting, where they were talking about early distribution of agenda packets for the City Council meeting. Given the short time I had to speak, I didn't get to mention how under the current system, there's always late minutes, staff additions of pieces of paper just as we have right now. I don't have a copy of the fact sheet in front of me. I think to be having a tour that's coming just this weekend, how are people going to find out about it and schedule your notice? Is this also the Mitchell Park tour date, the library, on September 27th? I think it would be better to have the schedule perhaps pushed further so that there's actual public input both on seeing the document that you've just been talking about, an opportunity for people to speak to it. Even if I just got it right now, I wouldn't have opportunity to digest it and to speak about it. If it's just something between the subcommittee and staff, I don't think that's the appropriate way about doing this. That's really the Commission's purview as a whole and to be done in adequate time with public notice to give you input for your recommendations and any decisions that you make. Also, I'm not sure that the Council or the staff even at this point know the entire history of the parcel and what restrictions or possibilities are available, since it took them so long to get to the point to take the action that they've done. For those of you have read the grand jury report on this issue, you may be aware of it. Thank you. That's all I have to say.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. All right. Let's move on to ...

Commissioner Crommie: I want to just say I actually agree with what he said. This is going pretty fast. Is there a possibility to move this out by one week?

Commissioner Markevitch: Yeah.

Chair Hetterly: I think we did that by eliminating the Acterra staff. (crosstalk)

Commissioner Knopper: I just made a note that maybe the ranger tours, if it's suitable for your staff and we can certainly address this tomorrow. October 4th and 5th and then 10th

and 11th, leading into the following weekend. Just to give time for the public to understand that there will be these ranger tours if you want to participate.

Commissioner Crommie: What's our process for posting this?

Mr. Anderson: We'll be following that new policy that I shared with you at the last meeting. I've already started the email distribution list. This will be the first document that gets shared via that. Of course, all the Commission Members will be on that list. It's still in its infancy, so I'll probably add a comment, please share this with other stakeholders. They can reach back to me and be added to that list ongoing. Of course we'll follow every other procedure listed on that.

Commissioner Crommie: So we can click and see what the stakeholder list is?

Mr. Anderson: My intent is not to have all the names visible. I was going to follow the model that's typically done; you can't reply all so you wouldn't be seeing everybody. It would typically be in the blind category. You'd see probably my name. I know there are pros and cons of both, but I want to be respectful of everybody who's on that list. Some of these are personal emails and work emails.

Commissioner Crommie: At least with the ad hoc committee, maybe they can review that.

Mr. Anderson: Sure, yes.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you very much, Peter and Daren.

V. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Peter Jensen: I have an announcement.

Chair Hetterly: Yes, please.

Mr. Jensen: The last Tuesday of each month while the Magical Bridge is being constructed is the opportunity for the public to come out at 10:00 a.m. and see the status of the construction site. I'm putting that out there to you as well. If you would like to come and see what the Magical Bridge looks like next Tuesday at 10:00 a.m., you are all invited to do so. I can't say there's a lot out there to look at. It's a big pile of dirt and a bunch of trenches. They're starting to build walls, so there is a little form. It is a good start to look at it. If you came a month after, the playground is going to start to come into form. I extend that invitation to you.

Chair Hetterly: Thanks. Do you have any other announcements?

Rob de Geus: Just a couple of quick ones. We've got the Come Together event this Saturday. There's been a lot of talk about it. This is the sneak preview of the Mitchell Park Community Center, which is something you have to sign up for. It's filled up really fast. There's a concert in Bol Park right after that, celebrating the Beatles' British Invasion. We are moving into the Mitchell Park Community Center in the month of October. I mentioned that earlier. I wanted to thank the Commissioners that were able to come to the recognition event at Foothills Park. Those that couldn't be there, that's why you got that bag and proclamation. The memo about the Comp Plan was in the Council packet last night. They've received the memo. I wanted to be sure to report that to you all. Thank you.

Vice Chair Lauing: While you've got the floor, you're not going to mention something about the golf course?

Mr. de Geus: I was here at this time last night talking to the Council about the golf course. I think I've emailed this out before. It was intended to go on September 8th, the recommendation to reject all the bids and rebid the project later hopefully this fall once the permits are in hand. There's no certainty around the permits at this point. Very frustrating for everyone. We went back to the Council and discussed that and asked for a budget amendment to continue to operate the golf course until the end of February 2015 with the hopes that we can start construction in March 2015. That's the status.

Vice Chair Lauing: As long as you have the floor, any status on El Camino Park?

Mr. de Geus: Daren Anderson would be better to respond to that.

Vice Chair Lauing: Do we have any new information on an opening date for El Camino Park?

Mr. de Geus: I don't think we do at this point. What is the expected timeline?

Vice Chair Lauing: What's the bottleneck? Remind us. I think you mentioned this previously.

Daren Anderson: It hasn't changed. The timeframe is still as of that last email I sent out to the Commission. I don't have it in front of me, but I'd be happy to send it again. What we're currently working on is submitting the building permit. It just got submitted the other day. This isn't holding up the project yet, but what we're struggling with is getting the right kind of in-fill. San Francisco got sued for the type of in-fill they used on their synthetic turf. Right now they're having this debate of finding what kind of product you

can use. Again this is the rubber pellets. Rubber pellets are the kind of thing now that's not getting approved. It's the kind of thing that people are getting sued over for environmental reasons. We've got a number of different products, but we have to test them. In order to amend the EIR, you've got to submit these products that we're proposing have been tested. We're paying an outside consultant to test three or four different in-fill types. I think we can get this all in without changing the date that we're going to end up going through construction and everything else. Everything else should be status quo as of the last update that I provided the Commission.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I have a follow-up question about that. There is some hope that we would have the El Camino Park in place before we start ripping up the turf at Mayfield. Is that going to be worked or are we going to be down to one turf field?

Mr. Anderson: No. The answer is no, we won't have El Camino done before then. We're hoping to have Stanford-Palo Alto under construction come January and February. It'd be really quick on that. However, that's going to be subject to the same in-fill criteria. The work we're doing right now for El Camino will eventually help with the Stanford-Palo Alto turf replacement as well, and Cubberley a few years later. We're looking for the best we can get now.

Commissioner Reckdahl: We're starting to rip the turf up in Mayfield in February?

Mr. Anderson: January or February is the tentative date right now.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The whole process is a few weeks or how long does it take?

Mr. Anderson: We'd be probably looking at no longer than 45 days.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you.

Commissioner Knopper: Just a really quick announcement. I attended the working group for opening day of Mitchell Park Library. It's still going to happen December 6. They're in desperate need for volunteers. The day of the event they're anticipating 5,000 people. That's what they're planning against, and they need at least 60 volunteers. If you would like to volunteer or if you know people that would like to volunteer or high schools students that need service hours, the woman to email is Emily.Lacroix@cityofpaloalto.org. The rentals start I think this week ...

Mr. de Geus: Monday, September 22nd. That's right.

Commissioner Knopper: People as of this week can sign up for rentals for the community center rooms starting January 15th. They're taking rental reservations which

is great. We can also do a Commission meeting there, they said, if we would like at some point.

Chair Hetterly: We should. That's a good idea. Any other comments or announcements?

VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR OCTOBER 28, 2014 MEETING

Chair Hetterly: Does anyone have something for the agenda for the next meeting?

Commissioner Markevitch: The review list for the joint session.

Commissioner Crommie: One of the meetings, I'd like to meet the sustainability czar. Any time it's convenient.

Rob de Geus: I did speak to him. It relates to the timing of our meeting. It's planned for October 28th, but the current thinking is the community workshops will occur on the 28th and 29th. Chair Hetterly and I talked and thought maybe we could move our meeting up one week and meet on the 21st of October if the Commission is available. Gil, I don't remember his last name at the moment, our sustainability manager, is available on the 21st to come speak to the Commission. He's not available on the 28th as it turns out.

Commissioner Markevitch: Did we move the November meeting?

Chair Hetterly: We have not touched November or December.

Commissioner Markevitch: That's Thanksgiving week.

Chair Hetterly: Yeah, yeah.

Mr. de Geus: Have to move that one up too.

Commissioner Crommie: There's a slight chance I might be out of town on the 21st, but I won't know for another week. I'm going to be flying in from Seattle, and I just don't know when I will book my flight. I could try to get back in time. I'm just not sure.

Chair Hetterly: Do we have a quorum that thinks they can do it on the 21st? I can do it.

Vice Chair Lauing: Yeah.

Chair Hetterly: That's three. You don't know

Commissioner Markevitch: (inaudible)

Chair Hetterly: October.

Commissioner Markevitch: I'll let you know because (inaudible).

Mr. de Geus: We've still got to find a location for the community meetings, and they were having a bit of trouble with that. I can poll the Commission via email, since several of you have to check your calendars.

Chair Hetterly: What's that?

Mr. de Geus: I can poll the Commission by email since it looks like several people need to ...

Chair Hetterly: Let's do that. We'll tentatively reschedule to the 21st.

Commissioner Markevitch: November (inaudible).

Chair Hetterly: Hang on. We'll confirm by the end of the week.

Mr. de Geus: Correct.

Chair Hetterly: For the next meeting on October 21st. For November and December, we have a Thanksgiving and winter holiday problem. Abbie suggested earlier something we've done in the past when we have a joint Council session in that same time. Since we have one on November 10th, maybe we skip our November Commission meeting and have an early December Commission meeting. That's a possibility.

Commissioner Markevitch: That sounds great.

Chair Hetterly: That's something everybody loves. I don't know what our agenda's going to be like at that point. If we do that, then we're going to want to have our Comp Plan ad hocs finalize their work before that early December meeting and have our final discussion about it to figure out what we want to send forward to Council, if anything, on the two elements of the Comp Plan. Are you with me?

Commissioner Markevitch: Yeah.

Vice Chair Lauing: Yeah.

Chair Hetterly: Last month we set up two ad hocs to look at the specifics of the Comp Plan elements. If we want to weigh in with Council, we want to be able to do that before

the end of the year. If we're going to condense those last meetings of the year, then we have to make sure we're moving along on those.

Commissioner Markevitch: You need to email us a reminder.

Chair Hetterly: Maybe you can poll people on what's a good date in December. I would say shoot for the first week.

Vice Chair Lauing: Oh, really? That early?

Chair Hetterly: Or the second week.

Commissioner Knopper: (inaudible)

Chair Hetterly: Those two weeks are off, right?

Vice Chair Lauing: Oh, really? It's either 2 or 9 or 16.

Chair Hetterly: I guess 9 seems sensible since we're meeting on November 10th. It doesn't really matter to me which date we do. You're going to poll everybody.

Commissioner Crommie: It's nice to have a full month at some point. I don't want to move up and then move up yet another week. It'd be nice to get a full four weeks in one of the months.

Chair Hetterly: Does anybody want to adjourn?

Commissioner Reckdahl: I have one more thing for October. I'm still concerned about fire up in Foothills. Could we get the Fire Department to come in and talk about their fire mitigation activities up there?

Vice Chair Lauing: That's a good idea.

Commissioner Crommie: Did we finish agenda planning? Did we cover everything?

Chair Hetterly: Did you have something else to add?

Commissioner Crommie: It seems like we morphed into the date before we talked about the agenda. What is on our agenda?

Chair Hetterly: I have Master Plan, joint planning session, review the list, come up with a strategy for our presentation. Byxbee Park might come back to us with the PIO. Sustainability czar, fire mitigation at Foothills.

Commissioner Markevitch: That's good.

Chair Hetterly: Ad hoc updates. Are gardens going to have an agenda item? The 7.7 acres discussion we had tonight, that kind of discussion should be an agenda item and not just an update. If you feel like you're going to want that level of discussion, then we need to try to bump it up just for public info. I know it's something you can't always anticipate, how much discussion is going to be stimulated by an update. If you have something substantive to report, maybe let's just default to put it on the discussion calendar. The packet goes out early, so you have to let me know if you're going to have something for the agenda. That's it.

Commissioner Knopper: Why don't you put the 7.7 with a question mark (inaudible) public meeting.

Chair Hetterly. Okay.

Commissioner Knopper: (inaudible).

Chair Hetterly: We'll add the 7.7 acres as a tentative agenda item also for next month.

Commissioner Crommie: Can we make sure we get notice on that public meeting. Make sure the Commission gets notice. I'm still a little confused on what date. You moved it up.

Chair Hetterly: The 18th.

Commissioner Crommie: It's the 18th.

Commissioner Knopper: It's Saturday, October 18th at 10:00 a.m. We'll be opening the gate at 9:00 a.m. so people can tour prior.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned on motion by Vice Chair Lauing and second by Commissioner Markevitch at 9:58 p.m. Passed 7-0