



APPROVED

**MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
April 26, 2016
CITY HALL
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California**

Commissioners Present: Jim Cowie, Anne Cribbs, Jennifer Hetterly, Abbie Knopper, Ed Lauing, David Moss, Keith Reckdahl

Commissioners Absent:

Others Present: Eric Filseth

Staff Present: Daren Anderson, Catherine Bourquin, Rob de Geus, Peter Jensen, Kristen O'Kane

I. ROLL CALL CONDUCTED BY: Catherine Bourquin

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS:

None.

III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

IV. BUSINESS:

1. Approval of Draft Minutes from the Meeting of March 22, 2016.

Approval of the draft March 22, 2016 Minutes was moved by Commissioner Reckdahl and seconded by Vice Chair Knopper. Passed 6-0 Cribbs abstaining



2. Update on the Conceptual Plans for the Rebuilding of the Palo Alto Junior Museum and Zoo

Chair Lauing: Very interesting subject that comes up next is our first substantive issue which is an update on conceptual plans for the Palo Alto Junior Museum and Zoo. Rob, if you'd like to lead that off and then introduce our guests.

Rob de Geus: I will. Good evening, Commissioners. Rob de Geus, Director of Community Services. We're really thrilled to be back here again to talk about the Junior Museum and Zoo and the exciting project that we've been working very hard on. Joining us at the table here, we have Brent McClure and Sarah Vacarro from Cody Anderson and Wasney Architects. We have John Aiken, the Director of the Junior Museum and Zoo. We also have members of the Friends of the Junior Museum and Zoo in the audience, just an outstanding nonprofit organization that has supported the City's Junior Museum and Zoo for many years and are committed to fundraising to rebuild the old facility that was built in 1941. We just wanted to sort of set the stage before I hand it over to them to present. I wanted to express that I think the staff and the architects have really listened to the Commission's concerns about the park and the impacts to the park. It's taken some time for us to come back because they really did some heavy lifting and heavy thinking on how we might adapt the program so that the encroachment onto the park is less than what the Commission was comfortable with. I think they've really done an outstanding job not only by being able to come back off the park as they have, but also with the design of the program and the facility and how it'll operate. I think it's really innovative thinking. Really appreciate the hard work that they've done. We have some new Commissioners here, so we are going to take a little bit of time to catch the Commissioners up. We've been here twice on the Junior Museum and Zoo, so this is the third time. We'll take some time to do that. Who's going to kick it off next? Is it Brent? John Aiken.

John Aiken: John Aiken, Junior Museum and Zoo. I think I know most everybody. Hello. I'm also excited to be here. I think we've heard your comments from our prior meetings and have been hard at work. If we can put the agenda up; there we go. We're going to try and brief you about the mission of the Museum and Zoo; our program goals that were developed for this project; the existing conditions—it's a complicated site and a challenging place to fit our program in, but I think we've done a good job to address that—review what we brought to you in the prior PRC meetings; the comments that you've made and how we've addressed those; and I think a very exciting proposed design that meets our program goals and your concerns. Let me talk a little bit about the Junior Museum and Zoo, one of my favorite subjects. The Junior Museum and Zoo works closely with researchers and professionals to provide a rich environment that stimulates a child's curiosity and creativity. We have about 150,000 visits a year. The institution, I think, really makes an important difference for the head start or the first start in a child's

life in this community. The science of brain development is providing concrete evidence that there's real power in play. Research tells us that play motivates and enhances a child's cognitive and social and emotional growth. Play-based learning environments are more effective than classroom learning, memorization-based learning environments at teaching our children. Those are the kinds of experiences that we design and support. The JMZ provides a strong start for learning in children in eight ways. Each way works to leverage the unique assets of the JMZ, offers to nurture a passion and skills for learning, promotes seamless linkages between formal and informal learning and engages children in low-income families so they too can participate in a learning landscape. The JMZ increases the availability of high-quality learning experiences to all children. We engage and support families as their child's first teachers. We support the development of executive function and deeper learning skills through literacy and STEM-based experiences. We position children for meeting expectation of the common core standards, and we add capacity to early learning networks and improve student achievement. In fact, this year our science outreach program will provide 19,000 school kids with hands-on science-based activities in schools. We create seamless linkages across early learning and early grades. We provide learning during the summer when many children are vulnerable to losing ground with learning. We build community through a vast array of partnerships. Come out to the Junior Museum and Zoo and you'll see all the groups that use us, from childcare facilities to all kinds of social safety networks and things. Rinconada Park has always been and will continue to be the best location to grow the Junior Museum because it leverages the park itself, the scout facilities, the Children's Library, the Art Center. We integrate indoor and outdoor experiences, live animals and collections to provide a strong start for children. With that, I'd like to introduce Brent McClure from Cody Anderson Wasney to talk a little bit about the program and goals.

Brent McClure: Thanks, John. Brent McClure with Cody Anderson Wasney Architects. We wanted to briefly kind of run through some of the programmatic issues with the existing facility to kind of get you guys up to speed since we last presented back in July. As John eloquently summed up, this project is this marriage of an education center, a museum and a zoo with a tremendous amount of public outreach and all of the wonderful programs that they support. The facility is woefully deficient to really support even the needs and the programs and the operations that they have today. As a tour of some of the spaces, stroller parking alone takes up probably a good 15-20 percent of the museum space right as you enter. Administration, the front desk not having really enough space. The teachers that run these amazing programs are really working –their office and desk space is really undersized. They're just all stacked up on top of each other. Here's how products and exhibit space is kind of being stored. A dearth of storage within the facility to properly accommodate their needs. One of the goals of the project is to achieve accreditation of both the museum space, their collections, as well as the zoo. What we'll need to do is, in essence, sort of right-size the facility to accommodate some of the needs.

1 By the way that they're operating today, they're unable to do so. This is one of my
2 favorite shots. It's the same room; it's the Zoo Director's office as well as the animal care
3 and food prep room. We've got three different activities that are all happening within the
4 same space. We've got this facility that's bursting at the seams, that's trying to get out to
5 accommodate the space. The next little bit we want to go through sort of existing
6 conditions.

7
8 Sarah Vacarro: I'm sure you all are familiar with the Rinconada Park site. The site is
9 actually a larger parcel owned by the City. The Museum itself sits on the City parcel
10 land, and the Zoo sits on the Rinconada Park land. The green line is the park boundary of
11 Rinconada Park. These are some of the main trees on the site that we are working
12 around. The dark blue-green are heritage oak trees. The red are heritage redwoods. As
13 you can see, they surround the existing Museum and Zoo. There are two special trees,
14 the dawn redwood tree and the mature pecan tree. We're trying to work around and
15 feature them in our proposed design today. There's also a utility corridor that runs
16 underneath the existing Zoo, so that's another site constraint that we're working around
17 with our proposed design. We can't build a building on top of that corridor. The parking
18 lot is a safety hazard and quite hard to navigate today. One of the goals of the larger
19 Rinconada long-range plan is to reconfigure that parking lot, add stalls and make it a
20 much safer vehicular circulation as well as pedestrian and bicycle circulation. These are
21 some quick shots of the existing conditions. The entrance into Rinconada Park from the
22 parking lot today is through a parking lot where they have dumpsters. The face of the
23 Zoo to the park today is a residential-looking wood fence. One of the main goals of this
24 project is to improve both of those entrances.

25
26 Mr. McClure: We wanted to run through and touch on what we've heard and what the
27 charge was that we heard more or less at the last meeting with the designs that we had
28 presented. February 2015 was our first meeting, and then our second meeting with you
29 all was in July 2015. Minimizing buildings within the parkland. We had some buildings
30 we'll show in a second that were physically in the parkland itself. Minimize expansion
31 into the parkland. Not only were we being charged with "let's move the program out of
32 the park but simultaneously let's maintain parking." That other parking edge that we
33 showed, "let's really work to hold that." Conversely, "let's also try to not remove any
34 more trees as well." We've got the utility easement; we've got Walter Hays as a
35 boundary; we've got Middlefield. We've got all of these different constraints that are sort
36 of pushing and impinging on this. We looked at densification. We looked at program.
37 We looked at a variety of different solutions. That's why it's taken us so long to come
38 back to you, because we've been working with the client to sort of get to where we are
39 here today. To recap those schemes. This was the first scheme really back in February.
40 Just to get everyone up to speed, the ever so slightly darker blue was the Museum and
41 Education Center over here. The Zoo, the outdoor Zoo zone was all of this space here, up
42 against Walter Hays. This oval-shaped piece was the open Zoo. This Zoo support

APPROVED

building was this piece in the back. For those that were here, if you recall, we looked at a variety of different ways to kind of look at things. Before I get to the July meeting, this is the diagram that shows how our first presentation to you expands beyond the existing facility. The existing facility, this weird, dashed-line shape here is the Zoo. This lighter pink color is the outdoor Zoo expansion, and then the Zoo support building. We put some diagrams over here on the left to show programmatically the square footages that we were looking at. When we came to you in July, we had a variety of different options, but I think the one that we working towards at the time was can we maintain the existing design and can we just sort of suck in the Zoo and the Zoo support building somewhat to minimize the impact from where we were in February. That's what you see here. You can see the outline of the original design, the white one. The July design now pulls in the Zoo support building, reduced the amount of Zoo. In essence, if you look at this bar diagram, the Zoo got a little bit smaller and the programs stayed about the same. Now, taking the charge of those bullet points that we showed you earlier, I'm going to show a diagram as to the design that we're going to present to you now. We would like to ask for your review. We've significantly reduced the building program by approximately 15 percent in building square footage. We've also significantly reduced the actual Zoo program. We went back to the client; we went and re-looked at the amount of space that we have, budget and all these things and were able to make things smaller from what we presented before. I think it's a huge sort of first step. The second move is the Zoo support building and its functions we've completely gotten out of the park. We've now taken those functions of back-of-house Zoo support and absorbed them into a building footprint that's outside the park boundary. The only encroachment at this time is the outdoor space of the Zoo that is, in essence, 50 percent less than what we had back in February. There's no more buildings in the park, and the Zoo boundary from where we had shown it before encroaching into the park has been pulled back by 50 percent. I'm going to walk through the design now. What we've done is—we have this unique-looking shape. We basically took the park boundary and fit buildings right up, in and around to the edge of it. The outdoor Zoo space is here, and then the outdoor Zoo support space that was always part of the February and July design is shown over into here. How that fits. Again, just some diagrams to reiterate. There's no buildings into the park. There's only outdoor Zoo space in the park which is consistent with the program as it is today with the Zoo and the park. We've not touched the existing trees. This design doesn't impact any of the trees further. In fact, by pulling the Zoo boundary back, there are two large chestnut trees that are in the park right now, that are now back into the park. Before they were encroached within the Zoo. We didn't really talk about those at the July meeting, but we want to illustrate to you that this move now is preserving those. The utility corridor, we've danced around that as well. That remains untouched, because we can't put any buildings or anything on top of that. The parking, we made a little bit of a nip and a tuck here and moved a spot here or there, but the parking, in essence, has remained unchanged. We've kind of done our darnedest here to adhere to all of the challenges that you set before us in July, to kind of fit this design around it. To kind of

show you the design, here's a shot of a model. We've got a physical model that we've done. One of the big moves, we have an exterior entrance. This is the pecan tree that's out at the front. By pulling the building forward and having an exterior entrance, it really freed up all of these great opportunities for us on the design side with your feedback to now create what we think is an even—actually, we like this design a lot and feel that it's going to be successful for the client and the City. Here's a shot of it from above. Outdoor trellis. This is that classroom building that was shown on the site plan. Here's then the two-story building and the one-story building in the front. The sort of entrance into the park. Here's the plan; I won't get into the details, because there's a lot going on. In essence, here's the edge of the parking lot. The pecan tree is here. We pulled everything much closer to the parking lot. We've taken advantage of the plaza space and located a classroom to anchor that corner over into here. Really, all you have now, this is all Zoo, and this is that Zoo back-of-house space, and then you have the Museum, classroom. That Zoo support building that used to be in the park is this grayish piece that's right up against the edge of the property here. The second story of the design is just this bar shape here, and then this little triangle piece that flanks, so we have actually less of a two-story impact out at the street. We pulled that edge back. There's a butterfly exhibit that then occupies the second story of that classroom building here to kind of anchor the corner. There's an exterior walkway that links the two. You kind of walk across a bridge and look out into the pecan tree. It's to sort of experience the overall. This is a diagram showing sort of the guts and the insides of the Zoo itself. We would have a wall around the perimeter. This is at the ground level. We no longer have these over and under that we had before; the ground plane is now flat. We have a tree house out in the middle with stairs that lead you up over on this side to the butterfly exhibit. Here's the second level of the Zoo that you see here. This is inside that building with the butterfly exhibit. We no longer have—we still have the Loose in the Zoo with the netting that we talked about last time, but the columns that were outboard into the park, all of those have been now pulled back in. The perimeter that we show you here on this site plan is the perimeter that we're proposing with this design.

Ms. Vacarro: The animal management area, that's the exterior Zoo support area that we've been speaking about. It's basically all of the birds and animals that are flying free and loose in the Zoo. This is where they would come to get cared for, to be fed and so forth. This is integral part to serving the Loose in the Zoo (crosstalk).

Mr. McClure: If they've been stressed by the little kids a little bit too much and they just want a timeout or just to kind of go chill out on the lawn and relax a bit, figuratively speaking. How does this design kind of now fit within the park? We've tried really hard to listen to your comments from July and see how this affects park arrival and park impacts as we look along the edge. First we wanted to look at and study this park entrance. This is a site plan that shows the existing conditions. There's this haphazard—the entrance to the Museum is down over here. This little bulbous kind of shape is the

existing Zoo, and then there's this fence zone that's the back of house for the Zoo. I don't know if you can see it clearly on this drawing, but the park boundary really is along this edge. Outside the park boundary is where those dumpsters are and this little staff parking lot inlet. There's a redwood tree that's nice and tall, that's kind of right on the corner, and then the oak tree that's right there, that flanked the entrance. Here's the playground at this spot. What we're looking to do is really grab space outside of the park boundary to kind of create this point of entrance. Although it's not within the boundary, it walks and talks and looks like park space is what we're hoping to accomplish here. In doing so, we now are kind of creating this zone out over into here with some lawn and some loose seating and not having this big plaza zone like we heard last time, but really trying to create more park-like activities as well as maximize the use of the program outside of the park as we talked about before. Here's a shot of what it looks like today. We haven't designed the buildings yet, so this is an early, early-stage rendering of finishes and whatnot, but just to kind of give you a sense as to how the pecan tree would engage the structure, the butterfly exhibit in concept up above and then sort of this entrance space over into here. The second area is now looking kind of down in space a little bit and looking in and around the corner. Again, the existing diagram, the edge of the fence, you have the pathway that wraps around those two chestnut trees and the playground. Here we superimposed the park boundary with this heavy green line. We're showing where the expansion of the Zoo wall is proposed to go. Presently it's overlapping part of the pathway and along this edge and this little nook of lawn space over here on this corner. Here it is in sort of plan design form. The other thing we want to do is move beyond this static wood fence and really think about how does that experience work of that edge and how do we animate it, how do we create park activities and opportunities within the park that sort of really reflect the mission and vision of the Zoo and the experiences that are happening within the Zoo, kind of trying to turn the Zoo almost inside out, if you will. Here's a shot we did also just to kind of illustrate to you in the photograph the extent of where that footprint would be. Here's a shot again in early stages of design. We're thinking about a whole variety of different ideas that could happen. The possibility of mounding up against the wall, so that we bring the scale down and create some opportunities to get some height and play within the park. Looking at sculptural elements that could be embedded within the wall. They might bleed a little bit into the edge of the park to suggest animal play and activities, echoing what's happening within the Zoo. Lastly, cutouts. We're showing a photograph here of a full-blown window cutout. We believe we can still carve cutouts within the space, but we've worked closely with John and his team, and there's a concern of having too much of a picture window and looking into the Zoo. We still believe that we can have these experiences where the wall becomes something that you can almost maybe sit inside of and kind of climb on a little bit and really integrate it within the park. Lastly, this is not photo-shopped. That is a picture of John; I forget the bird's name.

Mr. Aiken: Sequoyah.

Mr. McClure: This is Sequoyah, the bald eagle, actually out in Rinconada Park. There's a wonderful opportunity to create spots of demonstration and activities within the park of the Zoo itself.

Ms. Vacarro: Echoing what John said earlier, the Zoo has always been fully integrated in the park. We believe our proposed design will allow that relationship to blossom even further and leverage the two back-and-forth together.

Mr. McClure: We've really tried hard to listen to your comments, go back and look at the program, go back and look at the design really, really, hard. There was about eight different schemes that made the cutting room floor before this one. We're excited to hear your comments and hope that we can get some feedback.

Mr. de Geus: Just to make a quick comment, Chair Lauing. It's a discussion item. It's not really a formal vote on this. What we're looking for is sort of a straw poll that we're headed in the right direction here, that we've got the confidence generally and support of this new design. Staff and the architects would like to move to the next step of starting to go through the formal process of the plan through Planning Commission and Architectural Review Board and Council. If that's okay.

Chair Lauing: Yep, great. Before I take comments, I just want to make a couple of very short, sort of summary comments. First of all, you gave the recap in our documents that we got before the meeting about what happened at the 15 July and previously 15 February. They're totally accurate. That's exactly right. I appreciate you didn't duck the punches. You took the punches and said, "This is what it's about." Again, for the new Commissioners, our concern always is, as you know, even in the Master Plan we're talking about the need for more parkland, and the population is growing. When there's a suggestion that we then have to lose parkland, we took that very seriously and suggested, as you now see some different results here, that there must be a more efficient way to do that and still have a much improved, beloved children's museum. That's kind of just the context for what we've been through to this point. Comments in no particular order. Who would like to make comments? Commissioner Moss.

Commissioner Moss: I have several questions. First of all, this is a beautiful design. I love it. I was a little bit worried that when you pulled back the wall and gave us more space back that something was going to be lost in the new design. It seems like you've really made it really efficient. This Zoo interaction zone, I think, has tremendous potential. I mean if you could put a little amphitheater and bring the animals out and show people in the park with a little amphitheater, that would be fantastic. It sort of brings the Zoo out to the public. The fact that you gave us that arrival space means more parkland essentially. I like that. Do you lose some heritage trees inside the Zoo today?

1
2 Mr. McClure: No.

3
4 Ms. Vacarro: There are no heritage trees within the Zoo footprint.

5
6 Mr. Aiken: There used to be one large alder tree, but it died of old age last year and was
7 taken out.

8
9 Commissioner Moss: I think that's enough for now. That's really great.

10
11 Chair Lauing: Keith, did you have anything?

12
13 Commissioner Reckdahl: (inaudible)

14
15 Chair Lauing: Maybe get a perspective from one of our old-timers here.

16
17 Commissioner Reckdahl: I do appreciate pulling off the park, and I appreciate that we've
18 pushed more towards Middlefield. I think that was an unused space last time. I think this
19 is a much better design. Some questions about the Zoo interactive zone. You showed
20 some pictures here. Do you anticipate that it's going to be grass? Do you anticipate
21 concrete? What do you expect?

22
23 Mr. McClure: We're very early in the process of the design, but I think our ideas and
24 vision would be a combination of soft materials, not concrete, either decomposed granite.
25 There might be some grass and then some foundation planting and whatnot. As we move
26 through the design, it'll be to have focused areas of interaction so that it doesn't bleed and
27 spread out. We've got strategic focal points.

28
29 Commissioner Reckdahl: Is the primary purpose to showcase animals or to have Zoo
30 programs out there? What's the purpose of the Zoo interactive zone?

31
32 Mr. Aiken: I can probably address that. We run a number of summer camps out in the
33 park. The green space is great for that, but also some programming space that's informal.
34 I think the key is to create something that doesn't look like it's empty when it's not being
35 used, but can still serve our needs. Whether it's just a grassy knoll that rolls around or
36 that has a log or a stone or a sculpture that's strategically placed that becomes sort of our
37 stage and focal point could work. As Brent says, we're just beginning to start that
38 process. We're also beginning to look at the integration of the Park Master Plan
39 playground renovation with this project. I think there may be great synergy as we go into
40 that design process.
41

Commissioner Reckdahl: That path that you show up there is cutting through the current playground, so the playground is going to be shifted, which means we lose green space on the other side also. My concern with that Zoo interaction zone is—I think it's a logical place, and I like the idea of bringing the Zoo outside and having a change of scenery for the campers or for just students. I want that to be park space that's used by the Zoo as opposed to Zoo space that's used by the park people. I want it to look like park. I want it to be able to do things other than just showcase animals or do Zoo camps. I'm really concerned about the look and feel of that. I don't want that to look like part of the Zoo. I want it to look like part of the park. What are the dimensions of the animal—what is it called? The animal management area. How far does that stick out, that corner?

Mr. McClure: One more time, which corner?

Ms. Vacarro: The square footage of that animal management area is just about 3,000 square feet.

Commissioner Reckdahl: How far—if you look on the far right there, that corner, how far is that from the current school right now?

Ms. Vacarro: I would say it's in the 20 to 25-foot range. We're also holding the fence line off of the property line with the Zoo about 3 feet, so that there's adequate egress out of that multipurpose space, back out into the park. I believe that's their current egress plan for the multipurpose space.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I went out there today to look at this. I eyeballed it, compared it to the size of the school there. On the very bottom right, you can see that school building. That school building was like 30 strides. Looking at the ratio, it looked like this was much further. It looked like on the order of 24 strides going out there. I walked out there, and I couldn't believe how far it was from the school. That's a really big chunk of land. I did measure it three times, that this can't be right. On paper it doesn't look that big. In the park, it actually looks big. Going into this, I was very optimistic that this design was a great improvement. When I went out there and stood in the park, I realized that this animal area is going to take up a good chunk of the park still, not as bad as it was before. I'm torn. I think this is a good improvement, and I think maybe a bigger Zoo isn't necessarily a bad thing. Still we're losing some park space there. I have some reservations. Overall, I think the design is very good. I think you've accommodated a lot of our requests. Overall, I'm very optimistic. Public bathrooms. Does that classroom by the parking lot, on the upper left, have any exterior public bathrooms?

Mr. McClure: The public bathrooms have been removed from the project at this point with the buildings being outside of the park.

1 Commissioner Reckdahl: That's just lack of space?

2
3 Mr. McClure: Yeah, and looking at the budget.

4
5 Commissioner Reckdahl: I guess that's a park planning. Are we, as park planners, happy
6 with just restrooms over by the pool or in the long-term plan did we want restrooms here?

7
8 Mr. de Geus: I think we want restrooms somewhere in this end of the park. It's such a
9 busy park, as you know, so many facilities. It gets so much traffic. Finding a way to add
10 a bathroom somewhere on this northern end of the park would be good.

11
12 Commissioner Reckdahl: Even if they're outside of the park, I have no problem with the
13 park paying for that. I'm not sure how that works. It would be a park facility. People
14 using the park would be able to use. I think it would be a public benefit. If we could
15 squeeze that in without displacing usable space in the Zoo, I think that would be a plus to
16 the design. The previous designs all had public bathrooms, and I thought that was a good
17 aspect. In summary, I think the design is nice. I still have some misgivings about the
18 size. I don't think it's a showstopper, but I still have to ponder what's the appropriate
19 amount of space to give up in the park.

20
21 Mr. McClure: Just a quick comment on that. One of the things I didn't mention in the
22 presentation is that we worked closely with John to look at—this question will come up
23 about the Zoo expanding into the space. What we've come away with is a reduced
24 program in the number of exhibits that we had and from what we presented before.
25 However, it's a number that fits within sort of the strategic plan of the Museum and Zoo.
26 With the amount of fundraising—this is a 100-percent donor funded project. In doing so,
27 they feel that we have to grow it a little bit to make sure that it's a viable opportunity and
28 that we're not just sort of recreating what is there. If we were to live within the existing
29 footprint, we'd have to actually have fewer exhibits than we have today, because we'd
30 have to meet egress requirements, ADA accessibility and Zoo back-of-house support to
31 create this loose in the Zoo experience. That's kind of why we've landed sort of where
32 we are with the boundary today and the amount of square footage.

33
34 Commissioner Reckdahl: Is there any way we could bring, on the far right, that corner
35 with more of a square?

36
37 Mr. McClure: Pull this edge back more?

38
39 Commissioner Reckdahl: Yeah.

40
41 Mr. McClure: Yeah. That's something we could look at.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Was that edge there for aesthetics? To give that Zoo interaction area better aesthetics? Why did we have that corner pointing out?

Mr. McClure: I think the thinking was that sort of frames this interaction area and it kind of creates a little bit of a backdrop. If visually we feel that this is bumping out into the Zoo a little bit, I think we could absolutely consider kind of pulling this back a little bit and kind of opening the angle up. If that would help.

Chair Lauing: Is that single story there or no?

Mr. McClure: It's a wall.

Ms. Vacarro: It's all exterior space. It's not an 8-foot high wall. There will be a netting that goes up to that 12 feet, but it's all exterior. It's going to be mostly animal enclosures for the animals to come out of the (inaudible).

Chair Lauing: Commissioner Cribbs, did you have some comments?

Commissioner Cribbs: I did, yes. I wasn't here for last summer's discussion, so I'm sort of coming to this new. I wanted to congratulate the planners. I think that the design, to me, looks really good. I think that it's really time—as a mom who took her kids to the Junior Museum forever and a grandma who takes her grandchildren there now, it's a wonderful treasure for Palo Alto, but it needs some updating and upgrading. I'm just excited to see us moving along. I'd love to see how fast we can get there. I know people have comments and want to do this and want to do that, but I think it would be really great if we could agree and move forward on all of this. I would like to ask if the staff feels that this space is adequate now, since you've had to pull back from the parkland, to do what you really want to do and really what the Friends see since they're going to be funding a lot of this or all of it.

Mr. Aiken: I can address the staff's concerns. I've got to say as we went through this process, there was a lot of sweaty palms and grinding of teeth and worry and stuff. As we prepared for this, we worked hard and we've got all of the program elements that are valuable to the staff in here. I think we're very excited about this design. As Brent said, I think the hard work has really paid off. In many ways, it's actually a better design than the original one. There are some things that we've given up. I think it will actually be an amazing space.

Commissioner Cribbs: That's great to know. My hope is that a whole new generation of Palo Alto children will enjoy it as some of the old generations have. Thank you very much.

1 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Knopper.

2
3 Vice Chair Knopper: Thank you. Thank you so much for your hard work. I know how
4 difficult this must have been and how many sacrifices and sweaty palms to your point. I
5 think it looks fantastic. I wholeheartedly support this design. I think you listened to the
6 Commission. I know that you probably, based on the amount of programming you do,
7 are at the minimum, cutting off a corner here and there. This happens to be one of my
8 neighborhood parks, so I've spent many hours there. The corner that my colleague was
9 talking about maybe cutting back, it's sort of like a dead corner, like a no-man's land now.
10 The opportunity to maybe develop integrative space out there that looks like parkland,
11 integrating art and sculpture that can be play areas for children when you're not bringing
12 the bald eagle out, I think is just another fantastic opportunity for people who visit the
13 park, for kids to climb on. I liked the idea of cutouts last time. I thought that was really
14 cool, a place to sit, checkout animals from the park side. I also love the idea of a grassy
15 knoll, kind of mounding up and giving some texture and dimension to the park. Kids
16 love mounds. They love rolling down them and throwing things down them. I think
17 that's fantastic. My only question is, because you had to cut back, are any of your
18 existing animals going to lose residence? Are you going to have to give anybody up with
19 this limiting of space?

20
21 Mr. Aiken: Thankfully no.

22
23 Vice Chair Knopper: Good. The next question is with this new design, will it provide an
24 opportunity for new furry or fuzzy friends to join your collection? That are alive, not the
25 stuffed ones.

26
27 Mr. Aiken: Did I hear kangaroo? Not quite enough room for a kangaroo, but we still
28 reserved a space for meerkats or prairie dogs in the site plan and a few other animals that
29 are pretty exciting. Let us get further along in the design before we share them with you.
30 The other thing about this back-of-house program animal space is it provides the kind of
31 support so that we can have handle-able animals for both the school programs, onsite
32 programs within the Zoo, but also to enliven the park and bring animals out. It gives us
33 the space to really work with an interesting collection.

34
35 Vice Chair Knopper: I know the entry area with the pecan tree, that looks fantastic. That
36 looks wonderful. It just feels like a lovely entry. I would encourage native plantings as
37 much as we can for that entry of the park. Where we can limit concrete, that's a good
38 thing. That's all. Thank you.

39
40 Chair Lauing: I'm just going to keep working down the line here. I have a couple of
41 comments. One, of course, it's 50 percent less than February, but we still haven't heard

1 what is the percentage of incursion into the park. How much of the square footage do
2 you take up of the park that you don't already have?

3
4 Ms. Vacarro: The square footage of the proposed new boundary beyond the existing Zoo
5 footprint is 5,600 square feet. The existing Zoo sits on about 8,600 square feet in
6 parkland.

7
8 Chair Lauing: In any design that we looked at before, there was some tree loss. Can you
9 identify if there is and how significant it is?

10
11 Ms. Vacarro: There are some trees, probably in the range of 12 that would be lost with
12 this design. If we go back ...

13
14 Chair Lauing: Is that along Middlefield? I know that was one of the debate areas.

15
16 Ms. Vacarro: Yes, there are a number on Middlefield. There's three large atlas cedars
17 that sit right here. Those will be lost; however, it's our understanding from meeting with
18 Dave Docktor that these trees are towards the end of their lifespan and they also drop
19 limbs very easily. They're not a great spot for kids to be playing under regardless. We'll
20 be losing those as well as a couple of small trees in here. None of them are heritage, and
21 they're not super noteworthy trees. There's a large, I think, juniper bush/tree that we'll be
22 losing as well as another small tree here. We are again maintaining these two large
23 chestnut trees that provide a lot of shade in the park. We'll be featuring them in that Zoo
24 interaction zone.

25
26 Mr. McClure: The expectation is that we'll add trees out at Middlefield that are
27 appropriate for that street edge, working with the City to pick the right species and
28 replace more trees than we remove.

29
30 Mr. Aiken: Many of the trees that are actually in the Zoo were planted for the animals,
31 and some of them have had a less than ideal existence, that are probably not ideal trees to
32 try and preserve. That value of planting trees for the animals still exists, so the new plans
33 for the Zoo will plant lots more trees for the animals. The Zoo will be a verdant
34 landscape.

35
36 Chair Lauing: As we're trying to share parkland and Zoo land, we also have to share
37 parking space land. I looked at that and even looked at Rinconada. There's about plus-12
38 net ADA slots for regular parking, I think, in the new design. Over on Hopkins Avenue,
39 there's about plus-eight net. Do we feel like we're done with that or in the Rinconada
40 design is there an opportunity to look at more? I don't see Peter Jensen here, who
41 designed that park so far. If there's 150,000 visitors, the Zoo's going to be spectacular.
42 We talked last time about we're going to get more visitors. We even talked about what

1 does it cost to do underground parking, and we're ending up with 20 more spaces. We're
2 not really making strides there. There's not room for everything. I'm not saying you can,
3 but it's an ongoing concern. I don't know if there's anything we can do relative to having
4 Rinconada take up some of that slack or if you even looked at underground parking that
5 costs an extra \$3 million or whatever. I guess I just raise the alert on that one. The last
6 time there was that tent structure that reached out. Is that gone entirely now in this
7 design?

8
9 Mr. McClure: The netting is still over the walled perimeter.

10
11 Chair Lauing: Is the tent with poles, the overhang ...

12
13 Mr. McClure: The poles have all been removed from the park. We're going to align the
14 poles then with the boundary of the wall. They'll be within that footprint.

15
16 Chair Lauing: The only other question I have is if, for example, this went to Council and
17 they said, "We just don't want to incur anymore on parkland," what's next? In other
18 words, what's your fallback or is that more sweaty palms and excruciating meetings?
19 You don't know at this point.

20
21 Mr. Aiken: That's a good question, and it's beyond sweaty palms. The institution really
22 does need to be right-sized. Our existing audience doesn't have enough toilet fixtures.
23 We can't meet accreditation standards the way we are. After looking at this project so
24 long, the fit within this park is so right because of the other children's facilities. I think
25 the development of the park is the right thing to do. I'm, of course, the Manager of the
26 Zoo and, of course, I would say that. The synergy here really works. In our visitor
27 surveys, most of our users use the park as well, so there really is an ebb and flow back
28 and forth between the park. We want to continue that relationship.

29
30 Chair Lauing: Just on the wish list for maybe next time, it'd be great to see alternate
31 elevations of the Zoo side facing—I mean, 100 percent of them are going to be better
32 than a fence looking in there. It's just been horrendous since day one. To get a feel of it,
33 ideally, sort of overstating it, you want somebody to walk in and kind of not know that
34 they entered the Zoo or that they left the Zoo going to the park. As seamless as possible
35 to make that all the same thing would go a long way psychologically and, dare I say, even
36 politically to make it work even better. That's my comments. Commissioner Hetterly.

37
38 Commissioner Hetterly: I really appreciate the hard work you all put in to address all of
39 our comments. I know it was somewhat disheartening to hear from us the last time
40 around. Along with Keith, obviously, I hate the idea of giving up any park square
41 footage, but I also agree that this is a really vital use to our community. I think this is a
42 great design. I share Ed's concerns about the parking as we have from day one. That's

APPROVED

1 obviously not a unique problem to this project; that's a Citywide problem. I'm very
2 happy to see the poles and the awning moved. I think that really ended up creating an
3 encroachment that was significantly greater than what's shown on your original plans. If
4 you take that into account, you really are looking at more than a 50 percent reduction in
5 the original plan. I appreciate that quite a bit. I had one other question about the shuttle.
6 I think at one point there was a plan to have a shuttle stop in front of the Junior Museum.
7 Am I confusing that with a different discussion? No. Is that still in this plan? Hopefully
8 that will help somewhat with the parking .
9

10 Mr. de Geus: That's a recommendation we have from our Planning and Transportation
11 folks.
12

13 Mr. McClure: You can see the bump-out on Middlefield is part of the Master Plan.
14

15 Commissioner Hetterly: That remains with this redesign. That's all I have. I think it's a
16 great improvement. I'm really glad to hear that you're happy with it too.
17

18 Chair Lauing: Jim, did you have any comments?
19

20 Commissioner Cowie: I do. I think it really looks fantastic, and I'm excited to see it
21 completed. I just have one question, which you may have covered—if so, I apologize—
22 in the earlier meetings. My understanding is there's no roof over the animal management
23 area. I'm just wondering how do we secure the animals against interference from
24 teenagers and whatnot.
25

26 Mr. Aiken: The animal management area, there are individual enclosures. I'm going to
27 use Sequoyah as an example. She lives in a house behind the scenes now, and she has
28 her own lawn where she comes out and perches and has a bath. It's how we interact with
29 her. Over the top of that area where we work with her is a net that is required by our
30 State permits as a secondary containment. There'll be that kind of netting over the top of
31 all of the management areas.
32

33 Commissioner Cowie: Thank you.
34

35 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Knopper has a follow-up.
36

37 Vice Chair Knopper: Do you track where your 150,000 visitors a year come from? Are
38 they a majority residents? Just going to the parking issue and shuttles and how we're
39 going to move people in and out of this facility. I'm just curious about that.
40

41 Mr. Aiken: We could probably get into more detail after we finish the CEQA analysis.
42 What the traffic studies are showing is that our peak usage is not at the same time the rest

of the City of Palo Alto has peak usage. It makes sense with toddlers, moving them around in the middle of the day. We do survey our visitors, and we know that they come from about 15 miles in either direction and only about a quarter of them are from Palo Alto.

Vice Chair Knopper: Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Commissioner Moss.

Commissioner Moss: Three quick follow-up questions. I'm intrigued by the possibility of having public bathrooms. I was wondering if there was any way you could swap the classroom with the inside bathrooms and only have outside bathrooms, like you would in a national park. In the visitor's center, you don't have the bathrooms inside; you have them outside, facing out. Is there any way you could swap the classroom with the bathrooms that are inside? The second thing is the outdoor animal management area has the net, but does it have like two-story cages so you could have double the number of animals in the same space.

Mr. Aiken: No, they're actually all less than 8 feet high.

Commissioner Moss: The last question is will there be any changes to the playground that's just outside there today?

Mr. de Geus: There will be. The current playgrounds are separated. We've got the younger playground and the older playground are going to be combined together. Our hope is that the design of the new playground will relate to the Junior Museum and Zoo and the new facility, so kids can continue to experience some of what they're experiencing in the Zoo when they go out into the park.

Chair Lauing: Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: How does the combined size of those playgrounds currently compare to the combined size of the new playground? Is it going to be roughly the same size? Are we gaining or losing playground area?

Mr. de Geus: I might need the help of Peter Jensen on this question. This is related to the Rinconada long-range plan. Do you know the answer to that one, Peter?

Peter Jensen: No. Peter Jensen, Landscape Architect for the City of Palo Alto. Currently there is no specific design for the playground. It will definitely increase in size at that end of the playground. Like Rob said, we are combining the two playgrounds into one. It will take up less space in the overall park when both playgrounds are combined.

APPROVED

1 There will be a gain of park space over by the tennis court area, underneath the existing
2 heritage oak tree that's there. That'll also help preserve that oak tree for a longer period
3 of time. As far as the exact square footage, I cannot give that to you. It will be
4 incorporated into that end of the design and the design of the playground. Hopefully, the
5 building will take place at the same time, so those things are linked together very well.
6

7 Commissioner Reckdahl: There's currently a couple of big trees over there, at least one
8 big redwood, that is now going to be inside the playground. Is there any danger to that
9 tree from the playground?
10

11 Mr. Jensen: Again, that's all about the playground design itself. You can see in
12 situations like we did for Magical Bridge, where it has the cork oak trees incorporated
13 into the design, every effort will be made to maintain the environment for those trees to
14 exist there. The idea is they would stay in their place. They would not be relocated or
15 removed for the playground.
16

17 Commissioner Reckdahl: Redwoods have such shallow roots, that any type of
18 construction around them may damage them. We're comfortable that that's not going to
19 be a problem?
20

21 Mr. Jensen: Yes.
22

23 Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you.
24

25 Char Lauing: This is not—sorry, go ahead.
26

27 Mr. de Geus: I just wanted to follow up on a couple of things as we conclude. The
28 bathroom, we'll take a look at that broadly. I don't think it's fair to ask this project to
29 accommodate exterior bathrooms to support the park necessarily. It creates an
30 opportunity to think about how we might do that in terms of the long-range plan for the
31 park. I also wanted to mention we will be back at some point for a Park Improvement
32 Ordinance. We can really move forward now with the design, I think, with a few little
33 tweaks here and there. The last thing I wanted to mention—I mentioned it last time. For
34 those that are still concerned about the loss of open lawn space, I think it's not so much a
35 loss of parkland. That's not how I see it. We have lots of facilities in our parks, tennis
36 courts and pools, and interpretive centers in our open space. I think the Junior Museum
37 and Zoo is like an intensive interpretive center. It's really an amazing place. Kids and
38 families that go through there have an appreciation for parks and the natural world in a
39 really meaningful way that lasts for a lifetime for these kids. What helps me is it's a
40 different use of parkland, but a very consistent use in terms of the values and mission of
41 Community Services and parks generally. I just thought I'd leave that with you.
42

APPROVED

1 Chair Lauing: I was going to just say that it's not a vote tonight. The Improvement
2 Ordinance might be coming as soon as next month, I saw from our packet, or the month
3 after. It'll be imminent. I think you wanted a sense tonight of—I'm going to just try to
4 summarize because we're not going to really vote on this. The sense that I have is that
5 there's pretty broad support. A couple of significant areas that are of concern are parking
6 and maybe that corner push-out there and the high importance, which is redundant
7 because you're going to look at this, that the facing into the park needs to look park-like.
8 That's going to be a high attention area for everyone of us and Council and so on.

9
10 Commissioner Cowie: I think we ought to add the bathroom ...

11
12 Chair Lauing: And bathroom.

13
14 Commissioner Cowie: ... to the list of things.

15
16 Chair Lauing: That was actually in an earlier design, and now it's not.

17
18 Vice Chair Knopper: I actually don't agree with the bathroom issue. To Rob's point, I
19 think that's part of the larger park, if you're asking for our straw poll opinion. I think
20 that's a separate conversation that shouldn't be attached to that. That's just my individual
21 opinion.

22
23 Chair Lauing: You weren't saying that it had to be funded by the Friends of the park, just
24 that if there was an opportunity there, to look at it.

25
26 Commissioner Cowie: No. I was saying of the things that got some attention in this
27 conversation. I'm not advocating one way or the other actually.

28
29 Vice Chair Knopper: That wouldn't preclude us from ...

30
31 Commissioner Cowie: I think that came up multiple times, so I think we ought to note
32 that as well.

33
34 Chair Lauing: And it comes up in the Master Plan surveys and plans. Rob suggested that
35 that does have to be looked at somewhere in the park there.

36
37 Commissioner Reckdahl: It has to be more efficient to put a bathroom on an existing
38 building than have a standalone building. I think we want to at least consider it.

39
40 Chair Lauing: Are there any other concerns that we should mention along with general
41 support of the new design? I think the bottom line is it's still more in the park than it was

before, but we understand that it is park-like and a good, intimate relationship with what goes on there. We're saying that, with reluctance but enthusiasm ...

Vice Chair Knopper: I'm not reluctant. I just want to go on record; I'm enthusiastic.

Commissioner Cribbs: No, me neither. I'm (crosstalk).

Chair Lauing: Reluctant about losing parkland, because that's ...

Vice Chair Knopper: In my opinion, we're not losing parkland. We're gaining a fantastic, updated, interesting, "different than other cities have" resource.

Chair Lauing: Any other? Thanks very much, and we'll look forward to seeing it again with even more pictures, so we can start visualizing it and visualizing our visits there.

3. Proposed conceptual design on Quarry Road Improvements and Transit Center Access Project

Chair Lauing: The next item on the agenda is review of the conceptual design of Quarry Road improvements and Transit Center access. Rob, are you going to introduce our guests there or Kristen? This is scheduled for about 30 minutes.

Daren Anderson: Good evening. Daren Anderson with Open Space, Parks and Golf. It's my pleasure to introduce Shahla Yazdy from Transportation and Paul Schneider from Siegfried Engineering. They're going to share a little bit about the conceptual design for Quarry Road improvements.

Shahla Yazdy: Good evening, Chair Lauing and Commissioners. My name is Shahla Yazdy. Real brief about the project. We are requesting feedback from you regarding the proposed conceptual plans for the Quarry Road improvements and Transit Center access. To give you a brief background, this project was a result of a development agreement between Stanford University and the City of Palo Alto where the City was obligated to design and construct these improvements on Quarry Road and also the transit connection before the permitting of the hospital, which is happening in spring 2017. We're on a pretty tight timeline. We need to start construction no later than this summer. I will turn it over to Paul, and he will introduce the project and go over some of the improvements that we're proposing. Thank you.

Paul Schneider: Thank you. Also here with me is Bob Norbutas. He's one of our lead landscape architects. Bob and I were really the pair that worked on the El Camino Park which is just adjacent to this. I recognize a few of you. We went through a lot of gyrations on that. You'll see, as I walk through what is sort of technically the normal

APPROVED

ARB package that we are planning to go to the Architectural Review Board with here shortly, you'll see a lot of the same elements coming out of El Camino Park. We didn't really want to reinvent the wheel. One of the things that I wanted to say is this really is—although, I think it'll be a wonderful addition to that empty piece of land that is next to the park and it'll provide a lot of connectivity and a lot of benefits to the City and the community, is an interim solution. There are still a lot of things in play with the Transit Center long term. I know I've heard a lot of different bits and pieces there. Please keep in mind that what we are doing is an interim solution, but we all know how long interim can last at times. If I may, I'll just go ahead and step through sort of the bits and pieces, and then let you guys get right to any questions you may have or comments. I know you were provided just one page, I believe, out of these 14 or 15 pages, which is the color site plan. I'll go through some of the beginning pieces. As you can see, we're basically showing up here all of El Camino Park Phase 2 that was built, which was a synthetic field, and all the pathway systems. Tried to capture some of the images. I know you can see this on your screen. Wonderful. You can see all the images that we're trying to capture of what is there now and what the park looks like. We really did in the second phase of the park—when you reconstructed it after the reservoir was built, we have a lot of decomposed granite paths that now sort of encompass that whole park. We've got the Class 1 bike path that runs parallel to El Camino Real. Largely the bike path just kind of dead-ended into the old bike path. We have the ramp that comes off of Quarry and El Camino Real there. The connectivity was just kind of poor, and it was getting old. We're trying to set the stage a little bit for what this looks like here. This is an exhibit that, if you've got a really good memory you might remember from El Camino Park, showing the Class 1 bike path which is, I believe, the more orange color if my eyes aren't letting me down. The yellow that runs across the top is sort of a walking loop that we had put in there including a walking loop that comes now around the right-hand edge of the park at the softball outfield and kind of tucks its way back into that Olympic grove there, which is a small cluster of redwoods that are down there. It also sort of dead-ends into the path. We're going to pick up all that pathway system. Realistically what you see here is the demolition plan. It's the existing sort of asphalt path that's kind of falling apart. It's too narrow; it's about 8 feet wide. It's got a very sharp bend in the corner as you come either eastbound or westbound along the bike path. As you keep in mind, this sort of pattern you see in the background is also reflected in the color exhibit you have, to try to give you an idea of the two that are overlaid together. If you haven't been out there, it's hard to tell where you are. I'll stop on this slide. Our goals were to try to create as much direct connectivity from the Transit Center out to basically Quarry and El Camino so folks can get on their way down this expanded bike path, which is largely a striping project as you come down Quarry Road all the way to Welch and the hospital. The only problem with the direct connectivity, if you've been out there, is there is just an unbelievable amount of utilities. There's the SFPUC water turnout which is a giant, sort of vertical 6-foot box that's out there. There's the high power lines went in and they relocated them in 2009 and '10. There are a lot of guy anchors. We're trying to pick our

1 way around these things along with, of course, all the trees that we have and, meanwhile,
2 trying to maintain—as you'll see in the staff report, there's as a civil engineer more of the
3 nerd talk about design speeds with the pathway and the curves of the pathway. Ideally
4 we were trying to maintain sort of the standard design for a Class 1 bike path, which is 20
5 miles an hour. That is really fast for this. It doesn't really allow the broad, sweeping
6 turns that we need. You can see we sort of back-calculated some things and tried to get
7 reasonable radii onto the center of the path, reasonable sight distances as you come
8 around the curve and sort of "T" your way back into El Camino Real. There's a little bit
9 of a cluster of trees and some power poles, so we're trying to maintain sight distance as
10 you're coming around a corner. Really the key there, that I didn't really know if we came
11 to the punch line in the report, is that we really want to be able to post speed-limiting
12 signs on this, so that we don't have a tendency to have bikes kind of fly through there.
13 We've always been fairly strong on saying this is both a pedestrian and a bike access
14 pathway. I've seen as many walkers and bikers there. It's connecting people coming from
15 all different directions. This really is an apex. I think Bob did a wonderful job of then
16 trying to soften things up, trying to use the landscaping, for instance, at the "T" where
17 you come off from the Mitchell Park restaurant here at the bottom of your screen and you
18 sort of circle up. We've even included a little bit of mounding in that apex there to keep
19 pedestrians from wanting to cut the corner. At the same time, we've been working with
20 Shahla, and she's been reaching out to various people and Daren to talk a little bit. We
21 actually have a little decomposed granite pathway for walkers that are accustomed to
22 taking the old pathway, so that they don't want to just kind of cut through the middle of
23 the bark. Largely, it's resolving the radii that are too tight. It's helping with the speed.
24 It's giving as much direct connectivity while sort of getting around all the obstacles that
25 are out there while also trying to accommodate walkers and bikers at the same time.
26 Coupled with this—if anybody really cares about grading, you can dive into this sheet a
27 little bit. We've gone ahead and we've shown some of the details as we'll get into with
28 the Architectural Review Board later. Some of the samples that you can see on your
29 screen here. A lot of these cut sheets, if you will, these pictures, the LED fixture that you
30 see there, sort of the railroad-type fixture, it is the fixture that was installed in El Camino
31 Park. From the color rendering, you'll see just into the park there's actually one of the
32 fixtures. We'll maintain all those fixtures along this path. We have enough capacity from
33 the El Camino Park project to tie into that system. They're all LED. I think they're a
34 great level of light. I think Daren's pretty pleased with the amount of light in the park.
35 As it turned out, I think we've gotten nothing but positive feedback. There's an image
36 right in the middle of the screen that shows the actual bike—there's a bollard with a slight
37 raised island in the middle of it, which is traffic control. The Bike Commission, if I'm
38 not mistaken, has commented that they don't want to see those bollards. They're not
39 critical to the functionality of the bike path. It's more of just keeping vehicles out of the
40 area. That is certainly something that can be eliminated and has been commented by
41 others that they don't want to see that. One of the key things that is happening with this
42 as well is we've created three different alternatives for wayfinding signage. Your lower-

APPROVED

1 left sign is largely just your sort of common—it's the City standard. It's what you'll
2 probably see within the Quarry Road right-of-way as more of a regulatory-type
3 wayfinding sign. We've also looked at creating some custom signs for this area, which is
4 also something that was funded by the financial agreement. These are images of what
5 they might look like. We'd encourage any feedback on these. I think probably the one
6 thing—we talked about it with El Camino Park a lot; we even heard it in the previous
7 presentation this evening—is unfortunately there is one tree that seems to be in our way.
8 It is a very small diameter Chinese pistache that is right as you come off of El Camino
9 Real. We tried as hard as we could, but we don't think we can avoid it. The health is
10 reasonable, and the arborist report is included in here. It's one of the trees back in 2011
11 that was kind of on the cusp. Please consider that if you're thinking about the trees. We
12 keep all the oaks and all the redwoods that are in the area. We're avoiding everything
13 quite nicely. We don't have any issues with getting into tree drip lines. On El Camino
14 Park we had some porous concrete on the Class 1 path, if you've been out there, where
15 we've actually bifurcated the path and sent it around the tulip trees that are out there, if
16 I'm not mistaken. They seem to be really healthy, and it worked out pretty well. I would
17 certainly let Bob step up and speak to the species of the plants that he's proposing in the
18 areas, if you're interested in talking about those. We do have a full planting plan and
19 pictures of the plant palette available.

20
21 Mr. Anderson: I would just like to add the plan is to return to the Commission next
22 month with a Park Improvement Ordinance that the Commission would be asked to vote
23 on to recommend to Council to approve, because this is on parkland. I would also point
24 out that during our very lengthy process of working on the El Camino Park project,
25 Council had been very vocal about wanting a pathway connection that was improved, that
26 connected the park with the rest of the transit area. It's in keeping with the direction the
27 Council had given us many years ago.

28
29 Mr. Schneider: I think the only thing I'd like to add is we do have some 11x17 hard
30 copies of the entire packet that I just presented to you, that Bob has. If anybody would
31 like a hard copy, if it's appropriate to hand that to you, you're more than welcome to it.

32
33 Chair Lauing: Ready for questions? Who's the first one that's going to ask where's the
34 dog park in this? I don't see it.

35
36 Vice Chair Knopper: (crosstalk)

37
38 Chair Lauing: I thought I'd get that out of the way early, Daren, just for you. Questions
39 for these? Commissioner Reckdahl.

40
41 Commissioner Reckdahl: What is the budget for this?

1 Ms. Yazdy: The park portion of the project doesn't have a set budget. There's a total
2 budget that was part of the agreement that included the larger, more comprehensive
3 details. That's why this plan is kind of labeled as temporary. The larger budget is about
4 2 million, I believe, but that includes improvements to El Camino, the proposed
5 undercrossings, transit connections from El Camino. That's really part of the larger
6 picture that's in our future. Right now, we were to do the minimum to provide the
7 requirements that came out of the Development Agreement which was to provide a safe
8 bike and pedestrian path.

9
10 Commissioner Reckdahl: Do we have any idea how much it's going to cost?

11
12 Ms. Yazdy: Paul, do you have the latest numbers?

13
14 Mr. Schneider: The current construction cost estimate that we have for these
15 improvements is around \$280,000. That is a 10-foot asphalt center with decomposed
16 granite edges. There are contingencies and permitting and things on top of that. Our raw
17 construction cost is approximately \$300,000.

18
19 Commissioner Reckdahl: That just seems like a lot of money. Right now, we have an 8-
20 foot bike path through there, which is in great condition—it's in better condition than the
21 road in front of my house—but we're replacing it with a brand new 8-foot bike path. It
22 seems like we're not really gaining a lot, and we're spending a lot of money. It's going to
23 look pretty, I'll give you that. The design is very nice. I think the design looks nice, is
24 functional. I really question whether we're getting our money's worth out of this.

25
26 Ms. Yazdy: This was, again, a result of the Stanford Medical Development Agreement.
27 Part of the requirements was to provide lighting, low-tolerant landscaping. All that kind
28 of does add up with irrigation. I think just providing the lighting and a safer path that
29 didn't cause so much conflict as it does now in the existing condition which is why we
30 added the alternative where the bicyclists can kind of veer away from the intersection and
31 have less blind spots.

32
33 Mr. Anderson: The only thing I might add is this is not coming out of the City's capital
34 budget. This is Stanford money funding this. It's not money that otherwise would have
35 gone to some other park project, for example.

36
37 Commissioner Reckdahl: If it's going to be torn up in 2 years, can't we push some of
38 that—I mean, if they're going to do the Transit Center remodel and rip up this design, I'm
39 a little nervous about putting 280,000 into something that may have a very short lifespan.

40
41 Ms. Yazdy: The proposed improvements for the more extensive plan is about 5-7 years
42 away, minimum.

Commissioner Reckdahl: You mentioned the bollards design was not acceptable. Was it just that particular bollard design was not good or is it just bollards in general?

Ms. Yazdy: Bicyclists actually don't—I think bollards are not preferred for bicyclists. That's not an element that they like to see in the middle of the sidewalk. There's actually bollards on the top corner where it comes out of Mitchell Lane and actually comes into the park. There's bollards there as well. Those are existing, so they've asked that we remove those as well. They prefer some other way to prevent vehicles from kind of driving on the ramp, so we're going to look at other ways and remove the bollards.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What are other ways, other than bollards, for keeping vehicles out?

Ms. Yazdy: We could add islands or maybe some landscaping. I think concrete islands, boulders are used a lot of times. That's something that we're going to update the plans and, again, take it back to them to see if that's something that they prefer.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Others? Commissioner Moss.

Commissioner Moss: To follow-up on Keith's questions. You must have some general idea of the grand plan that's going to replace this. I'm assuming that for the 280,000, some of this is not in question, some of this will always be out of that area, and some of it is in a gray area. Can you tell me what percentage of this whole project is sort of cemented, we really know that this is going to be around?

Ms. Yazdy: I unfortunately don't have that information. I don't believe a study has begun on the improvements, but I do know just on a really brief, general description was connections from El Camino to the Transit Center, which may or may not include actually bus access from El Camino; whereas, currently they go around. Connections to the Transit Center. I've heard of an undercrossing under the Caltrain tracks. Again, some pedestrian and bicycle improvements at the intersection of Quarry Road and El Camino. It's really general at this point. I don't think we have that information right now.

Commissioner Moss: The second question I have is we talked at length in previous meetings about a dog park in El Camino. One of the concerns was that this is an interim solution. We can't put a dog park there because it may go away. Do we have any more information about where—we really don't know where we could put a dog park if we could. Especially with the amount of money that we're spending on this, an interim

1 solution would be very inexpensive. I think you are more worried that we would take
2 something away eventually. Was that right?

3
4 Mr. Anderson: Yeah. I had really good conversations with both Paul and Shahla about
5 this. They had said they could work around a dog park in the area we were originally
6 looking. It was really a conversation with Stanford that had led to some additional
7 concerns. One is the future development at that site and the fear that there would be
8 opposition from a vocal group of dog enthusiasts who would take over that area as a dog
9 park if we did so. The other was parking impacts. There's a parking lot immediately
10 adjacent to this area at the Red Cross building, which Stanford owns. It would be heavily
11 impacted if we added an amenity like a dog park. This is the closest parking lot to it, so
12 that was their concerns. Same goes with their other building, the restaurant just down the
13 way. Those were kind of Stanford's big issues. As we further looked at it while we were
14 looking at our other 12 options for really good, high probability parks for dog areas, this
15 one seemed to fall a little bit lower. It's not walking distance from any other
16 neighborhoods. It doesn't mean we couldn't still use that area. This doesn't preclude that
17 or cause problems with the idea if for some reason in the future we wanted to, if we got
18 news, for example, that any transit improvement was really far away or plans had
19 changed. I don't see how this project would get in the way of utilizing that spot or, for
20 that matter, if the Commission changed their mind and wanted to do something in the
21 developed area of El Camino, which would be going back on a prior Commission's
22 decision. That's also something that could always be looked at again.

23
24 Commissioner Moss: That's all I have.

25
26 Chair Lauing: Any other comments. Commissioner Hetterly.

27
28 Commissioner Hetterly: I have some concerns about this design. As a bike commuter
29 looking at this, I would think, "Awesome. This is great. I'm going to be able to go so
30 much faster, and it's going to be easier and smooth and paved and great." As a park user,
31 it feels like somebody just put a road right through the middle of the park. I'm concerned
32 about bike and pedestrian conflicts especially around that first "Y," this one here. I
33 appreciate that you have a direct route pedestrian pathway to try to build a path where
34 they'll walk, but it runs right into the intersection of the bikeway. There's no place for
35 pedestrians to walk on the far side of that intersection. It's kind of an incomplete leg for
36 the pedestrian side. I don't think this really fully meets the goal of pedestrian and bicycle
37 connections unless you're talking about the pedestrians walking in that DG strip on the
38 border of the path. Maybe that was the intention. Even if that's the intention, how they
39 get safely across that intersection; I don't know how much bike traffic you have going
40 through there. Maybe that's a consideration. If there aren't that many people, then maybe
41 you don't worry about conflicts. I think that could be a concern there. I also feel like the
42 location of the upper part of the bikeway really cuts across a big chunk of park and

breaks up some contiguous open space maybe unnecessarily. I guess that's a question to you. As you look it, it's as though you have—with the existing path that goes around the bottom here, this whole area is contiguous and unused. I understand there's all sorts of stuff in here from utilities. There's still potential for other kind of park uses up here at some point in the future possibly. Once you put a road through the middle of it, then you don't really have that option any more. I'm a little concerned about that. I'm not sure why it's favored over just revamping the existing path along the southeast edge. I know that you're concerned about the sharp curve there, but it seems that even with that utility box thing and the trees, you could soften that curve somewhat. That would enable you to have a pedestrian path alongside that's also in a direct route. You'd provide both types of users a direct route. In addition, I'm a little concerned about the landscaping. As I read the staff report, it's supposed to be an attractive, landscaped, passive park and green space. As you read further in, it's basically mulch with landscaping that's designed to enhance the street frontage but not necessarily the park frontage. It didn't sound very exciting, the landscaping. It's going to be used sparingly due to maintenance, with the aesthetics at the street frontage. I guess I'd like to see more in this plan to meet the needs of other users besides just the bicyclists. I'm also concerned about the signage. That's a lot of big, bright signs in a not very long stretch of land. I'm not sure you need a four-item sign at every intersection every 200 feet along the way. Those are my concerns.

Chair Lauing: That has some merit. Could you just make a comment on why you didn't just kind of put the path on the outside and keep the inside an Indianapolis Speedway for (crosstalk)?

Mr. Schneider: We had a lot of discussions. Shahla has asked me that a good dozen times. There are two primary issues. One is we would need to make a conscious decision, which may be appropriate, to reduce the speed significantly. You talked about sort of having this bicycle boulevard, and that's been a concern of ours as well, trying to strike a balance between creating a Class 1 bike path which has certain speed requirements. It's supposed to be 20 miles an hour, but that may not be what we want. We may want the Class 1 width, but we may not want sort of the Class 1 speed. If we were to sort of abandon the speed goal, which is again more of a bicyclist goal—in fact the Bike Commission said, "We don't want stop signs on a bike path. We don't want the bollards. We want to just cook right through there." I'm paraphrasing. That's kind of the bicyclist mentality as opposed to maybe a pedestrian mentality. If we were to make a conscious decision to really want to reduce the speed, we could go back down the existing alignment and do, as you suggest, and soften the curve. It was a reaction to try to strike a balance between an alignment that is just so far away from a Class 1 bike path standard to something that would better meet the standard. As you can see, we don't even quite meet that standard with the soft curves that you see in there now. The other thing that we're trying to resolve is really the intersection as you come off of Quarry to sort of El Camino Real, as you come across El Camino Real and you want to enter into this part

APPROVED

of the park. The way it is right now is there's zero stacking distance, if you will. If there's two bikes and a stroller and a couple of pedestrians, you just sort of run right into them. Our goal was to try to pull that away from El Camino Real. As soon as you do that, you start to get into other conflicts with the oak trees that are there. It just started to add up that maybe we should go and hug the utility cluster around the top of it. Those were our drivers. That's kind of all I can say as to how we arrived at where we are, after considering the existing alignment sort of long and hard. We would really want to take direction that we want to consciously slow people down and, again, try to maintain more of the open space. I don't think there's a lot of value in that utility cluster that we're kind of surrounding. We were trying to actually bring the prominence of that down a little bit and trying to bring people more into the park, how to make it more inviting. There was some other things that we did study a little bit further into that open space that you're talking about. In terms of the landscaping, the last thing I want to try to address is we struggled a little bit with El Camino Park, the reality of water use and maintenance and sort of the proper use of funding. We can certainly expand the amount of landscaping that we have on the project. That wasn't a big discussion we've had with Daren and his group yet to understand what is the threshold for that, trying to beautify it to what we want it to be and follow that description a little bit better versus taking it too far down. Again, probably for us, it was reacting a little bit to the history of El Camino Park, where there is a lot of bark mulch. That was sort of the standard we were reaching for on this project. Maybe we weren't reaching high enough. Daren, did you want to weigh in?

Mr. Anderson: Just to reiterate. I think when I first met with Paul and Bob from Siegfried, they were thinking a more robust plan. I think they responded very kindly to my concerns that we're under this challenge. We are still in the drought, and we do have confines on how much potable water we could use. This is a potable water only site; we don't have recycled water there. I also am not getting any new staff. El Camino is already bigger and better than it was, which stretches the capabilities of staff who are taking care of it. We're adding new landscaping, new irrigation, new trails to blow and clean. There's an element of I don't want to over-promise what we can take care of. This is a lot of additional stuff. It's a large area too. You could go hog-wild and add a tremendous amount. I'm afraid it would just become overgrown and weed infested, something I can't keep up with. That was the original intent, to reach out to Siegfried and say, "Please keep it easy to maintain and low water use." If we've erred to far on that side, I think there's probably some flexibility to add a little bit more. I would just caution to be thoughtful of the fact that there are impacts to maintenance as we make these decisions.

Chair Lauing: On the design issue that Commissioner Hetterly raised, would it make sense to give a Scenario 1 and 2 to the ARB with the note that instead of bisecting the park, if you move around it, open space is retained for future use?

Mr. Schneider: We actually did develop sort of an "A," "B" and a "C." "A" was keeping the same alignment. We have an exhibit that's largely similar to this that does follow the same alignment and soften the curve. "C" was a little bit out of this world. It had a bike roundabout in it. I don't think we'll present that one. We do have another alternative that we could go in with that strategy and show alternatives and just explain the stepping down of the speed as really the primary concern with Concept A which is existing alignment.

Chair Lauing: Preservation from the Parks Commission perspective of more space for future park use.

Mr. Schneider: Correct.

Chair Lauing: Any other comments on this one?

Commissioner Hetterly: I'd like to make a follow-up comment. I hear what you're saying about the landscape maintenance. I just don't think it makes sense to position a bench looking out on the giant mulch circle. Maybe think more strategically about where you want people to hang out and plan your landscaping around that. I am very concerned about the—I don't think this plan meets the pedestrian needs at this site, where you have so many people coming from the Transit Center over to Stanford on foot.

Commissioner Moss: One more thing. If it's possible to put a bench or two near the walking path, pretty bad to put them near bike path. If you could put a bench or two near the walking path, that might be nice.

Chair Lauing: Thank you very much.

Ms. Yazdy: Thank you.

4. Parks, Open Space, Trails and Recreation Facilities Master Plan

Chair Lauing: The next item on the agenda is near and dear to our hearts, presentation on the ongoing Master Plan process.

Rob de Geus: We have Peter Jensen coming up to join us, and Kristen. They're both going to do the presentation this evening.

Kristen O'Kane: Good evening. Kristen O'Kane, Assistant Director of Community Services. Peter and I are going to present to you some information on the Master Plan. I'm going to kick it off by just giving a brief summary of the policy document that we presented last month. We did have some minor revisions to that, that were based on last

APPROVED

month's discussion as well comments that we received from the Audubon Society and Sierra Club. In your packet, you have a clean copy as well as a redlined version of that document. Just to summarize, we did go back to the Comp Plan standard of the 2-acre per thousand for neighborhood and district parks in the policy document. I am going to turn it over to Commissioner Hetterly in a just a moment to talk about some conversations that we had recently about how we might want to revise that policy a little bit. I'm just going to finish going through the slide, and then I'll turn it over to you. We also, just based on comments that we received from many of the Commissioners, deleted the policy that was to explore expansion of Foothills Park to nonresidents. We've revised the policy on turf fields, added the two policies on restrooms and dog parks, and then we also added a policy to develop an asset management program. This was in response to mainly Commissioner Hetterly's comments about having something in the plan that addresses future park maintenance as well as future funding for those maintenance projects. An asset management plan does seem very broad and general right now, but the intent is to really have a plan that will address our future needs for the parks and how we would pay for those needs. Again, we included all the revisions that the Audubon Society and Sierra Club had recommended in their letter that we received. That's pretty much a summary of what we changed to the policies, with the exception of a possible tweak to that park development standard policy. I'll turn it over to Commissioner Hetterly.

Commissioner Hetterly: I had contacted Kristen and Rob since our last meeting to talk about the park standards. As I was thinking about their assessment that our deficit was all on the neighborhood park side and that they had counted—sorry, let me back up. Maybe you all know that the Parks and Rec standard as it stands now calls for 2 acres of neighborhood parks per 1,000 and 2 acres of district parks per 1,000 along with minimum walksheds and minimum sizes. The question came up of what counts as a district park and what counts as a neighborhood park. As far as I can tell, throughout the history Palo Alto everybody calculated differently, defined differently what counts as a neighborhood park and what doesn't. For example, the Community Services Department had categorized everything 5 acres or larger as a district park. The Planning Department picked and chose and said, "These five are really more districty than those five." The Comp Plan Environmental Impact Report has a different calculation of how much we have in terms of district and neighborhood. That's why I reached out to them about it. I was concerned that we weren't on the same page in how we talk about our park inventory. As you all know, while I love the standard, I don't think the district and neighborhood distinction is really fully appropriate to the inventory and the patterns of use that we have here in our City. For example, Eleanor Pardee Park is over 5 acres, so it could be a district. I think most people think of it as a neighborhood park. I didn't want to impose artificial definitions, and I would suggest that we refer to the standard as our guideline. I didn't print out what I sent you earlier today. Don't apply the district/neighborhood distinction to our system, instead say we use the standard as a guideline, we recognize

APPROVED

1 that this distinction doesn't apply to our City, but we want to add parkland with
2 population growth to achieve 4 acres per 1,000, so you still maintain the same number,
3 and it has to be well distributed throughout the community and of sufficient size to serve
4 a variety of neighborhood and broader community needs and stick with just a single
5 walkshed of the 1/2 mile which is the minimum for neighborhood parks under the
6 national standard. Our goal is really to make sure everybody can walk to a park. That
7 was what I was looking to do, take the district/neighborhood distinction out of the policy
8 and massage it a little bit to be able to still refer to the standard but apply it to our ...
9

10 Chair Lauing: That's what's—this documents that discussion, includes the discussion?
11 These words that you have in the policy include that discussion?
12

13 Ms. O'Kane: No, they don't. We just had this discussion last week, and then
14 Commissioner Hetterly and I have been sort of throwing some language back and forth in
15 email on how we might revise that policy. We would keep the actual policy in a sidebar
16 in the document so that the readers could refer to that guideline, but the policy would say
17 use this as a guide but sort of tailor it to what Palo Alto has, that we are sort of a unique
18 community, we have these parks, like Commissioner Hetterly said, that are neighborhood
19 parks but also serve as district parks. It gets a little confusing on how we would count
20 those. We reference both, but the policy itself would not be an actual word-for-word
21 repeat of the standard.
22

23 Commissioner Hetterly: We would repeat in the policy the 4 acres per 1,000 and
24 growing and all that other good stuff. Right?
25

26 Ms. O'Kane: Yep.
27

28 Chair Lauing: That sounds very reasonable to me. Anybody have any minority reports
29 or further comments or questions on that?
30

31 Commissioner Moss: (inaudible)
32

33 Chair Lauing: One ...
34

35 Ms. O'Kane: That's correct.
36

37 Chair Lauing: ... "B," yes.
38

39 Ms. O'Kane: Correct. I'm going to turn it over to Peter Jensen then, Landscape Architect
40 with Department of Public Works to continue the presentation.
41

Peter Jensen: I would add to that that there is a series of programs which we talked about today that do support "1B" that gets into more specifics on how to add or to look at reviewing and expanding the park system. That's something that you will see as well. I think those things really start to speak to our system itself and starts to identify what we can actually do to make that happen. I am going to transition into the results of the community survey. A few months ago we looked at the preliminary results. We're going to look at a few of the graphics from that as well as some additional ones, and then talk about at the end how we are actually using the data from the survey in the process of the Master Plan. First of all, let's just briefly discuss the survey development and the survey use. The survey development was developed from community feedback and system analysis that was done early on in the project. That helped to develop our opportunities matrix that we put together that identified specific areas of needs that the City would like to address or add or expand in our park system. From that then, these areas of focus that we developed specifically for the community survey itself to allow the overall general community to have some say in how funds and projects should be prioritized to give us good feedback so when we did do that process, which we are working now, we could reference these general ideas and have that in mind when we went about ranking and then scoring projects and programs. That's how this survey developed and why it developed. Like I said, how it's going to be used is for our prioritization of projects and how they will be sequenced in time. I'll get into a little bit more of that at the end of the presentation. Basically it's talking about when we do recognize projects and prioritize them, then there is the step of actually sequencing them in a schedule or a calendar of time. When that takes place, the data again will be used to reference back to what the general community has as higher priorities than others that we want to spend funding on. The survey was done online, and it ran from August 28th to February 15th. We also did have a community meeting; it wasn't very well attended, but a few people did show up. I would say that in the community meeting we did focus on all the specific hot topic items of restrooms, dog parks, synthetic turf. All the main topics were brought up. It was a very open and good conversation that we had there. On the online end of it, 730 respondents took the survey. When we looked at the survey itself and looking just at the IP addresses and those that took the survey, most people took the entire thing. I believe there was about 10 percent that had started to do the first page and stopped, but most of the people that did engage in the survey took it to its completion, which was an interesting finding because the survey definitely in titling it "The Challenge" denotes that it was a challenge to do, that you had to work a little bit at it. Everyone that took it took it to the end, which was a good result for it. We also didn't have many people taking it—basically everyone that started it took it one time, and no one really wanted to fill it out again. You didn't have any ballot stuffing that was happening with the process. It was a good, clean process going along as the far as the survey numbers go. Six hundred five of the respondents were from Palo Alto; 46 of those live in nearby communities, describe themselves as visitors; 48 owned businesses as well as living in Palo Alto, and 223 of those also worked in Palo Alto as well. The survey results themselves. Basically the

survey was broken into four sections. The first three sections were the specific elements; the parks, trails, open space was one of them; the recreation program was one, and the recreation facilities was another. The fourth aspect of the survey itself was combining all of those into one longer list to get a set of prioritizations for the entire list. As you can see the allocations of more than \$2 and the percent of allocations of those that didn't provide any for those are going to be shown in the bar graphs as we kind of go through those. Those particularly were highlighted to represent and to review the people that did put more emphasis or more money or more funds on a specific thing than just one specific dollar. This is more—for example, the dog park question in the first element, you saw a greater number of individuals putting more money towards that which signifies that it does have a deep-rooted following for a smaller group that would like to see more investment in that, which basically I think we've heard as the years have gone by from the dog community. Those findings kind of reveal, I think, what we already know, which is one of the bases for doing these surveys is to make sure that the information that we do have is the real information. The survey results again, it's broken into four different sections. This was the first section which is six parts of the areas of focus for the parks, trails and open space. In this graph, you can see it's basically per the money that was allotted for each one and with the enhancement, comfort and making parks more welcoming, the item that received the greatest amount of funding. These represent basically the prioritization of the community of what they felt funding should be directed to for our park system. The light blue or green—I'm not quite sure how you're seeing it on your screen—and then the red bars. The green represents those that allotted more than just \$1 towards that. The red is an interesting aspect of those that didn't allocate any for it. As you look down the list, you'll see that those figures kind of correspond. If we want to just pick out one, like expanding the system, you see that 17 percent of the respondents placed a greater deal, more than just \$1 on that, and 57 percent of the voting community did not actually give zero to that. This is another bar graph basically showing very similar information, except it does break it down into the amount, the percentage of people that spent more than just \$1. You can see basically the light green at the beginning of the bar is the \$1 allotment, and then it basically goes up from there, so two, three, four, five, and then zero where the community didn't vote any funds to be appropriated towards that element. It's shown in that way. For the last one, let's say improving the accessibility of the full range of park and recreation opportunities, you see that over basically 60 percent of the respondents did not allocate any funding for that. For that one in particular, I think what we are deducing with the project team is that overall the general sense from the community is that the park system itself is very accessible, does have a lot of good amenities that are close by. They recognize that it is a very well put together park system. For that one that's more discussing the accessibility, we feel that it was based lower because what we are providing now is adequate, and they're not recognizing that as being something we should fund since we're already doing a good job of doing that. A question on that?

1 Commissioner Cowie: Yeah. Peter, did we not reach the same conclusion that we don't
2 need any dog parks, though, if we read that one that way? The zero on the dog parks is
3 almost as strong.

4
5 Mr. Jensen: Right.

6
7 Commissioner Cowie: That seemed like an awfully strong conclusion.

8
9 Mr. Jensen: It's based ...

10
11 Commissioner Cowie: I don't think we have that conclusion on the dog parks. Right?

12
13 Mr. Jensen: Right.

14
15 Commissioner Cowie: But the numbers were very similar.

16
17 Mr. Jensen: That conclusion is based on our first survey that was conducted, that
18 recognized that the general feeling of the community is that the park system itself is a
19 very good one already, where the dog park question in that survey gave us the result that
20 we did not have enough or we weren't doing enough to serve that. From that initial
21 survey information, deducing those two things is where that result comes from.

22
23 Commissioner Cowie: I guess I'm not seeing that that's an obvious conclusion from this
24 survey. It just seems to me those two—if you look at the data for those two questions,
25 the results are pretty similar. To conclude that accessibility is completely fine, but we
26 need lots more dog parks, it seems to me you're taking very similar data and reaching the
27 opposite conclusion.

28
29 Mr. Jensen: Like I said, the initial data from the first survey, because we had a survey
30 that was more about site analysis, was that the general feeling of the community that our
31 park system is very good right now. From that survey, it came back that our dog park,
32 though, and how we're serving the dog park needs is not very good. Again, it's an
33 interpretation of the results, and then reflecting those results on the previous results to
34 figure out basically what these figures are actually meaning. Yes, there is some gray area
35 of interpretation there. Because of those early results that our park system is good and it
36 is fully accessible right now, the general community feels that—that's why it received
37 lower funding. I would agree that definitely it's not as solid. I can't give you a specific
38 comments per those that are taking the survey that that was their general idea of it. That's
39 what's being extracted from it.

40
41 Chair Lauing: Did you want to add something?

1 Ms. O'Kane: I'll add a little bit there. I think comparing dog parks to accessibility is a
2 little bit apples and oranges, because the people who are obviously putting money
3 towards dog parks are likely dog owners. That's a certain percentage of the people.
4 People who are putting money on accessibility could be the entire population. I think
5 that's something that anybody would put money towards as opposed to the dog parks.
6 Maybe comparing the accessibility and dog parks isn't very clear or very black and white.

7
8 Mr. Jensen: The second aspect of it was the recreation facilities. These were the
9 rankings per the funding value that was given by the community for each of those seven
10 things. This is basically how they ranked in that order. Again, this is the exact same
11 basically with the percentage of more than \$2 given and the percentage of \$0 given.
12 These are just different ways to basically look and understand the data that was
13 presented. The key aspect is how it ranked out total with those things that are ranked
14 higher or receiving higher considered by the community to be those things that should be
15 funded, which will work into basically our overall prioritization.

16
17 Chair Lauing: Go ahead.

18
19 Commissioner Cowie: I'm curious as to how did we account for the negative votes. We
20 clearly took into account the positive ones, the "I want to spend this amount of money
21 and I spent \$2 or more." It's not clear to me how do we take into account the votes that
22 said, "Don't spend a dime on it." Did we subtract from the total the negative ones? It
23 doesn't look like it.

24
25 Mr. Jensen: No.

26
27 Commissioner Cowie: It looks like we essentially ignored them. Is that true?

28
29 Mr. Jensen: I don't know if you could say they were ignored.

30
31 Commissioner Cowie: I'm just trying to figure out how did we—if you look at "4" and
32 "5" here for example. "4" is slightly higher than "5" on the positive side, but it's
33 significantly higher than "5" on the negative side.

34
35 Commissioner Hetterly: Can I just pipe in for a second?

36
37 Chair Lauing: Sure.

38
39 Commissioner Hetterly: I see the percentage of \$0 votes not as a negative vote but as a
40 lower priority vote. For example, if what I'm very concerned about is improving and
41 enhancing community center and recreation space, I already have a fixed amount of
42 dollars. I don't have enough to spend on everything. What do I have to pass on? It's

APPROVED

1 going to be this and this. Surely there are some negative votes that say, "I'll do anything
2 but spend \$1 on that." I think dog parks is one where you might get some people like
3 that. I think for the most part, the challenge is figuring out of all the things I really want
4 to spend on, what can I sacrifice in order to support those things. I don't think the \$0 is a
5 negative vote; I think it's just an indication of a lower priority for the most part.

6
7 Commissioner Cowie: I agree, but I think the effect is essentially the same. Whether you
8 count it as a negative or you count it as of low priority, the effect is essentially the same,
9 is the point I'm making.

10
11 Chair Lauing: I agree with that. It served as "I don't care about that priority." It doesn't
12 matter why you don't care about it; it's not being prioritized, which then also speaks to
13 those that are "special interest groups" relative to dog parks or fields or whatever rank it
14 really high and try to weight it that way, which also showed that that was the case, which
15 is fine to get that knowledge.

16
17 Commissioner Reckdahl: What we don't know is if they gave them zero, is it because
18 they thought what we're doing is okay and we don't have to add anymore or they don't
19 care about the subject at all. It would be nice if we could add a correlation saying, "How
20 is the accessibility of the parks?" If you had answers for both, you could find some
21 correlation and find out why people are saying zero. I just don't think we have the
22 information to say why they're saying zero.

23
24 Chair Lauing: You're right; we don't have any exit polls. We don't have any
25 projectability from a very small sample size that's not statistically being evaluated. It
26 can't be with that kind of (crosstalk).

27
28 Commissioner Reckdahl: it's hard because you can make two conclusions out of the
29 same answer. How do you make it actionable then?

30
31 Mr. de Geus: I think a lot of times with surveys, it ends up you have more questions than
32 answers in some ways. It's a beginning of a conversation. I think Peter mentioned we
33 have to look at the results of this survey in context with all of the other outreach that
34 we've done and the staff knowledge about the programs and services and try to draw the
35 best conclusions that we can. Sometimes we may need to talk to more residents to get
36 their input. "This is how we're interpreting this. Do you think we have it right?" One
37 thing that struck me about the survey was that every one of the areas of focus did get
38 some funding. I think that speaks to the fact that the areas of focus are good, and we're
39 on the right track there. I think that's good news.

40
41 Mr. Jensen: The goal for the survey itself was to determine where people would spend
42 their money if they had the possibility of doing that. It wasn't to highlight or try to

1 provide a negative aspect where they didn't want to. All the areas of focus were vetted
2 through our first phase of our project by looking at the system as a whole. All these
3 elements or areas of focus were things that the community itself brought up as being very
4 important that should be part of our park system. This general survey was conducted to
5 figure out where they would like to spend their money. When we start to rank those
6 projects and programs that are new, then we'd have a general sense of what is the top
7 priority and how we should, as a City, use our funds to make those new programs or new
8 projects come to light.

9
10 Chair Lauing: Let's move through this, and then we could just have a bunch of
11 comments.

12
13 Mr. Jensen: Again this is the bar graph that shows the amount of dollars per each one of
14 those areas of focus and the percentage of who gave one, multiple or none to each one of
15 those. This is the breakdown of the scoring for the recreational element programming
16 and how it was prioritized by the community, one through six. You can see here unlike
17 the other two that the top one was felt by the community to be a much high priority than
18 the other five items on the list. This again goes through that same review of what was
19 allocated per each element. We do have a summary of the findings from the elements.
20 Each area of focus did receive, as Rob was saying, funding from the community.
21 Respondents allocated a higher average amount to improving and enhancing community
22 centers and recreational spaces. This as felt by the project team was done because the
23 community realized this is a higher dollar value item to do, to enhance these community
24 centers, and that's why more money was allocated per individual for that specific item.
25 Exploring new programs and classes was allocated more resources than expanding
26 existing recreation, indicating a preference for newer recreation opportunities. Top areas
27 under each element usually receive a higher percentage of respondents choosing to invest
28 more than \$2. If you look through those graphs, you'll see that the top portions received
29 more than just the \$1 allocation. A higher percentage of respondents chose not to invest
30 any funding in the lowest ranked areas. Again, if you wanted to start to look at those
31 ways that people did allocate their funding, more of the lower aspects received less
32 funding for those things over the \$2 amount. The off-leash dog park had a relatively
33 small number of respondents allocating a larger amount of funding. Those that did feel
34 that dog parks were something that we should provide more funding to, there was that
35 group that did move that money towards there felt and did it \$2 or more than just adding
36 one to that. Improving the accessibility of full range of parks, which we had talked about
37 a little bit, received the lowest average allocation of funding of all three investments.
38 This lower investment supports the overall satisfaction with the distribution or
39 availability of parks and facilities across the community. The fourth segment of the
40 challenge was to rank all of the areas of focus in one compiled list. This first chart that
41 you're looking at are the top six. There's 12 areas of focus altogether; these were the top
42 six. They've been separated into two groups of six. The project team felt that these were

APPROVED

definitely above and were prioritized higher than the bottom six. You can see the percentages aren't very much. Number 7 received 9 percent of the funding that was allocated to it. The ones above that were 11 and 10. You can see that there was definitely a clear drop from 8 to 12 as far as funding goes and how those things were prioritized by the community. This, again, is that bar graph showing the amount spent for that last segment that did all 12 of them. A greater amount was allocated, \$10, instead of \$5. This list breaks it down in that respect as well. Summaries for the overall findings. The top responses in the full ranked list matched those of each element. If you go back through and look at the top votes for each specific of the three elements, you'll find that they also filtered out as the top choices in the overall list. Integrating nature into Palo Alto parks received the highest level of funding in the overall ranking. It did get second in its element as far as its ranking in that. In the overall, that did receive the highest amount of investment by the community. A relatively small percentage of respondents chose to invest heavily, 14 percent invested more than \$2 out of their \$10 budget to improving spaces and increasing options for off-leash dog parks. Again, this is an indicator that there is definitely a strong vocal group out there that feels that this need needs to be filled. Enhancing the quality and capacity of sports fields ranked number seven overall and also received relatively large investments from a small group of respondents. Like the dog park question, this basically reveals that there is a strong core group of users that feels that those facilities need either to be enhanced or upgraded or need more of. They allocated more funding to that. 50 percent of the respondents allocated at least some funding to integrating nature into Palo Alto parks, improving and enhancing community centers and recreational spaces, and enhancing comfort and making spaces more inviting. Those three, which fall out at the top of the list, received a good amount of funding allocation for their prioritization. Again, the improving accessibility, which we talked about before, was the lowest one. That is felt that it was the lowest because of the high standard that we have right now of having many facilities available at close proximity to the majority of the residents. The real question is what do we do with these findings and how are we going to use this data. That brings us to our project and program prioritization. The survey findings will be used to inform the ranking and sequencing of future park and program projects. The overall results will be used in the ranking of projects and scoring in the overall community needs category. Within our scoring of the proposed new projects for the system, there is a column referenced by community needs, and this is one of the data sources used to provide a score to that for prioritization purposes. It will then be used again later when the projects are actually sequenced, which is another step that basically puts the projects and gives them a kind of date of when they're going to be done and performed. Of course, those items that received a higher community prioritization in this will be given more weight and score better than the projects that scored lower. If there's any questions or comments to that or if Rob wants to add anything to that.

APPROVED

Chair Lauing: I think we'll jump in with a bunch of questions. As the Chair's prerogative, I just want to talk about the numbers first. We've had basically 600 people from Palo Alto, 607, took the survey. That was over a 6-month period. They had 6 months, and we got 600. I don't know if that's good or bad, but we're still back here with—what is it? 1 percent of Palo Alto citizens that voted. I just think we have to be very cautious about prioritizing things that we're going to spend millions of dollars on. When I looked at that last thing that you had up there, a few back, you had the top six and then the second six. If that's true, then the ones who voted in the 10 percent range was like 60 people. The ones who voted in the 5 percent range were 30 people. I don't know if that's about right. Plus or minus 30 people voting on one issue is just—it wasn't a vote. It was an indicator. If we prioritize it or you prioritize it or Council reads these top five are in the—it's obvious what we want to do. It's not obvious just from this point. Let's keep the numbers in mind as we talk about tonight's comments as well as future prioritization.

Mr. Jensen: This survey joins with the information from our initial survey that we did to inform our prioritization. In that, staff has gone through and started to look at—the project team has started to look at the prioritization that is just one factor that is considered in that with all the other analysis information that is put into there. This isn't the end-all, and this is not the absolute of how we are ranking our community preferences for these prioritization. This is a data point that we are using as a reference to make sure that when we are prioritizing that we are considering this. It's not, again, the end-all thing that we are using to do that.

Chair Lauing: Commissioner Knopper.

Vice Chair Knopper: Thank you. I was actually going to say that I feel that the—to reiterate what Ed just said, it's such a small sample size with kind of contradictory results. I'm totally convinced that the people that didn't vote versus the people that did vote—it's a very gray area. I think this just needs a big asterisk, this data, next to it. It should, to your point, sort of fall in line in the big bucket of data that we have. I feel like this is a very unstable sample size with a lot of contradiction in it. I'm glad to hear that this is not the be-all end-all kind of, because it's not reliable in my opinion. Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Commissioner Cribbs, did you have comments?

Commissioner Cribbs: I was just worried about the same thing, the small size of the sample over the 6 months and sort of wondering why more people who have so many opinions in Palo Alto didn't really join in to take the survey. That was the first thing. The second thing was I agree it could be a little part of a data point, and it could be useful looking back. Did the staff take it and can you do any comparison between what your staff sees on a daily basis and what this study came up with?

1
2 Mr. de Geus: We didn't take the survey, but we are interpreting the data and affirming or
3 not affirming what we understand and what we know based on being in the community
4 and managing the parks and recreation system. We're not taking this as sort of gospel at
5 all, just as information. I would say 700-plus respondents to a survey is actually pretty
6 high. I know it's a small number compared to the population, but that is a high result on a
7 survey. It is meaningful data, I think. I think we've got to be careful certainly with it, but
8 it's meaningful.

9
10 Commissioner Cribbs: It just seems like really small to base a lot of decisions for the
11 future on. That's all. I was worried about that.

12
13 Mr. Jensen: I would say too that it is trying to devise a method that allows the
14 community to prioritize not just putting a list of projects up and going through that, but
15 getting an overall, general feeling of what the main things that funding should be spent on
16 was the idea behind this, so we can get an overall, general feeling of how funding should
17 be spent on what areas of focus to inform staff and the project team when we actually
18 started looking at the projects and programs and trying to rank them in an order or set
19 them in a calendar schedule of what was going to happen first to what was going to be
20 happening later down the line.

21
22 Commissioner Cribbs: Do you know anything about the demographics of the people who
23 took the survey other than they're Palo Alto residents or not, live and work in Palo Alto?
24 I mean in terms of age groupings.

25
26 Mr. Jensen: That was not one of the questions of the survey.

27
28 Chair Lauing: No cross tabbing or anything, so you just don't know. Commissioner
29 Moss.

30
31 Commissioner Moss: I have several comments. I sort of disagree with the weight being
32 put on the survey. The way I understand this whole process to work is that it's one of five
33 points, five factors. One is the survey. One is your day-to-day interaction with the
34 public, what they're complaining about every day. One is our input from our diverse
35 backgrounds. We're from different parts of the City, and all that kind of stuff. We're
36 supposed to be representing a good chunk of the population. We're supposed to be
37 looking at these inputs and these comments and forming our vote. That's the third one.
38 The fourth one is the City Council. We're supposed to be giving our input to the City
39 Council, but they're the ones that are going to make the final decision. They have diverse
40 viewpoints as well, and they're going to take our input and your input and the survey, etc.
41 I think the survey is fantastic for what it is. It shouldn't be the be-all end-all. The other
42 thing is that I went through the survey comments, and this is fantastic comments. We're

APPROVED

going to have a field day when we get down to the next layer which is the programs. We've only gotten down to the policies. There are many programs mentioned in here. I for one, representing my little constituency, I love a bunch of these programs, and I'm going to cheer for them going forward. I wanted to make sure that those programs had a policy to fit under. When I went through the policies, I went with that in mind. The one policy that I think is missing is that "1K" about explore options to expand access to Foothills Park. We took this too literally. We said it's either black or white, you open Foothills Park to everybody or you don't open it to everybody. I took it to mean that we could have some temporary and limited access. For instance, open house. When I read the comments from Stanford that Stanford does not have access to Foothill Park. Los Altos Hills doesn't have access. Portola Valley doesn't have access, and Los Altos doesn't have access. I think if we had an open house for Los Altos Hills or an open house for Stanford or two or three a year, that is not going to destroy Foothill Park. It's going to give us some brownie points.

Chair Lauing: What's the connection to the survey that we're discussing now? I'm just kind of missing if that's on point.

Commissioner Moss: One of the survey points was expanding our reach. It says serving Palo Alto residents, but that seems shortsighted and parochial. I would like to know if we can expand in the policies to not just think about Palo Alto, but think about our good neighbors. I have something I want in exchange. I want to make sure that the Stanford Dish stays open. Maybe if we gave them a little bit of access to Foothills Park, they wouldn't be so quick to get rid of the Stanford Dish access. That's all I wanted to say about that. I would love to put "1K" back, but make it say explore temporary and limited access of Foothill Park to others. That's my one point. My last point is that there were many things said in the comments about swimming pools and about tennis courts. Those two things were just below bathrooms and dog parks. I couldn't believe how many people said those two things, swimming pools and tennis courts. It sort of gets lost in here. I can see where it would be under programs. You talk about quality of sports fields, but it doesn't talk about swimming pools and tennis courts and things like that. It really is included in there, I think. I'm just not sure, but I think it's in there. I want to make sure that we look at these comments thoroughly and try to find a policy to stick them under.

Chair Lauing: Other comments? No. Thank you.

Mr. de Geus: Can I bring something up, Chair?

Chair Lauing: Sure.

APPROVED

1 Mr. de Geus: We're moving to and working on the projects and programs as the next
2 step. You saw the long list that MIG first came up with, needed a lot of work. We've
3 been working on it with them. As we prepare for bringing that back in May for the
4 Commission to look at, one thing that we're struggling with a little bit is the policy,
5 program and how they nest together. You may recall last time we talked, Commissioner
6 Reckdahl asked if every program has to fit with a policy. We weren't quite sure on the
7 answer to that. I think at the time I said, "Not necessarily. A program could fit directly
8 to a goal." As we've been working on the projects and programs and trying to format it in
9 a way that really makes sense and try and create some consistency with the
10 Comprehensive Plan and the Urban Forest Master Plan, that would be inconsistent to
11 have programs that don't relate to a policy. We haven't come to a final conclusion on
12 this, but it is likely that we might revert and go back to sort of the structure of the Comp
13 Plan and the other Master Plans that the Council is used to seeing and have programs
14 really nest under policies. If we do that, it's likely we will need to add some additional
15 policies if they're not fully representative of the goal. We know there's a couple of areas
16 where we think that exists. That's something that we're looking at, and we'll bring that
17 back in May to talk more about as we bring the first draft of the projects and programs.
18 Does that make sense to everyone?

19
20 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Reckdahl.

21
22 Commissioner Reckdahl: A question actually. I looked through some of these comments
23 too. There's one in here about Arastradero Park. Someone said they're old and they
24 wished there was more benches. We had talked about this and put it on hold until after
25 the Master Plan to see whether we could have benches or picnic tables or something like
26 that in Arastradero. Are we evaluating that? Will the Master Plan address that? We put
27 it on hold specifically because the Master Plan was going to address that.

28
29 Daren Anderson: In the interim, I've had conversations with Director de Geus, and he
30 explained that it's really an interpretation of that prior Council decision. He's directed
31 staff to proceed with some limited benches in Pearson-Arastradero that won't
32 fundamentally alter that direction that Council provided. The picnic tables is a little bit
33 different and probably something that would be better addressed by the Master Plan and
34 bears a little further discussion and thought, because it does change the use. As soon as
35 you bring in something like picnic tables, there's trash and other amenities that affect
36 wildlife, an already over-burdened parking lot and other dimensions to that preserve. The
37 park bench less so and more just a typical feature you find. We're already moving on
38 that.

39
40 Commissioner Reckdahl: Good. Was the issue that they didn't like the look of park
41 benches?

1 Mr. Anderson: It wasn't the look. It was that this should be a low-amenity nature
2 preserve and not to duplicate other amenities at nearby parks. For example, you wouldn't
3 have a boating lake like you have at Foothills Park. It would be inconsistent with the
4 direction Council had given. We've interpreted the low-amenity, low-use as part of the
5 reason why the parking lot was designed the way it was. I'm sure funds were part of it.
6 As you build a bigger parking lot, of course, more people come and it changes the use of
7 the preserve.

8
9 Commissioner Reckdahl: Is the Master Plan going to address the parking at Arastradero?
10

11 Mr. Anderson: That's a good question. I'm not sure; I'll have to get back to you on that.
12

13 Commissioner Reckdahl: If we have these questions that are kind of put on hold, do we
14 just wait until the Master Plan is done? If it's not addressed in there, then we just take
15 them up? I'm not sure exactly how (crosstalk).
16

17 Mr. Anderson: I haven't had a chance to discuss this with Rob or other staff, but I believe
18 the parking one is a bigger issue. It's a big capital issue as well. To fix that, it's not
19 simply bringing in more rock and grading it out. It's far more elaborate than that. The
20 implications of expanding that parking lot affect the preserve, affect the wildlife, affect
21 the whole experience of it. It probably bears consideration that comes with the CCP, that
22 Comprehensive Conservation Plan. We've got that slated for FY '19. That's to do
23 Foothills, Pearson-Arastradero and Esther Clark. It seems to me an appropriate one for
24 that more so than the quick look that the Parks Master Plan would give to that parking lot,
25 because of the influence that that would have on wildlife. I don't think the Parks Master
26 Plan could possibly get into that in-depth look.
27

28 Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you.
29

30 Chair Lauing: The next agenda item is to review ad hoc committee and liaisons.
31

32 Mr. de Geus: There was one more slide to the last item that I don't think we went over.
33 Peter.
34

35 Mr. Jensen: We started moving back into the other slides. The final slide for this is the
36 next steps. For the May PRC meeting, we are planning on bringing back the project and
37 programs development to review. That, again, is what Rob was touching on before. That
38 could have some policy impacts we will discuss further. We are also developing the site
39 concept plans which we are planning to unveil to the community for their review and
40 bring that back with their comments for your review as well. That meeting is planned for
41 next month, May, before your PRC meeting. We're also having a City Council study
42 session which has been in the works and is going to be in June now. That will discuss

1 these goals, policies and programs that we're putting together, so the Council has an
2 initial look before it actually goes into a rough draft of the Master Plan itself. The other
3 aspects of it are the draft Master Plan, summer of '16, starting to be developed right now.
4 Staff will review that and then bring that to the PRC for review. Hopefully approval of
5 the Master Plan in the fall of 2016 is our current schedule for that.

6
7 Commissioner Hetterly: I just have a couple of questions. In the final Master Plan, are
8 the site concept plans intended to incorporate the recommended projects and program
9 projects? This version that's coming in May does not, because we haven't done that yet,
10 the projects. Or does it? That's (inaudible) question.

11
12 Mr. Jensen: It does. I guess putting those things together are one and the same. The site
13 concept plans show specifically where the projects are going to be. The project list that
14 will come with that recognizes that there's a specific project of whatever it is, volleyball
15 courts. Then the site plans show where in specific parks that those are proposed to be
16 located at. I think when we saw the original list of however many there were, 400 and
17 something projects and programs, when you started to take that out and condense it, you
18 could get down to the projects being a short list of between 20 and 30 things. When you
19 started to underneath each of one those things add each park that they were going to be at,
20 that's how the list itself got expanded. Graphically as we're showing that, we'll talk about
21 the specific projects that made the list and then refer to the specific parks that they've
22 been referred to or proposed at. They work together.

23
24 Commissioner Hetterly: That is presented to the community, and that's sort of your war
25 room idea where they have an opportunity to come and look at the maps on the wall and
26 say, "I like this. I don't like this." Is it presented to them as these are all the projects we
27 want to include in the Master Plan? Is it presented as these are the projects that are going
28 through some process of prioritization, what do you think of them? That then feeds into
29 the final decision making or is the decision making basically already done and you're
30 putting it in the site plans to throw out to the community?

31
32 Mr. Jensen: It's the proposed, I guess, draft plans of recognizing which parks these
33 specific things would be placed at, and then allowing the community to comment on
34 them as a process of vetting those things.

35
36 Commissioner Hetterly: That would kind of be the final stage of your public outreach for
37 the Master Plan that will then result in refinements.

38
39 Mr. Jensen: Right.

40
41 Mr. de Geus: I would call them concept plans really. Even when we get to a finished
42 Master Plan and we go to renovate the park, we sort of in some ways start over because

APPROVED

1 we actually then meet with the community and talk about these concepts that we came up
2 with, that we felt had some real credibility, validity for that particular park, and then we
3 get into the details. We might find that some of it works, some of it doesn't, but it's a
4 good starting point for the community. I will add we've been working on this, all of those
5 concept plans, and trying to figure out where things fit, what makes sense in terms of
6 balancing the system and so on. I think this is correct. We're going to try and take
7 advantage of the May Fete Parade fair because we have so many Palo Alto residents at
8 that fair, that we want to have some of these concepts out there available for the public to
9 start looking at, so we can start having conversations about people's neighborhood parks
10 and what they think. That'll roll out throughout May. Of course, we'll have a substantive
11 discussion at the May meeting, at the Commission meeting.

12
13 Commissioner Hetterly: Thanks.

14
15 Ms. O'Kane: I'd like to point out one thing too. In the staff report, it does say that the
16 Council study session is May 16th. That's been rescheduled to June 27th. We just felt
17 like we weren't quite there yet on what we were going to present to Council, so we
18 wanted to make sure what we were presenting we were presenting in a very thoughtful
19 way and giving them enough information that would make it beneficial for them.

20
21 Commissioner Reckdahl: What was the date on that?

22
23 Ms. O'Kane: June 27th.

24
25 Commissioner Hetterly: Do you expect that we would see that staff report before our—
26 do we meet before the 27th or after the 27th?

27
28 Vice Chair Knopper: I was just going to ask. We don't have a June date on our calendar.

29
30 Commissioner Hetterly: Is it likely that that staff report for the Council would be done in
31 time for the May meeting or are we just going to see it as they see it?

32
33 Mr. de Geus: This is what I was envisioning. The May meeting is a little bit of a draft
34 test run of what we would be sharing with Council. The staff report and what we bring in
35 May will mirror a lot of what we're going to share in June with Council.

36
37 Commissioner Hetterly: Thanks.

38
39 Chair Lauing: Thank you.

5. Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates.
- Parks and Recreation Commission webpage
- Community Gardens

Chair Lauing: Now we'll go over to the ad hoc item. We just want to do ad hoc committee and liaison updates. We did some reassignments and creation of some new ones at the retreat. Just wanted to get a status so we can all kind of collectively know the probable action going forward for the rest of the year. There are a couple scheduled here, and then others are going to speak to the ones that are in process. The first on the list is the Parks and Rec Commission webpage.

Commissioner Hetterly: That's me and Catherine. As many of you know, this has been a long process with not a lot of movement. I think we had some grand plans at the beginning that the Office of Information Systems put the kibosh on at various stages, but there is a certain consistency that they want from one page to the next page. Catherine, can you put up the existing page? You had a copy in your packet, and I think Catherine sent out a link to the website so you could see what showed up. Basically what we were trying to accomplish was to have some more information upfront about what the Commission's doing and some sort of key documents and answer some key questions for folks who were wondering something about the parks or wondering about what the Commission was doing, and wanted to find it. The old way to find it was simply to—the only way you could find anything was going through every single agenda and looking at the agenda item, clicking on the packet or looking at the following month for the finalized meetings. We wanted people to be able to say, "I'm interested in dog parks. What did the Commission just do about dog parks?" and not have to go through clicking a million different things. We pulled out some of the key items. We added a third column. The current website has sort of a menu on the left side and then a single column with "this is how you apply to the Commission, here are the Commissioners, here are the agendas." This new version we added a column with all of the contact information for staff as well as how to email the Commission, how to get straight to the agenda, get straight to the video of the latest meeting as well as sort of the top couple of policy topics that are floating around. As you click on each of those policy topics, you get to a second page that—I guess I won't go there yet. The other big change aside from that right-hand column is in this agenda section. You're seeing the existing agenda section now; we changed it to instead of having just agendas and minutes listed by date, we now have the table view. You have the date, and you can click on the agenda and the packet for that date and the minutes for that date and the video for that date. You don't have to search through every one. It's a little more user friendly. On the policy topics, I think it basically gives you a little introduction to what's going on there and some links to—like for the Master Plan, it'll link to the Master Plan page. Can you click on one of those current policy document things, Catherine? Here you can see it has a little introduction. You can link to the main Master Plan page, and you can also get right upfront the latest

APPROVED

Commission discussion on that topic, and then also access the archived discussions from previous meetings. We also wanted our general policy documents on the front page. If somebody wants to know what does the Baylands Master Plan really say about that, they can access it online. The same for formal recommendations issued from the Commission to the Council. Any questions? Thanks.

Chair Lauing: I have one. What's the plan for maintenance, adds, subtracts? Everything has to be maintained.

Commissioner Hetterly: That's why we reduced our fantasies about how current everything could be. We have three current policy topics on there. Catherine is our guy for all of this stuff. Anything new we want to add or updates we want add, that falls on her. I think she felt like those three—it was manageable to keep track of those three. If we had a new discussion on that topic, she could just update the link for the latest staff report and minutes.

Chair Lauing: The plan is to add existing documents that explain the progress, not blog, orientation, commentary from a Commissioner or something.

Commissioner Hetterly: Right. The only thing we thought we would change is probably an annual update. The current policy topics at the beginning of the year at our retreat, we may say, "We don't want dog parks on there now. This is our issue of the year." You might change your policy topics, and you change the message from the Commission, so the Chair would have to write a new message every year. I think that was all that needed ongoing maintenance. Is that right, Catherine? Can you think of anything?

Chair Lauing: I just had one other one. Did you consider and then reject the idea of something like a breaking news? If we finally break ground on the golf course, to have a headline up there, not a document per se but sort of an announcement. Was that one of the fantasy items?

Commissioner Hetterly: It sort of was a fantasy item that we would have more regular updates, but the update problem got in our way. We thought rather than institutionalizing something like that, so we have a banner and people expect a new breaking news every day, that would be something that could maybe be added on a very special occasion.

Catherine Bourquin: (inaudible)

Commissioner Hetterly: Yeah. Where is that? That's on the second page? It's on the second page of your handout. What's happening in our parks clicks to a page that kind of does keep up-to-date on sort of what's the latest thing that's happening. Monroe Park just opened or whatever the issue is.

Chair Lauing: Yes, Commissioner Moss.

Commissioner Moss: You could also put something in the message from the Commission. If there was something important, you could put it in the message from the Commission. That wouldn't be that hard. Also, I'm assuming that we could add more community partners on that section there. Is that hard to do? For instance, Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space and Silicon Valley Audubon Society, they have a lot to say.

Commissioner Hetterly: We do have a lot of partners that we work with. I think these four were the ones that made the cut because we contract directly with them for City services. Right?

Ms. Bourquin: That's what I hear. (crosstalk)

Commissioner Moss: You also have ...

Commissioner Hetterly: We debated whether to include that section at all.

Commissioner Moss: You also have the School District and you have the social services and other groups. It could get pretty big.

Commissioner Hetterly: It's tricky to decide who gets listed and who doesn't get listed. We did have that question of whether that was sufficiently problematic that we shouldn't list anybody. We'd love your thoughts on that.

Chair Lauing: Any others?

Commissioner Hetterly: Yes, list them. No, don't list them. Don't list anybody, okay. Take off the community partners section.

Commissioner Moss: You could move it to a different page.

Commissioner Hetterly: I think it may be on the parks page. We can just take it off of this one.

Chair Lauing: Great. It exists. Yea.

Commissioner Hetterly: Green light.

Commissioner Moss: It's beautiful.

Ms. Bourquin: We go live, right?

Commissioner Hetterly: Yep.

Chair Lauing: Community gardens.

Vice Chair Knopper: Catherine's going to do the update because she's done all the work.

Chair Lauing: Credit where credit's due.

Ms. Bourquin: You just wanted a brief update. Basically I've just come up with explaining how many vacancies we have and so forth. Right now at Johnson there's three vacancies. We have a waiting list of 12. At Rinconada, there's 13 vacancies. Eleanor has 12. The waiting list is very, very short. We have seven to share between Eleanor and Rinconada. Right now, we're actively advertising the wait list. We're using the Enjoy!, high schools, kiosks and word of mouth. We just had an irrigation project completed ahead of schedule. Peter is here. Everyone is very, very grateful for it. Let's see. In the Ventura garden, right now it's still being managed by the Palo Alto Child Care. Discussions for management of the garden will take place sometime in June when their tenant agreement is renewed. When coordinating our Fiscal Year '17-'18 for the budget, the garden fees will be reviewed. Ventura's garden fee implementation would be phased in for that year. I think that was what you were concerned about, right?

Chair Lauing: Yeah. I just wanted to make sure we got an update on the Ventura contingent.

Ms. Bourquin: There is a project that's happening. It's called the "Migration of Monarch Butterfly," and all of our gardens are participating in it. That's about it.

Chair Lauing: Any questions to the ad hoc on that?

Vice Chair Knopper: You forgot to mention that you're starting Facebook pages, at least that was in my notes.

Ms. Bourquin: Yes. Part of working with my volunteers at the garden, we're trying to make it very—how can I say this? Right now I'm doing everything as far as emailing and stuff like that. Right now they want to do a Facebook page where we can announce workdays and things that are happening in the garden.

Chair Lauing: Make the community do some of the work. That's good. Other ...

1 Commissioner Hetterly: Can I just make a quick comment?

2
3 Chair Lauing: Sure.

4
5 Commissioner Hetterly: I just wanted to make an announcement on behalf of myself and
6 Stacey Ashland who was formerly on the website ad hoc. Catherine really worked hard
7 on this project. That included the really ugly job of going through all of those years of
8 archived minutes and figuring out which ones fit with which topic. I wanted to publicly
9 thank her for all that (crosstalk).

10
11 Chair Lauing: Thank you for bringing that up.

12
13 Ms. Bourquin: Thank you.

14
15 Chair Lauing: Are you on the next five ad hocs too? You could just keep going. Great
16 job. Commissioner Reckdahl had a few that he was going to comment on for us.

17
18 Commissioner Reckdahl: The only one with news is the Matadero Creek undercrossing,
19 the one that goes under 101. Commissioner Moss and I are on that. There was a pop-up
20 event at Matadero Creek in Midtown between Hoover and Waverley last Saturday. I
21 didn't know about it. Commissioner Moss saw that and forwarded it on, so we showed
22 up there. There was a good turnout. Mayor Burt was there, and the Planning lead, Josh
23 Mello, was there, and also some angry neighbors were there too. I think the bulk of the
24 people there were very interested in seeing the—they opened up one block of the trail.
25 People were walking back and forth on that. Overall the response was very good. There
26 were some people obviously that did not want it open, but most of the people, I think,
27 were in support of that. Mayor Burt had a nice discussion about the Matadero Creek
28 undercrossing. He was very supportive, and that was good to see. Also, we asked if the
29 trail itself slows down, can we go forward with the creek underpass by itself. He said
30 yes, he would see no problem with that. Hopefully we've gotten the ball moving, and
31 we'll get some progress on that. Did you want anything?

32
33 Commissioner Moss: Mayor Burt also mentioned that if we have trouble with the
34 utilities that we should bring that up in the City Council. They can work in ways that we
35 can't. We had the argument about the dog park. What if we want to have an ingress or
36 egress to that Matadero Creek and it's very near the utilities and they use the very good
37 argument of security, is there no way to push back? He would like to know about those
38 issues and not just keep them to ourselves.

39
40 Chair Lauing: Is there ongoing action or plans or goals for this ad hoc or is it a
41 monitoring situation now?

APPROVED

Commissioner Reckdahl: The next move is that Josh is going to be talking with the consultants and talking with the Water District and seeing if they have any issues with that. We'll circle with him. We'll get together with him shortly and keep moving. I think this will be slow going just because the Water District's involved. It's just not an issue of getting the Council in line or the staff in line. There's going to be a lot of iterations.

Chair Lauing: You were also going to mention Canopy and Baylands Athletic.

Commissioner Reckdahl: We haven't done anything on those. With the golf course opening, maybe we do start getting together at the Athletic Center. Commissioner Cowie and I are on that. When is construction going to start?

Kristen O'Kane: There's a pre-bid meeting for the golf course this Friday with the potential bidders on the project. We don't yet have the permits, but we are supposedly very close. I know you've heard that before. I believe right now it's with the agencies in their approval process. It has to go to different offices and different managers within the agencies to get approval. The pre-bid meeting is this Friday, like I said. Hopefully construction would begin this summer.

Chair Lauing: You guys will just monitor that and see if there's any action you want to take in conjunction with that.

Commissioner Reckdahl: One question about the Baylands Athletic Center. Was it a CIP that was going to resurface that parking lot and look at reconfiguration or was that ... There was some plans for that or some time table for that.

Daren Anderson: I believe it would be after the project. The JPA will be mobilizing through that parking lot. It would be the wrong time to do it in advance or during their project. At the end would be appropriate.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The timing for reconfiguring the Baylands Athletic Center would be as the golf course is finishing up, and we should be making plans of how we're going to place things and do we want to do anything or do we want to just leave the land bank as is.

Mr. Anderson: I think so, but probably in combination with wrapping up the Parks Master Plan to some degree as well.

Chair Lauing: Since you mentioned CIP, I think at this point you're on that. I rolled off it. One of the things we've got to do tonight potentially is to talk about configuration of folks on ad hocs. One of our Commissioners is not on any ad hocs yet. We don't necessarily have to do it now. There's an opening there. Let's see what other ones we

1 have. Dog parks, we can declare a victory. The Comprehensive Conservation Plan,
2 that's getting under way. It's listed as Moss with Hetterly backup right now.

3
4 Mr. Anderson: Would you like an update on where we're at?

5
6 Chair Lauing: That'd be great.

7
8 Mr. Anderson: This is a CIP; the funding will start this next fiscal year. Starting July
9 1st, we'll have funding for the Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan. We haven't
10 started work on the scope yet. That would be the next step. Right now staff is focusing
11 on obviously the Parks Master Plan and several other large CIPs including the golf
12 course. As you heard, we have the pre-bid meeting this Friday. We've got Stanford-Palo
13 Alto playing fields, which we'll start construction June 13th. This is the replacement of
14 the synthetic turf out there. Getting Buckeye Creek hydrology study up and going.
15 That'll go to Council for contract approval in June. The next step for the Baylands
16 Comprehensive Plan will be that work on the scope of work, to develop it for the RFP,
17 maybe June, July-ish. I'll outreach to the ad hoc on that one as soon as staff's ready to
18 kind of get that going and definitely involve the Commissioners that are interested.

19
20 Chair Lauing: Good. Any others that I've inadvertently left out that need to be reported
21 on? We can do some horse trading to get you on one or two of these.

22
23 Commissioner Cribbs: I had sent a note about the Baylands and also (inaudible) ...

24
25 Chair Lauing: Turn your mike on.

26
27 Commissioner Cribbs: I had sent a note back about both the Baylands and also gyms, a
28 sort of joint use facility.

29
30 Chair Lauing: Jim is on gyms. You could join on that one.

31
32 Commissioner Cowie: That would be awesome. Terrific.

33
34 Chair Lauing: The one other thing that I thought, Jim, is that you're kind of a quantitative
35 guy. You might want to look at the CIP ad hoc. If Anne is interested in Baylands, she
36 could maybe take that one, and you can move to the CIP process one. Don't necessarily
37 (crosstalk).

38
39 Commissioner Cowie: Probably worth an offline discussion, because I don't really know
40 what it would entail.

41
42 Chair Lauing: I was going to say you don't have to decide right now.

Commissioner Cowie: Yeah, but I'm open to it, absolutely.

Chair Lauing: Any other committees? If not, we can move on to the next agenda item.

V. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Lauing: Comments and announcements. I guess we just heard about the golf course, which is one that I wanted to hear about.

Kristen O'Kane: I just have a couple of announcements of some events that are coming up. This Saturday is the Great Race for Saving Water, which is a partnership this year with CSD, Community Services, as well as the Utility Department. If anyone's interested in running or walking a 5K on Saturday, we would appreciate the support. Also the May Fete Parade is coming up. You should have received an email, I believe, from Catherine asking if anyone would like to participate in the parade as a VIP. If you are interested in that, please get back to Catherine, so we can make sure that you're all set up when you arrive. Also, we are looking for someone from the Commission to be a parade judge. This would be somebody who judges the floats in the parade. If anyone is interested in serving in that role, please let me know. We will make arrangements for that as well.

Vice Chair Knopper: I built two floats, and I felt judged; therefore, I will not judge.

Chair Lauing: But you've got the resume, you have to do it.

Vice Chair Knopper: I got a blue ribbon, but I didn't win.

Commissioner Cowie: Kristen, what was the date again?

Ms. O'Kane: For the May Fete Parade?

Commissioner Cowie: Yeah.

Ms. O'Kane: It's May 7th.

Commissioner Reckdahl: For the newbies, the way it works is all the Commissions march in the parade. Last year, I guess they were separated from the Council. In past years, we've marched with the Council. You march down the street, and the kids all scream. It's like the Beatles coming to the Ed Sullivan Show. It's a good time.

Commissioner Hetterly: Parks and Rec has a tradition of exceeding the turnout of any other Commission in the City. If you can go, you should.

Rob de Geus: Arrive at 9:30. It's a lot of fun. You get a t-shirt.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What is the theme?

Mr. de Geus: It's "Happy, Healthy Habits," related to the Healthy Cities Healthy Communities priority that the Council adopted.

Chair Lauing: It's really fun. I'm going to be unfortunately out of town, so I'll break my 7-year string here. It's just really fun. Maybe not as much admiration as the Beatles, but the kids love it too. Were there other announcements? I kind of wanted to make—I'm sorry, were you not done? I kind of wanted to make an observation/announcement. I went to the duck pond last weekend. The ordinance is accomplishing nothing unfortunately. The feeding—I mean, there was a family standing at the sign throwing hot dog buns to the ducks. At the sign. Some of the stuff they were throwing was touching the sign that's clearly marked that this is bad for life in general. It raises the issue again about what can we do to occasionally enforce it so that the word gets out that you're going to get ticketed or whatever it is. It didn't accomplish its goal. It's kind of frustrating for all the time and effort that Daren and others put into it.

Mr. de Geus: Yeah. Have you seen that multiple times? I mean, could it have just been a bad day? We'll check with Daren to see ...

Chair Lauing: It could have been, because I don't go there that much. I intentionally went down there just to see what was going on. It was dreadful.

Mr. de Geus: We'll check in with Daren and the rangers.

Chair Lauing: Any other announcements?

VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR MAY 24, 2016 MEETING

Chair Lauing: Tentative agenda for the May 24th meeting which will certainly include the Master Plan. It may include the Zoo.

Kristen O'Kane: Will it include the Zoo?

Chair Lauing: The PIO.

Ms. O'Kane: Mm-hmm. Daren also mentioned the presentation we heard tonight may be coming back next week on the El Camino. That discussion on the Master Plan will be

1 significantly more, I think, in-depth next month than it was today. There will be a lot
2 more information that we'll be presenting (crosstalk).

3
4 Chair Lauing: We had to get through the survey data, so that we could all see what was
5 there. I think that's the right batting order. Other items? I'm sure there will be more.
6

7 Ms. O'Kane: One thing that I would like to bring hopefully next month is to have some
8 of our Rec staff come and present just what we're doing with teen programs, youth and
9 teen programs. We have a lot going on. We have a lot of really interesting programs that
10 we're either partnering with other organizations on or hosting. I asked them to come and
11 present to the Commission just sort of a brief summary and highlighting what they're
12 doing. I think what they're doing is really great things for the community. We'd like to
13 share those. Hopefully that will be in May.
14

15 Rob de Geus: I have one announcement that is fairly significant. We're in the budget
16 season. Our operating budget for the department is going to be reviewed by the Finance
17 Committee next week on the 5th. The Chair of the Finance Committee is right here. If
18 you're interested in that, I think it's a 6:00 start. The Finance Committee goes department
19 by department for the 2017 budget. The City Manager last night gave the overview of
20 the budget to the full City Council and gave them their books. It seemed to go quite well.
21 If you have questions or are interested in knowing more about the operating budget and
22 what's in there, you certainly can ask me. It's also posted online so you can access it.
23 We'll send you a link so it's easy to access.
24

25 **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

26
27 Chair Lauing: If there are no other items, we can entertain a motion for adjournment.
28

29 Meeting adjourned on motion by Commissioner Reckdahl and second by Commissioner
30 Cribbs at 10:03 p.m.