



APPROVED

**MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
September 27, 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:

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:

Chair Lauing: Are there any agenda changes, requests or deletions? If not, it's time for oral communications.

III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Chair Lauing: Seeing no cards or people, I think we'll pass that for now.

IV. BUSINESS:

1. Approval of Draft Minutes from August 23, 2016 Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting.

Approval of the draft August 23, 2016 Minutes as amended was moved by Commissioner Hetterly and seconded by Vice Chair Knopper. Passed 6-0 Cowie abstaining



2. Review of Aquatics Program Analysis

Chair Lauing: Next up is a review of the aquatics program analysis by staff. Who would like to introduce that? Rob.

Rob de Geus: Good evening, Commissioners. Rob de Geus, Director of Community Services. You all know Kristen O'Kane, but we also have another new staff member here, Jazmin LeBlanc. She's our new Senior Analyst, who has a working title which I still need to remember. She's like 2 or 3 months on the job now, Jazmin. She's been helping us with this review of the aquatics program. I'll just make some introductory remarks. Kristen and Jazmin will go through the presentation. I wanted to just frame this because over the last couple of years we've found that the delivery of the aquatics program, the way we're doing it now is really not meeting the needs of the residents of Palo Alto. We felt it was important to take a good hard look at how we're delivering that service and consider alternatives for how we might do a better job for the residents of Palo Alto. We're really aiming for a high quality, consistent and diverse aquatics program. We have a couple of alternatives that we're reviewing, and we're doing the evaluation this past summer mostly. We really would like to hear the Commission's thoughts on the sort of policy implications of a different delivery model and what you think that might be and what do you think is in the best interest of Palo Alto residents and what they might hope is the outcome of a study like this. Ultimately, we'll be going to Council, hopefully in the fall with a recommendation. Your input will be extremely helpful. With that, I'll pass it on to Kristen.

Kristen O'Kane: Good evening. Kristen O'Kane, Community Services. Jazmin and I are going to share this presentation tonight. I'm going to start out by just probably telling you things you already know about our aquatics program. Currently, the City of Palo Alto's aquatics program offers adult lap swim, which is year round; family recreation swim; learn to swim; swim lessons; and facility rentals for private pool parties. Those last three are only offered in the summer. Family rec swim and learn to swim is offered at the City-owned Rinconada pool but then also at JLS Middle School pool, which we lease from the School District. We also have two partner firms that operate the youth competitive swim team as well as the adult masters swim team. Those are partnerships that are run by a third party. Rob touched on this a bit. We were faced with some severe staffing issues. Back in 2015 we were faced with a difficulty of hiring and retaining aquatics staff to operate and run our summer swim program, so we had to take some immediate measures to handle that. We also learned from residents, and we've been hearing this for quite some time, that residents want more access to the pool. They want a longer season. They want longer hours. We're also responding to that as well. The staffing shortages. Like I mentioned, summer of 2015 we were really struggling to hire and retain lifeguards and fill the shifts that we needed for lifeguarding but also for swim instructors. It was to the point where we were at risk of canceling many of our summer

APPROVED

swim lessons just due to staffing shortages. We did an emergency request for proposals to obtain a third party who could satisfy our need just for that summer. We did that and had a successful summer. Following that, we continued to have shortages, and actually some of our full-time staff, our aquatics recreation coordinator, had to fill in for some lifeguarding, which resulted in overtime as well as it's not the best use for him to be at the pool lifeguarding. Another thing that we've learned over the past couple of years is that there's really an increased demand for our aquatics programs, for our swim lessons, for our family recreation swim. Both in 2015 and 2016, we've had a lot of classes that have been full or wait-listed. Half of our youth swim lessons in 2015 were either full or there was a waiting list for them. This past summer 30 percent of our classes were wait-listed or full. We've done some surveys, one very recently, where we asked recent participants of the swim lessons program, which is really the parents of the participants of swim lesson, if they would like to have an extended season for swim lessons, have additional lessons in the fall and the spring. 70 percent of the respondents said yes, they would like to see that offered. Half of our respondents also said that they'd like to see more recreational swimming opportunities offered by the City. In response to this feedback, what staff has identified as our objectives are to expand the recreational swimming season; adjust and add hours for the lap swim and recreational swimming outside of the 9:00 to 5:00 hours; and then also expand the swim lesson season and provide evening and weekend lessons as well. In fall of 2015, staff went to the Finance Committee with a recommendation that we go out for an RFP to explore the option of a long-term contract. We addressed in the one summer of 2015, and what we decided to do was will there be interest and what would it look like if we did a long-term contract with someone. It was more of an exploratory phase at the time. This then went to Council in winter of 2015 and was subsequently approved. We went out for an RFP, and we got two firms that responded. When we did the RFP, we made it very broad. Respondents could bid on one or more options. If someone just wanted to do lifeguarding, they could bid on that. If someone wanted to do lifeguarding and learn to swim classes, they could do that as well. We also included the youth competitive swim team and the masters team in that proposal. I'm going to turn it over to Jazmin now to discuss the results of the RFP.

Jazmin LeBlanc: Thanks. I'm Jazmin, a new employee with CSD. We reviewed that RFP. We received two responses, evaluated both and chose to proceed with Team Sheeper's bid, which was an extensive bid to cover all of the program areas at the pool. Team Sheeper's bid not only met the City's need to provide swim lessons without running into staffing shortages, but it also provides an enhanced level of service with increased pool hours and new programs. We also looked at several other options for pool management: Team Sheeper's bid; continuing the status quo; expanding our in-house lap and rec swim hours while contracting out the swimming lesson portion of the program, which has been the hardest part to fill staffing-wise; and looking at what it would take for us to provide in-house programming that has a more expanded recreational and lap swimming program and also has the swim lessons that residents are demanding. We

APPROVED

1 looked at these four options using the three criteria that you can see here: City and
2 customer costs; quality of service and customer satisfaction; and diversity of
3 programming and accessibility. On the first note, you can see City costs projected in
4 Year 1 for these four options. The alternative that is fully contracted out, that's Number
5 2, is the option that has the lowest General Fund impact. Team Sheeper proposed a 90/10
6 revenue split, where they would give the City 10 percent of their revenues throughout the
7 year. Sheeper expects that the revenue share would—the split would stay the same, but
8 we would likely see increased revenues after the first year as more and more customers
9 begin using the pool. Contracting just swimming lessons has the second lowest impact
10 on the General Fund, but it does not provide the same level of programming as
11 Alternative 2. It does expand the lap and recreational swim season by several additional
12 weeks, but it doesn't add more swimming lessons where Sheeper does offer more lessons
13 plus several other programs. The full in-house alternative is more expensive than these
14 first two options. A large factor for that is that we recommend adding another staff
15 person, a Community Services manager, who can really help to provide sufficient
16 oversight if we want to enhance what we're offering in-house. We also would
17 recommend, if we're going to go with an in-house option, that we increase lifeguarding
18 salaries, because that's one of the things that we've identified as causing our staffing
19 shortages. We think that would help. As you can see, the status quo is actually what we
20 project to be the most expensive option. This is looking at budgeted figures. It estimates
21 a lot less revenue than you'll see in the other options, because it doesn't have that
22 expanded season, it doesn't have expanded lessons, and it's not using the staffing
23 strategies that Team Sheeper's model proposes. We tried to replicate in the in-house
24 changed versions for 1 and 3. In customer costs, you'll also see some big differences. On
25 the in-house versions we did not propose any changes to the lap or rec swim prices, and
26 we didn't modify prices for masters or youth swimming programs. Team Sheeper
27 proposed prices that would match the price structure that they have in place at Burgess
28 pool, which is essentially not different for drop-in lap and recreational swim users. It's
29 also not different for masters swimmers. In this model, Team Sheeper would manage
30 PASA as a subcontractor. They may possibly want to have lane fee increases at some
31 point in the future, but that's not part of what we were looking at, and it's not part of their
32 plan at this point. The other thing that we'd want to note about lap and recreational
33 swimming is that right now at Rinconada pool you can purchase ten packs of tickets,
34 which reduce the gate prices in some cases relatively dramatically. About 40 percent of
35 rec and lap swim users utilize the ten-pack program, so they would see a price increase
36 under the Team Sheeper; however, Team Sheeper also offers a monthly pass program.
37 For heavy users of the pool, people who are going 12 or more times a month, they would
38 actually see their prices drop compared to what they're paying now at the pool. On to
39 lessons. We also looked pretty extensively at swimming lessons, youth swim lessons,
40 across these four options. In Alternatives 1 and 3, we propose increasing—those are the
41 in-house versions where we sort of ramp things up a bit. In-house, we would propose
42 increasing swim lesson prices to be a little bit more in line with what we identified as

APPROVED

benchmark comparisons for other public pool facilities in the area. Right now, our swim lessons come out to be about \$11 per lesson. This would raise it to about \$13 for group lessons. Team Sheeper has a significantly higher rate than that, where they're offering lessons at about \$22 per lesson. This is the middle of the range for private operators of swim lessons in the area. It's a bit different. Where we've historically compared ourselves with public facilities, they're comparing themselves with other private offerings. They offer a fee reduction program, and they're willing to offer a similar fee reduction program in Palo Alto. In the fee reduction program for people with low income, the prices drop about 66 percent, so it's pretty dramatic. They've also offered, if we want to subsidize a little, if we do want to go with Team Sheeper, they've offered to raise their prices to \$18 in the first year rather than \$22, so that it's a little bit less of a heavy impact on residents. If we were to do that, they would want the \$4 price difference to be subsidized by the City in that case. We have a policy question here. Do we feel like the increasing lesson prices will lead to fewer residents enrolling their children in the learn to swim program? If so, are there options that we can explore to alleviate that? When we looked at quality of service and customer satisfaction, we found that both Team Sheeper and the City have received generally high customer satisfaction ratings from users; although, they have really different lesson strategies. The City has modeled its lesson program on the Red Cross water safety program, which emphasizes safety and comfort in the water. Team Sheeper also emphasizes safety and comfort in the water, but really goes beyond that and has innovating programming where they are trying to make sure that every students in their lessons has the opportunity to perfect the swim strokes. Should they want to, they can move into competitive swimming in the future. Because they're offering year-round swim lessons, they're able to get professionals who really know their stuff with regard to swim lessons, and they also offer this deck manager program where, in addition to a person in the pool with the children, they have another person who's sort of roaming and providing additional oversight. Sheeper's program is flexible with make-up lessons available, a simple process for changing schedules for lessons. Like I said, with the year-round programming, kids can start at any time and continue their progress until their family decides they no longer need it. Team Sheeper's programming is much more expensive than the City's current offerings, but we have another question. Do we feel like this innovative lesson philosophy will lead to better outcomes? The final criteria that we looked at was the diversity of programming and accessibility. Alternative 2, Team Sheeper's proposal, offers the biggest increase in programming. As I mentioned, they offered not just increasing the number of swimming lessons at different times of the year and day as well as the increased lap and recreational swim access, they also proposed swim camps, aqua fitness programs, triathlon team, water polo and therapeutic aquatics, to name a few. Their expanded hours, we think, will increase pool access to users who would like to use the pool on evenings and weekends and recreational users who are looking for access outside of summer months. In Alternatives 1 and 3—those are the sort of enhanced City options—we also looked to expand recreational and lap swim hours but are not proposing to offer those additional

APPROVED

1 programs such as the swim camps that I mentioned. The other thing we wanted to
2 mention here is that Team Sheeper really maximizes, especially if you look at Burgess
3 pool, the use of the pool, which leads to more customers at the pool, which is great but
4 also a double-edged sword. On the one hand, there are more people using the pool, and
5 we're getting greater community access. On the other hand, current pool users will have
6 more people to share their swim lanes with. This kind of leads to our final question
7 around the criteria. Do we feel like a higher level of programming at the pool will lead to
8 higher or lower customer satisfaction? Thank you so much for listening to this
9 presentation. We'd really appreciate to hear your thoughts around these key policy
10 implications and which alternative will result in the greatest value and highest and best
11 use of Rinconada pool for Palo Alto residents. Your input will inform our analysis and
12 recommendation to Council. Thanks.

13
14 Chair Lauing: Do you want feedback on these two specific bullet points? Is that a good
15 way to organize the discussion?

16
17 Mr. de Geus: Yes, I think that would be great to do it that way. I like that picture up
18 there, because the impact's also going to be on the customer base. There's a young
19 swimmer watching and wondering what we're going to do in the aquatics program.

20
21 Chair Lauing: How many takes did you have to have to get that shot right? Who would
22 like to start?

23
24 Commissioner Cribbs: I would be happy to start.

25
26 Vice Chair Knopper: I was going to say let the swim expert go (crosstalk).

27
28 Commissioner Cribbs: The swimmer will start.

29
30 Chair Lauing: I think that's a pretty good place to start.

31
32 Commissioner Cribbs: First of all, I'm very happy to see this report and to see some of
33 the things that you're suggesting, just because the old swimmer in me thinks about going
34 by Rinconada, which I do very often, and seeing during the winter time empty, not used
35 pools. That really is not a good thing, because every other pool, I mean broad statement,
36 is over-packed, jammed and should be used 24 hours a day almost, at least from 6:00 in
37 the morning to 9:00 at night. It's good that we're looking at this. That's the first thing.
38 The four different alternatives are very interesting. We obviously can't afford to do the
39 status quo. That's probably not acceptable, I would think, to the staff and to the Council.
40 That leaves three left. Of the three, I can see that Team Sheeper is very attractive and
41 very interesting, because there are professionals really managing and focusing on the
42 program with the latest swim techniques and the latest ways of doing things. That's a

APPROVED

1 good thing. However, I'm very concerned specifically about the cost of the swimming
2 lessons, because I feel like one of the things that we all need to do is to make sure that we
3 give our kids the opportunity to learn to swim, because drowning is such a high cause of
4 death among teenagers, even in Palo Alto. It's really scary and serious. Even though
5 Palo Alto's supposed to have a lot of money, there are families here who will find this
6 very difficult to afford \$22 for one single lesson. As a detail, I would be in favor of
7 raising the private lessons but not the group lessons. The other comment that I have is
8 that I'm concerned about the longstanding relationships that we have all had in Palo Alto
9 with both Palo Alto Swim Club, which I believe was found in the 1950s, if I'm not
10 mistaken, and has been at Rinconada ever since, and also Rinconada Masters that was
11 found sometime in the '70s. I just want to make sure that if those programs aren't
12 working, then we obviously should look at them. If they're working and we're just going
13 in a different direction, I'd like to hear more conversation about that. I have some little
14 detail questions as I went through here, but I think those are my big comments for now.

15
16 Mr. de Geus: Just on that last point, Commissioner Cribbs, we were sort of expecting
17 that we would have the masters and PASA bid on their part of the pool operation for the
18 competitive swim or the masters. What in fact happened is Team Sheeper and PASA and
19 the masters got together and talked amongst one another about how they might work
20 together. They sort of proposed altogether. I think they're all sort of excited about being
21 able to do that and improve all of the programs, both masters and PASA, with Team
22 Sheeper.

23
24 Commissioner Cribbs: That's a good thing, but how would that work actually? How
25 would they manage that? What would be the reporting relationship? Who collects the
26 money? How does that all happen? Maybe it's details that you don't know yet.

27
28 Mr. de Geus: In an alternative where we have one contract with Team Sheeper, then
29 those two organizations would subcontract to Team Sheeper. Our relationship would be
30 with one organization. One of the alternatives is where Team Sheeper just does the swim
31 lesson program, which is what we did this last summer and the summer prior. We have a
32 contract with them for that, and we have a separate contract with Carol McPherson for
33 the masters program and another contract with the competitive swim program, PASA,
34 and then we retain the lifeguard program. That's how it's currently working.

35
36 Commissioner Cribbs: I appreciate that. I just wanted to mention this kind of
37 longstanding relationship especially with Palo Alto.

38
39 Mr. de Geus: It's a good point. Team Sheeper, I think, wants to maximize the pool and
40 get lots of activity and diversity of swimming in there. What will that mean for the
41 masters program and PASA? Will they be able to retain the same amount of pool time as

1 they have today? Probably not. That's true for everyone that goes to the pool under a
2 Team Sheep model. There's going to be a lot more sharing needed.

3
4 Commissioner Cribbs: You know if you ask anybody who's a swimmer that they always
5 need more water, more water, more lanes, more this.

6
7 Mr. de Geus: Right, and that's a tradeoff.

8
9 Commissioner Cribbs: Is there an opportunity, if you decided to do the Team Sheep or
10 even the other alternatives, that you could look at keeping the pool open year round and
11 not closing it in the end of October and opening it in the first of April? I would love to
12 see winter swimming. I think the people in this area would come and go swimming in
13 the winter time.

14
15 Mr. de Geus: We can look at doing that. Heating the pool during the winter is costly.
16 There's a certain number of months where we'd—we'd have to look at that. We would be
17 open to that. We want to see greater access to the pool that makes sense for the public.

18
19 Commissioner Cribbs: I could go on, because you could drop the temperature a little bit
20 and people would be okay with that. You could have a bubble over the pool. We could
21 build another 25-yard pool, but that's in the Master Plan so that's for later. I'll stop now.

22
23 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Knopper.

24
25 Vice Chair Knopper: Thank you. I just had a couple of questions. I did like Alternative
26 2. It just made sense to me to provide more opportunities for people to swim is really
27 great. I concur with everything Commissioner Cribbs just said. She's obviously at a
28 much higher expert level in this area than I am. My first question is we get
29 approximately, if I remember when I read this, 1,300 resident users and like 440
30 nonresident users. Correct?

31
32 Ms. LeBlanc: For swimming lessons?

33
34 Vice Chair Knopper: It was in the report. Was it just users of the pool or was it—here.
35 Approximately 1,330 residents use a ten pack at some point per year and 443
36 nonresidents use. Is capacity at the pool—this is really a capacity question before I ask
37 the money question. Is it too much capacity for the pool if we changed it to just residents
38 only, if we're over capacity? If we're adding all these other programs and you don't want
39 to edge out the Rinconada masters and PASA is obviously very rich, and they have all
40 their competitive stuff. It's a question. Is that something that we should entertain? I
41 don't know. The pricing just like a dollar or two based on all of the other cities, I don't
42 think that would be an impact. The private pricing is a concern. I think private lessons,

APPROVED

1 especially when you have a new swimmer, there's tremendous value to having a one-on-
2 one lesson. Even though I do like the fact that they offer 66 percent off for finance
3 reduction. You've had a lot of positive feedback from Team Sheeper, so it makes sense
4 to me that they would be a really great vendor to use, which would support what you're
5 looking for with regard to an alternative. I guess that's all I wanted to say. It's really this
6 resident/nonresident. I think this is sort of what we go through with some of the Foothills
7 Park or whatever. Do we want to kind of go down that path especially if we have one
8 pool? I do like the idea of winter swimming. I think it's fantastic exercise, especially
9 with the Master Plan where we're trying to do more senior. A lot of people who are older
10 swim in the winter because things hurt. After you swim, it feels a little better. We're
11 trying to enrich that. I'll shut up, I swear. Also in the Master Plan we're talking about in
12 our later report that private/public opportunities. Would this be an opportunity for us,
13 because I think it would, to try to find some sort of private sponsorship, somebody to help
14 us offset? I don't know. Like going to the swimming vendors, like Speedo or TYR, I
15 don't know. Right? Is that how they say it?

16
17 Commissioner Cribbs: Those are vendors.

18
19 Vice Chair Knopper: Say would you offset—sometimes they like to do that, because
20 they want people to wear their gear and they do pop-up shops or whatever. Like, do we
21 have an opportunity to offset our costs if the City has to make a differential payment or
22 something? I don't know. I'm done.

23
24 Ms. LeBlanc: Thank you. I'll start with capacity. The capacity is really mostly a
25 problem on warm summer weekends, when we have the pool open roughly from 11:30
26 until 4:00 and 500 people want to use the pool all in a very short time period. I think if
27 we were to expand the hours, we'd actually ease up capacity quite a bit. If you go over
28 to—I'm a resident of Palo Alto and a mother. I go to Burgess pool and I go to Rinconada
29 pool quite a bit. Burgess pool is open, I think, from 10:00 a.m. until at least 7:00 p.m.
30 On the same day when I get turned away at Rinconada, I can go to Burgess, and they
31 have the capacity just because people are spreading themselves out over the day. I think
32 we would help a lot in that case. The other thing I'll say is if we are going to go with the
33 contracted model, Team Sheeper put a lot of thought into how many lanes they dedicate
34 to swimming lessons versus lap swim versus their masters program versus the youth
35 swimming. They really have tried to make sure that they're getting as many people in as
36 they can without overburdening any particular group. They do that by offering just such
37 a long day. They also are proposing to do a year-round swim program. They wanted to
38 do it in both the round pool and the lap pool. We already heat the lap pool all year round,
39 so there isn't an added cost for heating the pool if we go with a year-round program there.
40 We don't heat the round pool all year round now, and we don't have a cover. I
41 investigated the price. Public Works manages the gas and water and chlorine bills there.
42 It would be a pretty dramatic increase; I think it was about \$60,000 more to heat the

APPROVED

1 round pool in the winter rather than just heating it through the end of October and starting
2 it up again in the middle of April. That's a question if we would want to spend the money
3 on that or not. In terms of the prices, the other issues that we ran into with Team Sheeper
4 is they really see the user base at Burgess pool and the user base at Rinconada as almost
5 the same. The pools are not very far apart. As I mentioned, I'm one of those people who
6 goes to both pools. They don't want to have a dramatically different pricing structure at
7 Rinconada than Burgess, because they would just see people shift their use from one of
8 their pools to another. That's where we do have some trouble negotiating the prices a lot.
9 There may be some willingness to at least for a year or 2 years, 3 years kind of ease into
10 increasing prices should we want to go with them. I meant to mention this during the
11 presentation. Despite the fact that they're so much more expensive per lesson, they
12 actually are able to do about 15 times more lessons in Burgess pool than we're doing in
13 Rinconada pool right now. It is a big price hit. Because they're able to cover their costs,
14 they're not subsidizing each and every lesson, they're able to get a lot more students into
15 their programs. That's another consideration.

16
17 Mr. de Geus: Just to add one thing to that, Jazmin. We would still expect to have
18 resident registration be a lower cost than nonresidents and also to have advance
19 registration for residents particularly for the spring and summer swim lesson programs.
20 If there's enough residents that need swim lessons, they could fill up all the capacity. To
21 your question about if we were just to support residents alone, residents do get that initial
22 advantage.

23
24 Commissioner Cribbs: I was just thinking that if you could mitigate the cost by just
25 having a lower fee—I understand what Team Sheeper is saying. You can't have two
26 different prices in two same places. If you could do it by just controlling and having it be
27 for Palo Alto residents, I just think it's our obligation. That's really too expensive. To
28 provide cheaper, less expensive lessons.

29
30 Chair Lauing: Were you done with your responses to Commissioner Knopper? Other
31 Commissioners? Commissioner Moss.

32
33 Commissioner Moss: I have several comments. One more thing about the pricing. If
34 there was some way to add to your Alternative 2 a scholarship or something like that,
35 maybe \$20,000, \$30,000 worth of scholarships, it might address what she's talking about.
36 I also like the idea of significantly reducing it for residents. I think it's way more
37 expensive. It's so expensive that I wonder if you charged \$18 an hour instead of \$13 an
38 hour how much more competitive would Hybrid 1 or 3 be if you charged more. When I
39 saw that the ten pack for instance was going to go up 50 percent for adults, 50 percent for
40 infants—this is residents—and 80 percent for seniors, that's a real shock. I think you
41 really need to look at the pricing and maybe beef up your Alternative 1 and 3 a little bit
42 and also offer some scholarships or, like Commissioner Knopper said, get some

APPROVED

1 sponsorship or some pop-ups or something like that to reduce the costs. I think that's
2 really important. The other thing is the swimming strategies, the teaching strategy of
3 Team Sheep. Somewhere I read that it's "not as fun," and second of all I heard that they
4 would do away with the ability to have four or five lessons in a row in a week. In other
5 words, if the family's on vacation and they would like to spend the whole week learning
6 to swim, they can't do it because the model is every week on Tuesday at 4:00 for as many
7 weeks as you want ad infinitum. That's a different model. I know that I as a parent
8 would not—it has some appeal, but I like the other model as well. When they say not as
9 fun, when you talked about the pre-competitive, 90 percent of the kids are not going to—
10 a large percentage are not going to want to be pre-competitive, but they're going to want
11 the safety, they're going to want to learn to swim, and they're going to want to have fun
12 because they want to be able to do it for the rest of their life. I know we burned out one
13 of our kids. At least two survived, but the third one didn't. Anyway, it's important for
14 some kids to have fun. That's the customer satisfaction question that you had between
15 the two. The other thing was about sharing the space. I think if you spread out the hours,
16 you're going to be able to share the space a little bit more. The last thing I wanted to
17 mention was hiring students. I think it's really, really important that we have some clause
18 in the Team Sheep that even though most of their hiring going to be full-time,
19 permanent employees, that you have a certain percentage, especially in the summer, be
20 students. If you don't have enough students, fine. I think if you have a base number of
21 students, I think it's really important for the students and for the kids and also for the City
22 to have that as an option. That is all for now.

23
24 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Reckdahl.

25
26 Commissioner Reckdahl: I too was taken aback by the large increase in the group rate
27 especially. If you're going to raise anything, the group rate is the entry point. I would be
28 very sensitive to that. Can you go back to Slide 9? I had some apples and oranges
29 questions. Obviously the status quo we have limited hours. When we're comparing these
30 alternatives, we don't get the same benefit from Alternative 4, which ironically is the
31 most expensive. I agree that that's a nonstarter. The other three, you mentioned that
32 Alternative 1 had less lessons. It has the amount of swimming? Can you clarify the
33 differences between these as the amount of product that the residents sees?
34

35 Ms. LeBlanc: Yes. In the in-house versions for contracting the swim lessons but nothing
36 else, Option 1, and the Alternative 3, which we do it in-house, we tried to match the level
37 of swim lesson offerings that we have had in the last several years. It doesn't increase the
38 number of lessons the way that Team Sheep's contracted version is proposed to do.
39

40 Commissioner Reckdahl: I thought Alternative 3 had the same—we're trying to mimic
41 Alternative 2. Is that not the purpose of Alternative 3?
42

APPROVED

1 Ms. LeBlanc: We're trying to mimic it at least with regard to the lap and rec swim hours.
2 What we've come to understand is that it's been really a struggle to get the instructors we
3 need for the swim lessons. At least initially we would probably try to just maintain or
4 maybe increase lesson offerings a bit. The other issue is that the lessons are very heavily
5 subsidized. For each lesson, it actually kind of is a hit to the General Fund. There's a
6 cost-benefit analysis to adding ...

7
8 Commissioner Reckdahl: Can you give an estimate of how many hours of lap swim each
9 of these alternatives have and how many hours of swim lessons each one has?

10
11 Ms. LeBlanc: Yes. Let me pull up my file. I have it in my head that the rec swim hours
12 are 56 hours a week in the summer. For anything where we expand our offerings and
13 that's the same as Sheep's.

14
15 Commissioner Reckdahl: That's rec. Is that just rec or is that rec and lap?

16
17 Ms. LeBlanc: Rec and lap.

18
19 Commissioner Reckdahl: For all three of those options, we have 56 hours a week for lap
20 and rec. How many hours a week do we have for lessons on these three?

21
22 Ms. LeBlanc: Sorry. I printed out a lot of information, and I didn't print this one.
23 Actually I know where I can get it.

24
25 Mr. de Geus: I can add something while Jazmin's looking at this. In discussions with
26 Team Sheeper for Alternatives 2 and 3, if we were to expand the program in-house, we
27 wouldn't lock into a schedule for multiple years. As we expand the program, we would—
28 we would write this into a contract with Team Sheeper as well, because ultimately we
29 must satisfy the customer base. We would adapt and adjust as we go. If we have not
30 enough lap swim hours, we might expand the lanes and hours. Their proposal is sort of
31 an initial schedule, but we'll be working with the community and the swimmers to see if
32 it's working. If it's not, make adjustments as we go. They're very open to that.

33
34 Ms. LeBlanc: For the weekly open hours in the summer, the enhanced program
35 recommends 79 hours of lap swim versus 39 right now; 30 hours of lap pool recreation
36 time versus 27 now; 86 hours with the round pool open versus 55 now.

37
38 Commissioner Reckdahl: You're comparing which option to now (crosstalk)?

39
40 Ms. LeBlanc: Any of the first three. We're really attempting to increase hours no matter
41 which option we go with. This is just compared to the status quo.

1 Commissioner Reckdahl: Can you start over? I missed that.

2
3 Ms. LeBlanc: It's 79 hours for lap swim versus 39; 30 hours of lap pool recreation time
4 versus 27 now; 86 hours with the round pool open versus 55 now. Those are summer
5 hours. In the non-summer seasons, the proposal is 52 hours of lap swimming versus 42
6 now; 4 hours a week of lap pool recreation time versus 0 now; and 46 hours of the
7 wading pool time versus 0 now, the round pool. Like I said, the round pool we might not
8 want to go with in January, in the dead of winter, just for the gas pricing.

9
10 Commissioner Reckdahl: The first numbers that you gave us, the 79 to 39 and 30 to 20
11 and 86 to 55, that's for all three of these?

12
13 Ms. LeBlanc: Yeah.

14
15 Commissioner Reckdahl: I thought that in your presentation you said that we didn't have
16 the same ... That's just recreation. That's not lessons though. That was the difference
17 between ...

18
19 Ms. LeBlanc: Lessons, we're proposing to try to just make the lesson timing better
20 initially. Like Rob said, if we can add more lessons in future years, we would try that.
21 This is where we've been struggling to get people.

22
23 Commissioner Reckdahl: Can you estimate—this doesn't have to be highly accurate, just
24 an estimate—the number of swim lessons that we have in 1 and 3 versus 2?

25
26 Ms. LeBlanc: Yeah. I would say in 1 and 3, the number of hours for swim lessons would
27 be about 500 probably. The number in 2 would be, I think, about—I'm not sure how this
28 works out. Right now Team Sheeper offers 1,200 lessons a week, 1,200 30-minute
29 lessons. Some of those are group; others are individual at Burgess pool. Let's say that
30 it's—I don't know—200 hours of private lessons and another 200 of group per week. Am
31 I doing this right? I'm trying to do the math on the fly here. Much greater, much greater,
32 because they're offering so many more lessons than we are.

33
34 Commissioner Reckdahl: We have 500 hours per week ...

35
36 Ms. LeBlanc: No. I think per season. We're proposing to have roughly ...

37
38 Commissioner Reckdahl: That's lane hours we're talking about.

39
40 Ms. LeBlanc: Yeah, I think so.

1 Commissioner Reckdahl: Big picture. What I'm trying to get at here for Slide 9 is 1 and
2 3 have the same amount of recreation and the same amount of open lap swim but much
3 more lower lessons.

4
5 Ms. LeBlanc: Than 2, yeah.

6
7 Commissioner Reckdahl: Than 2. The lessons are being offered by Sheeper.

8
9 Ms. LeBlanc: In alternative 1, Team Sheeper has no problem offering as many lessons as
10 we would like. The problem is our cost. Each lesson right now—for group lessons, I
11 think, we have about \$8 that we pay to Team Sheeper per individual per lesson. As we
12 add more lessons that Team Sheeper is willing to offer, we have to pay that unless we're
13 going to raise our prices. They're contract states that they get \$20 per child per lesson,
14 and we're charging \$11. Nine, not \$8.

15
16 Commissioner Reckdahl: Go to Slide 11 please. If we look at these numbers, if we
17 added more lessons to Alternative 1 to try and match the number of lessons in Alternative
18 3, how much more is that? Is that another \$20,000 or another \$200,000?

19
20 Ms. LeBlanc: It's a lot, yeah. If you look at Alternative 1, the line that says contract fees
21 is all lesson prices. That's paying for Team Sheeper to provide those lessons. It doesn't
22 account for the revenue that we get from the lessons. The cost isn't actually \$265,000.
23 It's net, but it is going to be about \$9 per lesson for each person doing the lesson. I want
24 to say that'd be about \$90,000 for how many people we have enrolled.

25
26 Commissioner Reckdahl: This is hard to compare because we're comparing options and
27 costs, but we get different—you're comparing a Mercedes to a Yugo. It's hard to judge
28 what's the best value. I'll move on to my other questions. I still am not happy with the
29 data.

30
31 Ms. LeBlanc: I'm just looking at the modeling that I did. I estimated that we would have
32 about 1,100 swim lesson enrollments under the in-house options, and Team Sheeper had
33 proposed that they would have about 4,600. It is a big difference between the options and
34 possibly something where we would want to look at what that cost would be, were we to
35 try to add as many lessons as Team Sheeper is proposing.

36
37 Mr. de Geus: Commissioner Reckdahl, we're not asking the Commission to help make
38 the decision this evening. We'll be coming back next month. If there's additional
39 information that you just—I have some of the same questions. If we can tease those out,
40 then we can work on those and bring them back next month.

APPROVED

Commissioner Reckdahl: That would be useful. The two options I see is to have Hybrid Number 1, where we still do the lap swim, but we just boost up the number of lessons that we hire Sheeper for. It'd be really nice to compare 1 and 2 with an equal number of lessons. A 2B would be how much—if we wanted to say all Palo Alto residents get \$16 lessons instead of \$22, how much would that balloon Option 2 up to? Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Did you have other questions.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I have a couple more questions here. When we talked about Sheeper's concentration on strokes, what are they giving up if they're spending more time on strokes? I don't know how swim lessons work. What is a typical swim lesson, and what are they omitting so they can do more stroke work?

MS. LeBlanc: I think a big factor is just the kind of caliber of the instructors. As we mentioned, there's a lot of full-time instructors. I'll let you weigh in.

Chair Lauing: We have a resident expert here.

Commissioner Cribbs: I would just say that the Red Cross lessons do teach you how to be safe in the water. I assume that Sheeper's lessons will concentrate on the four basic swimming strokes, the competitive strokes, freestyle, backstroke, butterfly and breast stroke, not necessarily in that order, and prepare kids for not only swimming on a swim team but being able to go into water polo, being able to go into synchronized swimming and all of that kind of thing. It's not that much different from Red Cross, because there are wonderful levels in Red Cross. They do do a great job. I think the changes that the instructions most likely who are getting kids ready for competitive swimming have a lot more knowledge that lifeguards who are coming in for the summer. Having said that, my first swimming lesson was from a lifeguard at Sequoyah High School. Does that help?

Commissioner Reckdahl: That does help. I'm just wondering if there's a difference in teaching style or teaching material, can we prescribe and say, "Can we have some of this style and some of this style," and add variety and let the residents choose what they think is the best. Commissioner Moss' point about hearing the comment it's less fun, we are doing something maybe some kids don't want to be competitive swimmers. They just want to have more fun. That would be an option.

Mr. de Geus: I have to mention this one thing, this interesting fact. The last visit we had with Team Sheeper at the Burgess pool, they have an underwater hockey court that they installed. Some regular swimmer there loved the sport and donated the court. Apparently they do this every couple of weeks; they have this big underwater hockey—I've never heard of it, but it was kind of (crosstalk).

1 Chair Lauing: With or without scuba tanks?

2
3 Mr. de Geus: (crosstalk). Snorkel, yeah.

4
5 Commissioner Reckdahl: We mentioned about how if you used the pool more than 12
6 times a month, it ends up being cheaper. Do we have any estimate of what percentage of
7 our swimmers use it more than 12 times a month?

8
9 Ms. LeBlanc: It's very small at this point. I think it's 18 people in the City. But with
10 more hours, I would expect a lot more people would use the pool more frequently.
11 Burgess pool, I think, has 250 residents that have lap swim memberships and come
12 frequently.

13
14 Commissioner Reckdahl: I also have a question about group lessons. How many
15 students are in a group lesson?

16
17 Commissioner Cribbs: Three.

18
19 Commissioner Reckdahl: Three, standard?

20
21 Commissioner Cribbs: Three to four.

22
23 Ms. LeBlanc: Four, four is the maximum.

24
25 Commissioner Reckdahl: When we looked at that attachment at the back, when it
26 compared all the different group lessons for the different cities, those were all roughly the
27 same size?

28
29 Ms. LeBlanc: Yes.

30
31 Commissioner Reckdahl: That's all my questions. Thank you.

32
33 Chair Lauing: Questions down at this end? Yes, Commissioner Cowie.

34
35 Commissioner Cowie: It sounds like we've done some things to address demand that
36 exceeds our capacity in terms of what Rob mentioned earlier about opening up
37 registration earlier for residents for certain programs. Some of the programs, though, like
38 lap swim, free swim aren't really susceptible to preregistration. I'd just like to get a sense
39 for how we think about the considerations of whether it's in the best interest of the City to
40 open up those things to nonresidents essentially on an equal footing. Maybe we price
41 them a little differently. If we're over-packing the pool and we're selling some people
42 that you can't come today, does that make sense if the reason they can't come is because

1 we've opened it up to both residents and nonresidents? I'd just like to get some feedback
2 on that question.

3
4 Mr. de Geus: It's open to residents and nonresidents now for recreation swim and for lap
5 swim. I think we would have to see what would happen as we start expanding the hours.
6 There's going to be more hours during the week to be able to lap swim. I think we'd have
7 to just see what would happen there. I don't know that we would want to do anything sort
8 of dramatic with respect to making it a residents only lap swim for a period of time or
9 something like that. I don't think that would be necessary. I'm not sure if I'm getting at
10 your question.

11
12 Commissioner Cowie: I guess what I ask, Rob, is that you don't pre-judge it, that you
13 keep an open mind on the question. If you find that Jazmin's theory doesn't really play
14 out that way, you still have multiple hours on the weekends when it's free swim, that
15 we're sending people home, then maybe we ought to think about maybe it doesn't make
16 sense or maybe we ought to change the pricing and make the pricing for nonresidents
17 higher to reduce demand a little bit. I just worry, given that we only have really only
18 pool and we're opening it to nonresidents and we're hearing that it's oversubscribed, does
19 that really make sense? That's all.

20
21 Mr. de Geus: I think that's a really fair point. If we do go into a contract that is more
22 significant that what we've done here, we can write those things into the contract, the
23 expectations and reopening the discussion about schedule and that type of thing. That's a
24 good suggestion.

25
26 Chair Lauing: Was that it, Jim?

27
28 Commissioner Cowie: Yes.

29
30 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Hetterly.

31
32 Commissioner Hetterly: I just had a question about—I agree with most of what's been
33 said tonight. I have a question about JLS and how that fits in the picture under the
34 various scenarios. We now in the summer operate both at Rinconada and at JLS. Under
35 Alternative 2, would Team Sheep run both of those pools in the summer? I just had a
36 comment about the programming. I have a competitive swimmer and a non-competitive
37 swimmer. There has always been great conflict around pool space between the two of
38 them and who's more entitled and who's less entitled. Obviously both want more, always.
39 I absolutely understand that PASA and masters want to be able to have enough lanes to
40 run their practices at pace. At the same time, there are a lot of kids who just want to get
41 wet. We were Greenmeadow members for a lot of years, and that was always a conflict
42 there. During the swim team season, you had a single lane for rec. I don't want to see

that happen. I worry a little bit about the increased programming. I love the idea of aqua fit classes, because I've seen that there's tremendous take-up for that kind of activity, especially among seniors. It seems like it fills a great need. My kid's a water polo player, so they'd love more options for water polo. I'm worried that if we add too many new kinds of programming in the pools, then we're just adding another constrictor on the unprogrammed time. I think that's something we are concerned about. Certainly coming out of the Master Plan, we heard it from Council as well that we want to make sure having opportunities for kids and adults to have unprogrammed time. That would be my biggest concern about the Sheepen proposal, figuring out what that right balance is. Thanks.

Chair Lauing: Any other? Did you get your questions addressed to be able to come back?

Mr. de Geus: I think so. We want to get to a conclusion here with a solid staff recommendation for Council to consider. We want to do that over the next month or two. We expect to come back here again next month, and we'll follow up on the things we heard this evening. If you have other things, that would be great. We may even bring Tim Sheepen here, so you can meet him and actually ask some questions of his program and some of the differences between what he does there at Burgess and elsewhere. They also have two pools now they're running in San Jose, that they won bids for. I think that might be helpful if you're interested in that. I would also add just on that point one of the advantages of having someone like Tim Sheepen that manages multiple pools is they can draw on staff from multiple locations, which is a challenge for a single operator like us, where we just have one recreation coordinator running the pool.

Chair Lauing: Commissioner Cribbs.

Commissioner Cribbs: For next time you come back, could you do like a graph of when the pool is open now, Rinconada, and when it's closed and what uses are during the times, so that we could just see it on one piece of paper, and then the projections for when you're open. If you're going to extend the opening through November, what that would look like. Perhaps the kinds of uses that you could have through the real winter time. That would be really helpful, I think, to see. Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Thanks very much. Very thorough.

3. Parks, Open Space, Rails and Recreation Facilities Master Plan.

Chair Lauing: The next item on the agenda looks familiar, the Master Plan. It's still with us. Kristen, are you going to introduce that one?

APPROVED

1 Kristen O'Kane: I'll be presenting on the latest status of our Master Planning efforts. I
2 have Peter Jensen and Daren Anderson here to provide support. What I'm going to talk
3 about today is I'd like to just do a brief recap of our Council Study Session. Many of you
4 were there, and we appreciate that very much. I just want to talk about some common
5 themes we heard at the Council Study Session. I will also be sharing with you our
6 revised Master Plan outline. We did reduce the number of chapters in the Master Plan.
7 The focus really will be on the revisions to Chapter 3 and the draft of Chapter 5, and then
8 the schedule to hopefully get us to completion. Our Council Study Session on
9 September 6 went pretty well. We heard a lot of comments from the Council. Some of
10 the themes we heard—this isn't everything we heard. Some of the themes were related to
11 demographics, specifically coordinating with the School District and just ensuring that
12 we have the right projections for population growth in the future. Also we heard a lot of
13 City/School District collaboration for space. Being able to not only get access to the
14 space but also a question as to what the legal rights are for the community to use School
15 District property. That's something we'll be working with our legal team on, to get an
16 answer to that. As Commissioner Hetterly mentioned, one thing we heard quite a bit was
17 this need and desire for more unstructured play, intramural sports, pick-up games, free
18 time, just time for kids to get out there, and even adults too to not be in the competitive
19 setting. We heard a lot of about dog parks and restrooms. Dog parks, I think it was
20 pretty much support for dog parks. Restrooms, I think there was support as well but also
21 just some concerns. Some Council Members sharing what they've heard from the
22 community and also just questions as to what the issues are with restrooms as far as
23 security and things like that. We did hear some comments related to the 10 1/2 acres at
24 the Baylands and the 7.7 acres at Foothills Park. Parkland dedication was also a common
25 theme and where we can dedicate parkland but also being cautious as to not restricting
26 ourselves too much on land if we do dedicate it. Incorporating elements of the Bike
27 Master Plan, making sure we're just coordinating with that Master Plan. The last one—of
28 course I had to throw it in here—the Pokémon Go stops we heard from a couple of
29 Council Members, incorporating that into our parks. I'm just going to share that Rob and
30 I were at Happy Hollow Park in San Jose recently. They had a whole big Pokémon Go
31 Day and just drew a lot of different customers that normally they don't have at Happy
32 Hollow, which is usually for smaller kids. They had a lot of teens come. They made this
33 whole day about Pokémon, and it drew a lot of people to the park. We started thinking
34 about how we could do that. I don't know if you wanted, Chair Lauing, to stop and have
35 any discussion on the Council Study Sessions?

36
37 Chair Lauing: Just if any Commissioners who weren't there want to make or who were
38 there—if there are any comments on that. David, did you want to say something?

39
40 Commissioner Moss: I thought it went really well, and they were very supportive. I
41 liked the interplay between Council Members about restrooms, positive and negative. I

1 know where I stand, and I'm glad that there's a couple of Council Members who agree
2 with me. Anyway, I liked the interplay of that. I thought that it was very well received.
3

4 Chair Lauing: Others? I think basically that was the first time in months that staff or we
5 got direct feedback. The direct feedback was pretty much green lights. It was
6 comforting.
7

8 Ms. O'Kane: It was. Just switching gears a little bit to the Master Plan document itself.
9 We revised the outline a little bit. Just in reviewing the previous draft we had from our
10 consultant, we just scaled down, combined some of the chapters. Also, Chapter 3 has
11 been re-titled from "Needs and Opportunities" to "Analysis and Assessment." It just
12 better reflects the contents of that chapter. We took Chapter 4, which was a very small
13 chapter called "Our Desired Future," and combined it with the goals, policies and
14 programs. The site concept plans that were the books of all the before and potential after
15 plans of the parks, we've removed those completely from the Master Plan. We just felt
16 like they were too detailed to include at this time, especially since they're conceptual and
17 they're not final plans that are in place. We'll keep them in our back pocket for future
18 use. When we do renovate a park, we'll have that as a starting point, but they'll not be in
19 the Plan. Chapter 7, "Implementation," is now Chapter 5. Chapter 3, this one had quite a
20 bit of revision since the last time you saw it. Staff, Rob and I, met with the ad hoc group.
21 They also spent quite a bit of time reviewing, talking about it and revising this chapter.
22 For that, we really appreciate your help with that. It was very helpful to get your
23 perspective and also your assistance with that. Some of the changes are—I feel like we
24 have a clearer introduction now that sort of describes what needs and opportunities are,
25 what gaps are, sort of what's the difference between a need and a want. That just sort of
26 sets the framework for that chapter right at the beginning. We also added quite a bit of
27 information on demographics, which was missing before. I think it still needs a little bit
28 of work. We're just making sure we have the latest data. You can see in the chapter sort
29 of the direction we're heading and what we think are important demographics to point
30 out. In general, the chapter was reorganized to flow better and sort of follow the steps
31 that we went through, through the Master Planning process. Do you want to pause here,
32 Chair?
33

34 Chair Lauing: No, I think that's exactly right. Any other ad hoc people want to chime
35 in?
36

37 Commissioner Moss: I just felt that this Chapter 3 was fantastic compared to what we
38 had before. Much more concise, much easier to follow. I know a tremendous amount of
39 work went into that on both sides. I really, really appreciate it.
40

41 Ms. O'Kane: Moving on.
42

Chair Lauing: Sorry.

Commissioner Hetterly: I didn't have a comment on the process, but I had one comment on the content. On page 2 under transportation, that first paragraph, the last sentence I haven't seen before. In addition to providing safe bike routes, encouraging users to use alternate modes of transportation can be accomplished through limiting parking at parks and recreation facilities. That's not something that we've talked about as part of this Master Plan process. I'm reluctant to include it in this report. I don't know where it came from. I'm happy to discuss it, but I think it's a policy issues that has significant ramifications.

Ms. O'Kane: That did come from staff. In this section we talk about transportation but only as far as bikes, sort of alternative modes for transportation. There are still a lot of people who drive to parks. One way to sort of reduce the number of cars going to parks and to use alternative modes of transportation would be to limit the parking adjacent to a park. That's the thought behind it.

Commissioner Hetterly: I don't like it, and I'm happy to talk about it. If you want to hear now why I don't like it, (crosstalk) maybe discuss it.

Chair Lauing: I thought we were going to talk about any comments that the Commissioners had on Chapter 3, because this is the first time we've all been able to talk about it since the ad hoc put its marks on there. Any level of comments from anybody. We have that item on the table. Other comments, agreements or ... You don't agree or you don't have any comment?

Commissioner Cribbs: Can I ask just a question about a comment that was here?

Chair Lauing: What about this one right here that we're talking about on page 2? Let's see if we can come to agreement on that.

Commissioner Hetterly: Did you want me to talk about that?

Chair Lauing: If you want, yeah, or others can.

Commissioner Hetterly: I'll tell you the reason I don't like it in a nutshell. I think that is a common strategy now to encourage mode shift in people's behavior. It's often considered in terms of housing and office space development, whether or not we should reduce the amount of parking that's provided in that kind of setting. Parks, I think, though are very different. Rather than having a captive population like you do in an office building or you do in a housing development, parks, we're really trying to get more and more and more people to come all the time. The last thing that we want to do is turn

APPROVED

people away because it's too hard for them to walk or it's too hard for them to bike or it doesn't work out or they for some reason can't do it. I would say in a world where we're looking from an environmental perspective at trying to reduce cars and reduce parking, parks and recreation resources are the last rung on the ladder that we ought to attack.

Commissioner Moss: Yeah, Mitchell Park has the problem now.

Chair Lauing: Other comments on that?

Commissioner Reckdahl: The comment I would make is that, especially at larger parks, people right next door, it's very hard for them to park already. For example, Mitchell Park, if we reduce the parking at Mitchell Park, the neighbors would be walking 3 or 4 blocks just to go to their house. I think we have to be very careful about limiting parking.

Chair Lauing: I'll make a comment since everyone else is done. I think most of the discussion that we've had over the years is the reverse, which is we've been trying to figure out ways at certain areas to get little bit more parking a la Arastradero, where you can't park some days, unless you park on the street or blocks away and then walk in. Of course, stating the obvious, it would be compromising folks with limited access or senior citizens as well. I think it was at the last meeting we were talking about one of those access areas out by the antenna space. Were you making that comment, Keith, that there's not enough parking to get to the Renzel wilderness space?

Commissioner Moss: (inaudible)

Chair Lauing: I thought it was something that was adjacent to the antenna place that we were talking about rededicating. There's no parking there now to even get into it. I also think this is antithetical to at least what we've been talking about. We want to encourage alternate modes of transportation, but I don't think we want to just say, "By the way, you can't use a car to get here." I agree to strike it. Are there minority reports that feel like that should stay in?

Commissioner Cribbs: You want to strike the whole paragraph or just this last sentence?

Chair Lauing: No, no. The last sentence, I think.

Commissioner Hetterly: If you're looking to have other alternatives—if you're looking to build the paragraph, you could maybe talk about shuttles or consider shuttles to the open space areas, that kind of thing.

Chair Lauing: That'd be great.

1 Ms. O'Kane: We will cut that sentence and talk about other options for transportation to
2 parks.

3
4 Chair Lauing: You had another comment, Anne, on something else?

5
6 Commissioner Cribbs: Yes, I did. On the second paragraph, I just wanted to know if the
7 60,000 commuters coming to Palo Alto to work included Stanford or Stanford is in
8 addition to that.

9
10 Chair Lauing: That's a good question.

11
12 Commissioner Hetterly: I think that includes Stanford Research Park but not the
13 University, is my guess.

14
15 Commissioner Cribbs: The number I've had in my head for a long time is 100,000 people
16 come into Palo Alto and Stanford every day. It's been that number for quite a long time.
17 I just wondered. Can we check on that?

18
19 Ms. O'Kane: Yes, definitely.

20
21 Chair Lauing: Other comments from anybody on content of Chapter 3 as revised?

22
23 Commissioner Moss: The question is how much does the Parks Master Plan have to
24 satisfy commuters as well as residents. If we have 100,000 commuters, how much
25 parkland do we need to dedicate to them as opposed to just residents. I think that's a
26 question that people will have. We've sort of been gearing towards residents only. When
27 you have 100,000 coming to our City, how many of them get to use our parks?
28 Somewhere in the demographics we should talk about that.

29
30 Chair Lauing: Sorry.

31
32 Commissioner Hetterly: Go ahead.

33
34 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Hetterly, go ahead.

35
36 Commissioner Hetterly: I was just going to ask for clarification. I don't think I quite
37 understand your question. We don't keep anybody out of our parks. Is that what you're
38 getting at or are you asking if we should be planning differently because of that extra
39 population?

40
41 Commissioner Moss: Right. Do we need to have even more parkland dedicated? This
42 100,000 people is a shock to me. Even 60,000 people was a shock to me. If we need to

1 include additional parkland to satisfy commuters as well as residents, then I think it
2 should be mentioned somewhere in the Master Plan.

3
4 Chair Lauing: It's mentioned right here. Would you put it somewhere else or would you
5 want to elaborate on it?

6
7 Commissioner Cribbs: That's good here.

8
9 Commissioner Moss: I think this is great, to have it in there. Now I have to think about
10 where all the other places are that are impacted by that statement. Leave it in there.

11
12 Chair Lauing: Other comments on any of this? There are a lot of changes.

13
14 Commissioner Cribbs: I have one more.

15
16 Chair Lauing: Sure.

17
18 Commissioner Cribbs: On page 4 under the ethnicity and culture, I just was confused
19 about in the past decade the City's Asian population alone grew by 10 percent, but we
20 don't know what it grew from. I didn't know if that's important. Maybe not.

21
22 Commissioner Hetterly: In the previous version or in some version, there was a chart that
23 tracked. I think if we just put that chart back in—there are a couple of other charts that I
24 would recommend restoring—that clarifies that a little bit. I don't know if the chart
25 shows the absolute numbers, but you can see the growth. It's a bar chart from the census
26 decades.

27
28 Commissioner Cribbs: It would be good to have that chart. Otherwise, that sentence just
29 kind of stands alone. It's like why.

30
31 Commissioner Hetterly: I agree.

32
33 Chair Lauing: Another thing on the same vein that the ad hoc was talking about is that all
34 this is great, but we need to know where it's going. Even if it grew 10 percent, that
35 doesn't mean it's going to grow 10 percent again or 20 or 50. To the extent possible
36 without commissioning original research, we'd like to find out what the growth factors
37 are going to be in those demographic segments. That one's back to staff for research or
38 whatever you can find. Jim.

39
40 Commissioner Cowie: I'd just like to play devil's advocate for a minute on this point. I
41 don't know what a snapshot taken—this is maybe building a little bit on what you said,
42 Ed—in 2016 is going to do for a long-term plan as opposed to a general

acknowledgement that the cultural mix in the City is always changing and has changed for decades and likely will continue. We need to take that into account in our planning. I'm just not sure that getting precise information about what it was in 1975 and what it was in 2005, I'm not sure that's meaningful.

Chair Lauing: I agree. I'd rather know what it's going to be in 2025 if we have some projection there, which still is a projection. To the extent that we can and that there's more Asians or more seniors, then if they need special programming or special facilities, then that's something we can act on. Without that data, you're kind of looking backwards.

Commissioner Cowie: I guess what I'm saying is I think that's going to continue to change and whatever we predict is going to be wrong. I think a more philosophical statement of taking into the account the population of the City, the ethnic diversity, the socioeconomic diversity is all part of our mission, I think. I think something along those lines is a forever, permanent thing as opposed to trying to get a precise either snapshot of the past or guess on the future. The past really isn't that relevant and the future is going to be wrong. Whereas, the philosophy should apply always anyway.

Chair Lauing: Right, but I think there are some demographic segments that you can more easily get forecast data for. For example, if there are seniors in the City and the trend has been that they stay rather than leave, they're going to get older. There are actuarial tables. That kind of stuff can be calculated more so than probably some of the demographic groups. The School District forecasts the age groups and when they're going to go up and when they're going to come back down. That's because they already have people that they're counting.

Commissioner Cowie: They do, but they don't put that in a plan that's supposed to last for 20 years. They adjust that every year. What I'm suggesting is that we acknowledge the fact that it's ever changing in the permanent Plan, and on an annual basis we expect the staff to deal with advice from this group and ultimately the City Council to determine what's the appropriate mix.

Chair Lauing: Commissioner Hetterly.

Commissioner Hetterly: I guess I'd just push back on that a little bit, to take the other devil's advocate side of I don't think the past is irrelevant. If we have seen a steady pattern of growth in a certain segment of the population over the last 10, 20, 30 years, it's not unreasonable to expect that that trend is not going to suddenly plummet. It's not going to suddenly take a change without a major change in what's going on in the City. It seems something catastrophic would have to happen for the number of Asians, for example, coming into the City to suddenly disappear, and then we're down to whatever

1 we were 10 years ago. I think the past is relevant. I don't think it's fully predictive
2 certainly.

3
4 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Reckdahl.

5
6 Commissioner Reckdahl: Where it really becomes important is if it affects your
7 construction. For example, if the senior population is aging and we're going to have more
8 seniors and we have to construct senior developments, that is a much bigger issue than
9 whether we have Polish or Asian or any other demographics. I think we have to say what
10 would we do with this. If the Asian population is growing, what would we do? If the
11 senior population is growing, what would we do? I think we have to look more at the
12 endpoint than the intermediate, what demographic is growing.

13
14 Commissioner Moss: Can I make one point?

15
16 Chair Lauing: Sure, go ahead.

17
18 Commissioner Moss: The reason the Asian population is important is because when we
19 went to the Midtown meeting on Sunday, there were at least two or three people who said
20 that their primary use of the parks was dancing and tai chi and that other thing that they
21 do. They need flat cement and a canopy over the top and could we do more. That's all I
22 wanted to mention.

23
24 Commissioner Cowie: I just want to make sure that the record is clear on this point. I'm
25 not saying it's irrelevant. I'm just saying it doesn't belong in the Plan. That's all. I think
26 it's very relevant. That's why I'm suggesting a philosophical construct makes a lot more
27 sense. It's permanent and you don't have to worry about getting it just right and having
28 the staff do a whole bunch of work about something that will be wrong tomorrow or a
29 year from now. I'm just not sure what the value of that work is. That's all I'm saying.

30
31 Chair Lauing: Anything else on Chapter 3?

32
33 Commissioner Cribbs: Yes.

34
35 Chair Lauing: Sorry. Commissioner Cribbs.

36
37 Commissioner Moss: (inaudible) on page 5.

38
39 Chair Lauing: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

40
41 Commissioner Cribbs: Go ahead.

Commissioner Moss: One quick thing on page 5 under play for children. Can you change that from play area to unstructured play? You mention it several other places, and I think it's really important to put the word unstructured. It's where it says play for children, somewhere in there. That's it.

Chair Lauing: Commissioner Cribbs.

Commissioner Cribbs: On the first paragraph after the geographic needs and opportunities, I just didn't understand where south of El Camino Real is in Palo Alto. The second sentence. Halfway down the page, page 5.

Ms. O'Kane: We will look at that and correct it.

Commissioner Cribbs: (crosstalk) my geography. I've never been south of El Camino in Palo Alto.

Chair Lauing: You should get out more.

Commissioner Cribbs: Yes, I should.

Ms. O'Kane: Thank you. We'll look into that.

Chair Lauing: Anything else on 3?

Commissioner Cribbs: Maybe.

Chair Lauing: Take it away, 5. I'm sorry. Were you not done?

Commissioner Cribbs: Go ahead. It's okay.

Ms. O'Kane: Chapter 5 is the implementation chapter. This is, I'd like to point out, draft, very draft. There are some placeholders that you'll see in there, that say under development. Staff's still working on getting more research. I just wanted to point that out. We would like to hear your feedback today. The implementation chapter goes through the prioritization process, which is the five criteria that we've discussed before. It includes the implementation timelines of near term, midterm and long term, and then we've added a list of 15 priority projects and 15 priority programs that we feel, based on community feedback as well as what staff knows today and what we've heard from the Commission and Council on what we think need attention in the nearer term. I'll get into that a little bit in more detail in a minute. Following that is an example action plan, funding strategy today and tomorrow as well as how we're going to report on progress in the future. We'd like to hear your comments and feedback on Chapter 5. One area where

APPROVED

we'd specifically like to hear are the priority projects and programs, specifically if there's anything that you feel is omitted from this list or you feel is on the list but should not be included. I know there's a lot there, but this is one thing we heard repeatedly from the Commission and the ad hoc specifically, having the list of what we know today that's obvious, that requires some priority action. Some of these things, especially the projects, could be completed in the short term. They're smaller efforts. They don't cost a lot. There isn't as much planning involved. Some of the other ones, for example Cubberley Community Center, that we'll pay attention to now, but the end result is not going to be for a while and the cost is much higher. Just because it's on this doesn't mean it's going to get completed in the next year to 5 years. It just means attention needs to be focused on those. We'd really like to hear your feedback on those, but the whole chapter overall.

Chair Lauing: Let me just make one sort of comment on one of the shifts that we made, just so you're aware of it. On the bottom of page 1, we've now swapped the batting order for two and three. It used to be fill existing gaps, address community preferences and respond to growth. We didn't think that was the right priority, because ...

Female: One?

Chair Lauing: The bottom of page 1 now says fill existing gaps, respond to growth and address community preferences. That's kind of in order of priority of how you would make your prioritization. Absolutely no disrespect to community preferences. Just they're slightly less quantitative. If we have a quantitative growth—let's keep picking on the seniors—demographic we think works and seniors are going to explode, that's something that's real and quantifiable and maybe more actionable than some of the preferences which were more like unlimited needs, as we've talked about before on a number of issues in front of this body. I just want to point that out. Just to ask a question of the game plan for how you're going to go ahead with the 5 and 6 to 10 and 11 to 20 and if there's going to be more than the 15 that you intend to prioritize in those groups within the Master Plan.

Ms. O'Kane: I'm sorry. I didn't understand the question.

Chair Lauing: You've put out now 15 projects and programs that we're going to talk about. In the actual Master Plan, do you intend to put those 30 on a timeline and stop or are you doing to try to take it to 50? What's your plan there?

Ms. O'Kane: That section is going to be expanded a bit. We'll include a description of each of those as well as tie that back to the near term, midterm, long term, and then also give each of those sort of an order of magnitude cost for completing those. We're not going to expand past those 15 projects, 15 programs as far as a timeline for completion. We will be doing an action plan, but we're not going to include the action plan

APPROVED

specifically in the Master Plan document partly because if Council approves the Master Plan, we don't want them to feel like they have to adopt that action plan as well, which could be a bit daunting. It'll have a lot in it, and it will have all the costs associated with it. That will change from year to year.

Chair Lauing: Commissioner Moss.

Commissioner Moss: Are you going to add to Number 5 about the 10 1/2 acres, are you going to add the 7.7 acres or is that lower priority? The 7.7 acres in Foothills, is that in the City ...

Chair Lauing: That's what we're just going to start talking about now. This is the first time any of us have seen the 30 projects. We want to talk about if we like that. I'm not sure we want to talk about 5 versus 6, but we definitely would want to talk about things that aren't on here or things that are on here that shouldn't be on here from our relative perspective.

Ms. O'Kane: Can I add? They're numbered 1 through 15, but that doesn't mean they're in that priority order just to be clear.

Chair Lauing: Maybe the best thing to do is just go person by person with questions and then make comments on those back and forth. Try to keep this organized and productive. Did you want to start, Keith?

Commissioner Reckdahl: Yeah. I mean, overall they look like reasonable projects. What struck me is, I think, all of them, though, I would include on the list if there's a 5-year Master Plan as opposed to a 20-year Master Plan. What would this list look like if we weren't going out to 20 years? Ed just went through on page 1, the respond to growth. I don't think any of these really stand out as responding to growth. That'd be my comment.

Chair Lauing: Is that all?

Commissioner Reckdahl: Yeah.

Chair Lauing: Do you have any other comments, David, on other priorities?

Commissioner Moss: Other than the 7.7 acres, somewhere in there, I think, that should be in there. I don't really understand Keith's question about the 20 years versus 5 years. I'm assuming because these are the higher priorities, they're all going to be done within the first 5 years.

1 Commissioner Reckdahl: If you were trying to make a list even for 2 years, these are all
2 current needs, and none of these are projecting for future needs. The maybe the answer is
3 that we wait for the demographics to get more firmed up. Are we going to get better
4 demographics than what we have right now?

5
6 Ms. O'Kane: We're continuing to research the demographics and connect with our
7 Planning Department. There's the sort of dual effort of doing the Comp Plan, and they
8 are looking at demographics as well. We're going to verify the numbers. We're also
9 trying to get more current data on senior population from Avenidas.

10
11 Commissioner Reckdahl: The whole purpose of the Master Plan was to kind of pave the
12 way forward and looking at the future needs to be prepared for those future needs. We're
13 reacting now to gaps and immediate needs. It's hard, very hard, to look out 20 years and
14 make any prediction. It's very difficult, but I would like to see more flavor of that. That
15 was the purpose of the Master Plan, to have a long-term projection of what we're going to
16 need in 20 years. This is all things that we need in the near future.

17
18 Ms. O'Kane: I would like to respond to that. Many of the projects that are on this list, I
19 think, do respond to growth. Acquire new parkland in high need areas, develop adult
20 fitness areas, new restrooms, a new public gymnasium.

21
22 Commissioner Reckdahl: Right now we're behind our 4 acres per 1,000 residents, so you
23 could say the same thing. Immediate need would be to acquire parkland. With growth, it
24 becomes even more of an issue. The gyms over at Cubberley are in bad condition, so you
25 could say build new gyms as an immediate need. Granted all these immediate needs
26 become more crucial if you look out in the future. (crosstalk)

27
28 Commissioner Moss: I think this is a great list, because it does address both the short and
29 the long term. I think it's a perfect list. It's not going to get all done in 5 years, but I'd
30 like something to be done on each one of these within the first 5 years. You won't finish,
31 but something needs to be done in all of these areas.

32
33 Chair Lauing: Just as a process question. When somebody like you comes up with 7.7
34 acres, let's just jot that down as a possible add here. We can also look at possible
35 subtractions, and then sort of true up at the end. Can I just probe you on your comment,
36 though, just interactively here? Why do you want this list to be in the next 5 years? Did
37 I understand that correctly? No, I'm talking to David.

38
39 Commissioner Moss: I think all of these are high priority. You said they're in priority
40 order.

41
42 Chair Lauing: No, no. They're not in priority order.

Commissioner Moss: I get it.

Chair Lauing: I thought I heard you say that all of these needed to be done in the next 5 years. I just was ...

Commissioner Moss: No. I wanted a little bit done towards each of these within the 5 years.

Chair Lauing: Thanks for clarifying that. Anne, did you have comments?

Commissioner Cribbs: I do. First of all, I'm just kind of reacting to this because we've just seen it. I wish that were something about aquatic programs and pools—I know, I know, it's predictable—in this list. I'm glad that this isn't a priority order, because I wouldn't like to go out to the public and have the dog parks be, even though they're really important, the number one priority ahead of Cubberley and ahead of youth programs. I think those are probably as important or more important. I'd just like to put more emphasis on some planning for big projects that, at the end of a 20-year time, we can say this is where we're going and we did that. Maybe that's not appropriate in a Master Plan, but I would love it if that's something we're able to say.

Chair Lauing: That totally is. I think that's Keith's point. We need to get out ahead of these big things. As we've been saying all along, if we thought for some reason needed five more pools and we had to roll those in over the next 20 years, then those should be on here. It's up to staff to figure out where's the money and also the ideal timeline. Go down here and move back up. Jennifer.

Commissioner Hetterly: I'm going to go up a level. For me, it felt like there was something missing in the analysis. I was looking at the criteria, which we'd talked about so many times. Once I saw the list in the packet, I thought, "Look at those things. Yeah, that 7.7 is missing." It made me look back at the previous outline. I think it had suggested that there was going to be a separate analysis of the long-range, high-capital investment projects. Has that been abandoned? If there's still going to be a separate analysis of those kind of big ticket items—I don't know if those three new land items are the only ones or not. I think it would be helpful to have a separate analysis of those. I think that's where we really need to identify the steps that have to happen if we want to end up in 20 years with a Cubberley that's been redeveloped, for example. That's the big ticket items. Also, I was a little confused by the near term, midterm, long term descriptions. Like Keith, as I looked at these it became very clear that it's not cut and dried what's near, what's middle, what's long. In fact most of these are going to be near and middle and possibly long. What I was looking for was some measure of the urgency that would be tied together with the prioritization that comes out of the criteria. For

APPROVED

example, on page 2 when you're introducing the timeframes, that short two-line paragraph just before the near-term timeframe, the second sentence says these represent different stages of implementation based on the application of the prioritization criteria. I didn't really know what that meant. The criteria don't really inform the timeline or the urgency at all. They just talk about how important it is. I would love to see it put in a different context of the priorities for each timeframe are going to be identified based on the criteria but also on the urgency or the opportunity costs of each particular project. Some of these, for example, have pretty huge opportunity costs if we don't do—like acquiring parkland in high-use areas. Typically we might think of that as a long-term category project because we have to come up with the money to do it. At the same time, if we don't do something now in order to end up with the money, we're never going to get there. Furthermore, the longer we wait, the harder it will be to acquire parkland because we're having less and less and less and less land. There are big opportunity costs to not doing something fast, as fast as we can, on acquisition for example. I could give other examples if you don't get what I'm getting at. That was kind of the gist of it. I think we have to have some sense of the urgency and the opportunity costs and figure out a way to present the projects and the programs so that maybe these top—I don't know how to do it. We indicate what we have to start on right away in the near term and the near-term steps that are involved and then indicate also that those things are continuing. Like dog parks and restrooms, we're not going to build all the dog parks and restrooms we want in the first 5 years no matter how many we want. Maybe in the near term, we want to get one done, and by the end of the medium term we want to have two or three done. Figuring out how to describe the way those projects extend across the timeframes, I think, would be helpful.

Chair Lauing: Jim, did you have any comments?

Commissioner Cowie: Thanks, Ed. I'll pass.

Chair Lauing: Abbie.

Vice Chair Knopper: The way I read it, based on what Jennifer was just saying, the title is "High Priority Needs and Opportunities." It made sense to me, this list, because you titled it "High Priority Needs." Actually one of the sentences said it was developed with feedback from stakeholders, City staff and includes a summary of each of those high priorities and then order of magnitude capital and operating costs for each. I just made the assumption that this is the stuff that is near term and maybe a couple of them obviously pushing to the midterm. It made sense to me. I was fine with this. The only other comment is just numbering it makes it look like it's priority. I know this is a draft. When I read develop new dog parks, I'm like, "Number 1," because I'm on the ad hoc and I would like that, but I know that's not what it is. Some other person wouldn't ...

1 Chair Lauing: Just use bullet points.

2
3 Vice Chair Knopper: What's that?

4
5 Chair Lauing: Just use bullet points.

6
7 Vice Chair Knopper: Yeah, bullet points. That's what I was going to say.

8
9 Chair Lauing: I know that might demote dog parks for you, but you'll have to live with
10 that.

11
12 Vice Chair Knopper: That's okay. Anyway, I have no more comments. Thank you.

13
14 Chair Lauing: I had a few here. A couple of these—again I don't want to open old
15 wounds—things seem like sort of best practices. You guys are going to make good
16 judgments and do that. They also seem a little bit—this one about integrate nature into
17 urban parks, that should be a design element for Peter and others. We can do that. I'm
18 not sure how you make a priority and put a budget number on there. It sort of needs to
19 happen as we redo parks. I'm not sure you're going to go out and cut up ten parks
20 because they don't have enough integrated nature into them. The latter would seem to me
21 to be putting it on this list. If you're just going to kind of do it as sort of a policy issue,
22 that's cool. Similarly, disability requirements, unless we're going to really go gung ho on
23 that and do 50 of them, I'm not sure why that's not sort of a roll out like other things.
24 Similarly, improve trail connections. If it's a big problem or a gap that we've got people
25 falling off trails, then we ought to run out and do it. If it's sort of "let's get to this," then it
26 just doesn't feel like a specific priority. The other thing is on maintenance, which we've
27 talked about a lot. The comments here talk about sustainability practices. I just want to
28 make sure it includes maintenance. If our collective understanding is that is the bullet
29 point about maintenance, which on ad hoc we've been talking about a lot and that needs
30 to be funded and attended to and so on, then that's great. The sustainable practices seem
31 to be the emphasis on that point. I wouldn't disagree with David's comment that the 7.7
32 should be on here. One other comment. We said this in the ad hoc, and I don't know if
33 you got a chance to do it yet. We didn't recall in the ad hoc that adult fitness areas in
34 parks rated that highly in the surveys. I'd like to make sure that's high. In fact, I recall it
35 was pretty low, and I haven't checked it since our ad hoc meeting either. Somebody else
36 was going to comment. Jennifer.

37
38 Commissioner Hetterly: Since you mentioned sustainable practices and maintenance and
39 management, I actually did not see that as just a keep-up with maintenance option. I saw
40 that as let's really examine how we manage our maintenance of our parks and build in
41 systems to manage them more sustainably in the future. That to me was one of those big
42 opportunity cost items, where that's something we want to do now because over time it

has a greater impact. Whereas, if we put that off for later, then we've got the next 5 or 10 years when we're not following best practices so to speak.

Chair Lauing: That was part of my question basically. Is this bullet point a big enough tent to cover maintenance in general, because it's going to be sustainable. I think you're saying it's not. It's a separate point.

Commissioner Hetterly: I read it as a separate point.

Chair Lauing: Pardon?

Commissioner Hetterly: I read it as a separate point.

Chair Lauing: Are there any comments on any of this? Are there any ones that aren't on here besides 7.7 acres that should be?

Commissioner Cribbs: A pool.

Chair Lauing: Do we know that or is that one of those—we also had this classification that we reserved that some things need more research before it became something that was definitely a priority. That one, and maybe gyms is another one that needs more research before it's prioritize-able. I don't know that. I'm just pointing out that there is that other category, which I think is also going to be called out in the Plan somewhere. I don't know if it's in this chapter.

Vice Chair Knopper: Gymnasiums, Number 7.

Chair Lauing: That's right. You're right. Now that one's on here; that wasn't before. Recapping, it seems to me like there are three or four that I mentioned, that maybe are not top 15, but the 7.7 is, is what I'm hearing from others. I don't know if we want to manage this here or move that one back to the ad hoc. Whatever you guys think. Did you have another comment? Go ahead.

Commissioner Hetterly: I have a question. I'm still confused about this list. I'm hearing folks say that this isn't priority order, we should just bullet it. Are we going to include in the implementation plan a priority order of things that we definitely want to try to get done in the first 5 years and what we want to try to get done in the second 5 years or not?

Rob de Geus: I think we're still trying to figure out exactly how that's going to look. Our thought first was to put this list out there and see if we're in the right ballpark, the right list. For each of these, actually describe what they are in some detail, probably half a page or a page that talks about what are the very next steps that need to take place, even

APPROVED

1 for the long-term items that may take 15 years before we get there in 20 years. There's
2 things that we need to do in the near term and midterm in order to achieve the long-term
3 goal. For each of these, we would try and lay that out and also lay out the relative costs
4 related to those. As staff, we were not thinking of prioritizing the 30, but that's open for
5 discussion. We were thinking all of these are high priorities, and over 20 years, we want
6 to accomplish them. Some will be accomplished sooner than others.

7
8 Chair Lauing: Just to feed back what I think I heard. These 30 will be all listed at
9 whatever that is, the high level, but they will also be put on a timeline.

10
11 Mr. de Geus: Yes.

12
13 Chair Lauing: I guess the third point is that you're not going to go beyond the 30 for this
14 sort of phase or vintage of the Master Plan.

15
16 Mr. de Geus: Right.

17
18 Chair Lauing: What happens to the Number 16 project? In other words, how does
19 Number 16 get on the list anywhere, whether that's put on by a Council Member or
20 primary research or whatever?

21
22 Mr. de Geus: Things will be added as we know. This isn't all that we do. There are lots
23 more, and there will be opportunities to do a specific project that'll just happen because
24 either there's someone or a group that's come forward to help us fund it or it's an
25 identified new need that we didn't identify in this plan, and we'll have to work that in. I
26 think what's helpful is, before we work in Number 16, we think about resources that we
27 have and staff that we have and we sort of weigh it up against this. Should we be doing
28 that Number 16 or should we really be doing this here first? I can see in some cases we
29 would want to do that Number 16 project because the opportunity has arisen that allows
30 us to do it, and it'll go away if we don't take advantage of it at that time. Or it's identified
31 as a big need that we just didn't know today, so we will do it.

32
33 Chair Lauing: Comments? Commissioner Hetterly.

34
35 Commissioner Hetterly: I'm sorry to keep dwelling on this. In the narrative then, when
36 you're describing the near term, midterm and long term, you're not going to have
37 priorities identified for each of those. You're just going to have the overall list, and the
38 only indication of a judgment about urgency or importance among those 30 things is
39 where they fall out on this action plan spreadsheet? Did that make sense?

40
41 Mr. de Geus: I'm not sure I followed that entirely.

APPROVED

1 Chair Lauing: I think what she's saying is that we had originally talked about having—I
2 guess you actually proposed that we would have high priority, medium priority and low
3 priority. Whatever numbers of those were, they would be on a timely. Maybe you would
4 have 15 on high and 10 on medium and 5 on low or whatever. It sounds like that's gone
5 away except for the action plan that you just referenced. Was that your question?
6

7 Commissioner Hetterly: Kind of. To give an example. If I'm somebody in the public or
8 on Council who looks at the list and sees that there are these 15 projects that high priority
9 projects for the Master Plan and I'm looking at the list and every indication is that these
10 all stand on equal ground, are equally high priority because we haven't told them that
11 they're not, I'm wondering why isn't enhancing seating areas in parks more important than
12 sustainable maintenance or more important than bathrooms or more important than
13 Cubberley or as important, I guess. As I read it, there's definitely a ranking of—in my
14 view, some of these are more urgent than others. I imagine my list isn't the same as
15 everybody's list, but everybody reading it is going to say, "Why is that as important as
16 this?" I'm wondering if we want to fill that gap and say these are the more important and
17 this is why or if we really want to just say these are all important and we're going to get
18 to them as we can get to them. That's really a question. I'm not arguing for or against a
19 different way.
20

21 Mr. de Geus: I think it's a good question. We're still discussing it and grappling with it.
22 Thirty is a lot. If they don't have any kind of order, as I hear what you're saying, that
23 could be problematic, I think, in terms of allocating resources and time. We can certainly
24 look at that. Maybe they're not all ranked in order, but the top five—the really urgent
25 ones that we know are going to have the biggest impact on the community, if we get
26 these done, they're identified as red hot or something.
27

28 Peter Jensen: I would too like to say that just putting it into the context of the process of
29 the capital improvement projects and how they're done now will stay the same. Now we
30 have a list of keep-up items that we look at. We look at those and decide which projects
31 we want to do from the keep-up. This is a different list now of brand new things that
32 don't exist at all. When the ad hoc group can meet to discuss which projects are going to
33 be put forward as the capital improvements for that year—I know it's a 5-year budget, so
34 you're looking at 5 years—you would consider our keep-up as well as these 30 projects.
35 Which one now is more important and how do we get it in the process of being a project
36 for the fifth year coming up? Just kind of understand that process remains the same, but
37 now you have a list of these 30 or 15 projects or 15 programs that are going to be
38 associated and considered with the keep-up items.
39

40 Commissioner Hetterly: You want to have not just huge ticket items on the top five hot
41 stuff list, because you might only have enough money to do a little item that year. You
42 have to have more to draw from.

Mr. Jensen: I think the ad hoc committee and staff and flexibility as recommending for that particular year depending upon the budget and people's needs and wants at that time to then have those things where we know we want to do these 30 things and we know we have to do this keep-up work. We are looking at those things and trying to get them in specific years based on, again, budget and people's needs of that specific year. Every year, it gets looked at. Every year, the list gets referenced. We try to take them off as best we can, depending on our current funding that we have.

Commissioner Hetterly: There's very little expectation that we're going to be able to do a lot of things every year. Out of that 30 list, we're going to have to fight for every dollar in that CIP budget every single year.

Mr. Jensen: Right. The interesting part about having the list of projects is that the community itself knows that these are the things that we want to do. That, I think, helps leverage trying to make up the gap of the funding by having more private-based money or the community money to come in to fill those gaps that we need. Now, we've set those projects up and we recognize that these are the things that we want to do. We understand that we have a gap of funding, but at least we know that this list and that list can then go to the community or however we can close the gap of funding and get those things. Yes, there are some items that are definitely less funding that we can incorporate more. The bigger projects, we're going to have to try to figure out how to get into the sequence based on the funding.

Commissioner Hetterly: I guess that gets to sort of the heart of my concern. I don't want to be in a position where we do all the easy stuff just because it's easy and don't do the hard stuff just because we didn't call it out as super duper important.

Chair Lauing: It is a little bit jarring to see on the same list acquire new parkland and enhanced seating areas. We're going to tell the entire community that those are the top 15. Put in some benches and buy a gazillion dollars worth of parkland. At the least, it has to be shown that the funding sources for that is going to be different. It is not just going to be the annual CIP program. That ain't going to work. There has to be a commitment to it to make it happen. Secondly, I think I'm echoing what Commissioner Hetterly said. If that's going to cost \$50 million, we don't make it long term just because of that. We've got to start it now so it becomes something that starts now and is midterm and is long term and we're executing while we're continuing to fund for the next phase of it.

Mr. Jensen: I definitely would say that in the description of each of the 30 projects there would be a breakdown of exactly what the steps in the short, in the mid and in the long term would be to get to that goal. You just wouldn't say that we need more parkland, and

APPROVED

1 that would basically be it. It would talk about we need to draw more funds and start
2 banking funds. We need to have staff look at different property opportunities around the
3 City and all those things short term that we can start doing. Long term, when we get
4 enough revenue together, what is the step to actually go out and start to gain land and add
5 surplus to our parks. I do agree with you that it needs to have the steps per the short, long
6 or mid as it goes to accomplish it.

7
8 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Moss.

9
10 Commissioner Moss: I think there is a big danger in going into more specifics than what
11 you have here with 30. I think it's going to be every year, as you said, we're going to be
12 revisiting. You're going to have new Commissioners every year. This is a really great
13 guideline for the next 20 years. The first thing we're going to do in January and every
14 January is look at this list and pick off pieces that should be the highest priority within
15 each of these. Using the acquired parkland, it would be really nice to start working on
16 that one January 1st and just do a little bit. Dog parks, it would be nice to do one dog
17 park a year, something like that. To put all that in writing in the Master Plan for the next
18 20 years, I don't think it's worth it. This is a really great start. I don't know if you need to
19 do much more and prioritize 1 versus 7 versus 8. I think there's piece of 1 and pieces of 8
20 and pieces of 7 that should be done next year and some more the next year and some
21 more the next year. To go into that level of detail before we have anything approved, I
22 don't think it's worth it.

23
24 Chair Lauing: Could I just ask a clarification point on your comment? One of the things
25 you said is it's going—I don't want to put words in your mouth. That's why I'm asking
26 for clarification. I think what you said is it's going to change every year, what we're
27 going to want to do.

28
29 Commissioner Moss: At the program level and the CIP level.

30
31 Chair Lauing: Some of these aren't even CIP and some of them are. I guess my concern
32 is that, if we're saying these are the top 15 projects, then they shouldn't change every
33 year.

34
35 Commissioner Moss: What I meant is the pieces of them. You're going to go to a next
36 level down. Every year you're going to pick off ...

37
38 Chair Lauing: The execution or the implementation, you mean?

39
40 Commissioner Moss: Yes, yes.

41
42 Chair Lauing: Thanks.

Commissioner Moss: What parts of each of these 30 you're going to do next year versus the year after versus the year after. You don't want to wait until Year 20 to start doing acquire parkland. You're going to have to trust every PRC, that they're going to be able to prioritize the pieces of each of these that can be done this year versus next year versus next year.

Chair Lauing: Do we want to have a discussion on the 12 or 15 programs? To me these are a little bit lower risk because they're not structural changes, as Keith mentioned before. When you're building something, there's more money and time. If you expanded some programs for seniors and they didn't work, you're going to shift them or you're going to scale them back. You've got them included here. Do you want our comments on that?

Ms. O'Kane: Yes, we'd like your comments on that. You're right that we're not going to build something with these programs, but it could be a shift in staff priority, it could be do we need a new staff person, a new part-time staff person to address some of these. We do adjust our programming as we see the need for it. If we would expand our program for seniors and didn't get a response to that, then we would adjust and try something else. They are very different than the projects, but I still they're important to include, especially when we may need additional resources as far as staff or the facilities that may go along with these programs.

Chair Lauing: Commissioner Knopper.

Vice Chair Knopper: Number 5, establish and grow partnerships and identify potential park donors. It was suggested that maybe you have a point person, a staff person. I've talked about it many, many times. I think that's a fantastic idea. I think there's a lot of opportunities. I always like to talk about New York, because I spent more time there than here. They sell benches in Central Park for \$10,000 a bench, and you get a plaque. I think that there's so many ways to help offset the maintenance costs, because I know that's also in the report, how that's difficult to maintain, to keep up with everything that we own instead of just the glittery, shiny stuff like a new pool or a new dog park, but just the every day. That's really the only thing. I did want to ask just a question. This might not be the right time. I've thought it, and I wasn't sure this would be the right place for it. There's so much commercial development in Palo Alto. It just kind of doesn't feel like the City requires new developers to develop public space. There isn't that laundry list of you're building a new building, we want a little pocket park, a couple of benches and some open, green area required in that development so the public can use that space. There just doesn't seem to be any uniform—it's just project per project. I'm not sure that would fall under that. Maybe that's a totally different conversation. It probably is, but I made a note, and I just wanted to say it. I think if you guys had a menu of—because

APPROVED

1 you're always looking for additional space for people just to chill and have that Zen
2 moment on a park bench or sit under a tree or sit in the cute little chair and check your
3 email with some plants around you. Why can't commercial development provide a lot of
4 what we're looking for in this City? I don't know if this is the right place for it. I've got 2
5 more months, so I just wanted to say it.
6

7 Mr. de Geus: Some of that is a requirement for certain size buildings and types of
8 buildings. It is in Chapter 4 where we have the goals, policies and programs. Actually
9 there is a section in there that talks about development and when they are required to
10 have a public space, that it be designed in such a way that's consistent with the Master
11 Plan and the needs of the community. What I found helpful actually as we sort of
12 prepared this list of 30 is to go back to that Chapter 4 and look at those goals, policies and
13 programs. Obviously not all of that is here in this list of 30. This was our first pass at
14 putting that together. That would be good feedback from you all, if you go back and read
15 that chapter again and then look at this again and say does that sound right, is this the
16 right top 30 or there is still some more changes that need to be made. Maybe that's
17 something the ad hoc committee can help with.
18

19 Commissioner Cribbs: To that point, what I'd like to see in both the lists are the things
20 that are like each other kind of grouped together. As I've been going down here, there are
21 things that are sort of the same, big ticket items, and there are things that are not so
22 expensive maybe. Maybe it's a way to do it by cost, maybe not. I don't know. When it's
23 a list like it is, it's hard to read because it's not the same. I don't know whether that makes
24 sense at all.
25

26 Mr. de Geus: I think that's good feedback. How do we order this list is something that
27 we still need to work through. I've said the same thing. We could order it in what are the
28 near, midterm or long term. We could order it in the order of magnitude of cost or scope,
29 how long it's going to take to do it or type of project, program area. We'll think about
30 some different ways of doing that.
31

32 Commissioner Moss: Yeah, all three. I don't know. I think certainly big, medium and
33 little go sort of hand in hand with near term, midterm and long term. I think a hybrid of
34 those two would be great.
35

36 Chair Lauing: Do you want to move on to another section here? Did you get your
37 comments on the top 30? Did you intend to do that tonight? Like funding section and
38 how people ...
39

40 Ms. O'Kane: If there's comments on those sections, sure.
41

Chair Lauing: I just didn't know if that was part of your request tonight for feedback on that tonight, because this is just a draft.

Ms. O'Kane: Any feedback on Chapter 5 is welcome tonight. Our next step is to get a better, more complete draft of Chapter 5. We'd like to meet with the ad hoc again, if possible, to discuss that. As much input as we can get tonight to help us refine the draft would be great.

Chair Lauing: Are there any comments on the next section, which is basically the funding today and tomorrow section, the narrative there and the chart.

Commissioner Cribbs: I have just one ...

Chair Lauing: Sure, go ahead.

Commissioner Cribbs: ... about knowing a little bit more about grants and funding and partnerships that have worked in the past with various Friends groups and other ways we've gotten money in the past to support things, and what's worked and what hasn't worked. I know it's history, but I think it's really important to include some place or at least people have the knowledge of something that's worked in the past. If it didn't work, why didn't it? There's several examples of those as well.

Chair Lauing: Nothing else on funding? Go ahead, Commissioner Hetterly.

Commissioner Hetterly: I like that idea, Anne. I would support that addition. I think that's a really great idea. I'd only have two issues on the funding section. On page 5, first is immediately below the table, it talks about the IBRC report and how we're on a path with a funding plan to do most of the backlog on the catch-up and keep-up. Of course, the IBRC plan, I think, was 2012. I imagine there's been an additional gap accumulated in the interim. I know we haven't funded everything in that. I really would like to see a little change in tone that doesn't suggest we're all taken care of, we checked that off the list so we don't have to worry about that catch-up and keep-up stuff, and that acknowledges as we grow it grows. That does it for me. Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Anything else? Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What do anticipate? We talk here about the bonds and creating special districts and other ways of raising money. This is on page 6, expanding existing funding sources. Are we going to be coming up with a recommendation of this is how we think it should be funded or are we just going to give the Council a bunch of options and let them sort through it?

APPROVED

1 Ms. O'Kane: As part of the adoption of the Master Plan, we will not be making a
2 recommendation as to whether we should create a special district or issue a bond. This is
3 just to provide a summary of all the potential options out there for funding in the future.
4 As projects move up the list, for example Cubberley or something else, a new pool, then
5 we could go to Council with a recommendation at that time.
6

7 Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm struggling with what is the Council, when they approve
8 this, signing up for and how can we keep their feet to the fire or is this just some thoughts
9 of a bunch of Commissioners and the Council doesn't have any obligation to follow it and
10 doesn't have any commitment to follow through. I'm just nervous about we have this
11 grand plan and here we go, Council. The Council says, "This is great. We love it." We
12 pass it all, and then they put it down and never look at it again. That's my big concern.
13

14 Ms. O'Kane: I think part of that responsibility is also on staff to report on the Master
15 Plan, which we intend to do annually, but also as we propose projects, as we propose our
16 budget to tie those things back to the Master Plan. I think a lot of that responsibility will
17 fall on staff but also the Commission as well to make sure that it's moving along and
18 moving forward.
19

20 Mr. de Geus: I'd just add something to that. I think we can probably make this more
21 meaningful as we think about these different funding strategies and how they can be
22 expanded and also think about the top priorities and which one of these funding strategies
23 maybe is best suited for which project. I think that could be in here to some extent. To
24 Commissioner Cribbs' point about looking at those funding strategies that we've used in
25 the past, that have been very successful and how we can tie them back to some of the
26 priorities. I'm thinking about our Friends groups in particular. Our department has five
27 nonprofit Friends groups; all they do is raise money for specific programs whether it's
28 parks or recreation. It's been very successful. We can strengthen that language in here
29 and tie it maybe to specific projects even.
30

31 Chair Lauing: Did you have others? Go ahead.
32

33 Commissioner Cribbs: Yeah. On page 5, it seems like the word, under funding gap in
34 the third sentence, should be maintain instead of sustain. The City should sustain a
35 sufficient investment. It seemed like the wrong word.
36

37 Chair Lauing: Or maintain investment to sustain existing facilities.
38

39 Commissioner Cribbs: You could say that too. Maybe that's even better.
40

41 Chair Lauing: David.
42

Commissioner Moss: I have one last comment about Chapter 5. I like it so much that I think you should make it Chapter 4. The Chapter 4 that you have, make it Appendix A. We've covered so much of the Plan in Chapter 3 and 5 that Chapter 4, going back to my comment earlier, is a level below what we've been talking about in Chapters 1-5 and that gives us all the things we need to do next year and the year after and the year after. What do you think?

Ms. O'Kane: Chapter 4 is the goals and the policies and programs. The order is this is what we did to get our data, our community engagement, our data analysis. These are the things that we identified as being the goals of our Master Plan, of our system, and then this is how we're going to get there. It's like a step, a phase through the Master Plan.

Commissioner Moss: Does Chapter 1-3 summarize that? No?

Mr. de Geus: I think Chapter 4 is really fundamental to the Plan.

Chair Lauing: The next section here is evaluating future projects. One of the things that we talked about very briefly in the ad hoc was the issue who can put a project or program into the top of the funnel. I think you are opening a massive can of worms if you're going to let any individual or any community member put something in there that you get to evaluate and give them feedback on. It seems to me there's plenty of opportunity for folks to send in letters to us as they do or to you folks as they do. If it's a good idea, that's fine. I don't think you should have your hands tied by having to go through an evaluation process for every even good idea that comes in, because you just have so much more data to look at and prioritize. I personally wouldn't have that in here. Others can comment on that.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I agree.

Chair Lauing: Jim.

Commissioner Cowie: I wonder whether you might be more comfortable with it if there was some acknowledgement of an appropriate level of review. If it's obviously a ludicrous idea, the appropriate level of review is quick. If it's something that really should be considered, then perhaps a deeper review. If we're going to have a concept of modifications and where the ideas come from, it seems to me that the citizens have to be one of the sources. Right?

Chair Lauing: Yeah.

Commissioner Cowie: Then it's just a question, I think, of perhaps how you write the concept of review. You probably write it in such a way where you're dealing with this

appropriate level of review that addresses your concern that we're not engaging in a deep review of a trivial idea.

Chair Lauing: I'm the last one that's going to try to rule out public comment at our meetings or incoming emails or anything like that, no constraints. It's just this seems like it's setting up a formal process and almost encouraging a lot of things. It seems like you're putting an excess burden on yourself and staff.

Ms. O'Kane: We did talk about that after you commented on that during our ad hoc meeting. We do feel like there is a need to have a process. We're listing what we think our top 15 projects and top 15 programs are. If somebody presents a new idea, what do we do with that? We felt there is a need to have a process to determine does this project meet the goals of our Master Plan. That's sort of the first step. If we can say it doesn't, then we're done. If we feel it does, then we continue our analysis. We've also added in here that in some cases things won't need to come to the Commission. If we add a certain type of program, we're not going to come to you every time we create a new program in our Recreation Division. Maybe this isn't the right process, but I think it needs to be acknowledged in here that we will consider new proposals and new ideas as they come up and address them in some way.

Chair Lauing: Commissioner Moss.

Commissioner Moss: I think it could stay the way it is if in Step 2 it says evaluate against the Master Plan. You'll probably find that that program or proposal is already in the Plan somewhere, in some program. We're just maybe expanding the wording or something like that. That's what I'm hoping will happen, that we have talked about it in general terms and you will find a cubbyhole in a program or process that we've already put into the Master Plan. This is just a detail of that. I'm hoping that if you do get Step 1, somebody comes to you with an idea, that Step 2 could be a 10-minute process, where you say, "Let's look at the Master Plan. Let's see where this fits. Here it is, under Program 6A. We'll get to it when we do 6A." I don't know.

Commissioner Cribbs: Can I just add? I like having the process so that people can propose something. I'm also concerned about the amount of staff time that some of these things are going to take and in addition the annual review. All of a sudden we have a lot of staff doing a lot of reviewing of a lot of things, and we want to push the Master Plan forward. If you can figure out a way to balance that and be mindful of your time, that would be great.

Ms. O'Kane: We appreciate that. It could be even—I was looking at Step 1, which talks about a group proposes a project or program. Maybe it's just the wording there. It does sound like it's a formal process to propose something. Maybe it's just how we word it.

Chair Lauing: Any other comments on that?

Commissioner Reckdahl: Part of it is also just volume. If you get one suggestion a month, you're going to do one thing. If you get 100 suggestions a month, you're going to do a different thing. This may be just something you'll iron out as you get more suggestions and you understand the volume.

Chair Lauing: The only other section there is the appendix. I'm not sure we need to comment on that. You're going to give us timelines now? Is that your next part here?

Ms. O'Kane: Correct. If we're done with Chapter 5, I'll go into next steps and schedule. We are trying to still get this wrapped up by the end of the year. Part of that is to recognize the Commissioners that will not be continuing into the next year, but also some of the Council Members who are also not going to be continuing into the next year. We would like to sort of complete this Plan. That said, we want it to be finished with the quality that we all expect. Our plan to accomplish that is to bring you a draft Master Plan next month at our October 24th meeting. Prior to that and concurrent with that, we also need to do some community outreach, meet with our stakeholder group again. Whether we do that combined or separate, we're still working that out. We should have an opportunity for the community to look at the draft Master Plan. Following the PRC meeting, we plan to go to Council at the November 14th meeting. Because of that date and the November PRC meeting, which is right after that, we would be asking the Commission to make a recommendation at the October meeting when the Commission is seeing the draft. This is a recommendation to Council. We originally had on our schedule that the Commission could make the recommendation at the November meeting. Due to the crunch of time and the amount of time we need to prepare in advance and have our staff reports prepared, the timing didn't work. That's what we're proposing. Council would adopt the Master Plan and our CEQA document. We've been in discussions with legal as well as our Planning Department that we do need to adopt a CEQA document, which would be an Initial Study/Mitigated Neg Dec at the same time. We're hoping to do that in December.

Chair Lauing: We need to change the November meeting, which is listed on the 22nd, 2 days before Thanksgiving. One possibility would be to move it way up, so we could do a second meeting early November before it went to the Master Plan. Then we'd get sort of two shots at it and solve both of those problems at the same time. That would mean it would be the week of the 7th, which would be about 2 weeks after the 10/24 meeting. We could do later that week.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Could we bump the 10/24 to 10/17?

APPROVED

Commissioner Hetterly: In terms of getting a draft to Council on November 14th, do they need to have in their packet the version that has been acted on by the Commission? If we add a special Commission meeting the first week of November, that's too late to make any changes, right?

Chair Lauing: Right.

Commissioner Hetterly: Or can it be done through an addendum?

Chair Lauing: We would at least not have to make the decision by 10/24.

Commissioner Hetterly: We'd have one look at it on 10/24 and resolve everything following that meeting before it goes in final, if there's any final tinkering.

Commissioner Moss: 10/24 would be speak now or forever hold your peace.

Chair Lauing: No, no.

Commissioner Moss: They'd have several weeks to wrap it up, bring it back to us, we see that all the changes we discussed on 10/24 were made, and we approve it on 11/7. Is that what we're talking about?

Chair Lauing: Yeah. That's a suggestion. Abbie.

Vice Chair Knopper: This calendar that was given to us shows the Park and Rec meeting on October 18th.

Chair Lauing: Which is so far incorrect, but we could move it to there.

Vice Chair Knopper: 10/24 is a Monday. Is it really 10/25, which is Tuesday, which is our normal ...

Chair Lauing: Yep. 10/24 is a Tuesday.

Vice Chair Knopper: No, 10/25 is a Tuesday. That's Monday's date. Is that the day we're talking about?

Ms. O'Kane: We're talking about the normal Commission date.

Chair Lauing: The normal fourth Tuesday which is 10/25.

Vice Chair Knopper: The 25th.

Chair Lauing: How do people feel about moving up our meeting for November by about 2 weeks?

Commissioner Cribbs: Two weeks is election day.

Vice Chair Knopper: Election day, no offense, I am glued to the TV with oxygen, and maybe drugs and alcohol. I don't know.

Commissioner Hetterly: Why don't we move it to the 1st?

Vice Chair Knopper: That's the following week?

Commissioner Hetterly: November 1st. We have our October meeting, and then we have 1 week to make final changes before the 1st. Approve it on the 1st and it's done.

Chair Lauing: Feels tight.

Ms. O'Kane: That's to see a final a week later?

Vice Chair Knopper: Can it be a special meeting?

Ms. O'Kane: It would be the draft. You'd see the draft on the 25th, and a week later we would turn around a final?

Mr. de Geus: It's difficult, but I think it's ...

Commissioner Moss: (inaudible) would you rather have (inaudible)

Chair Lauing: It doesn't have to be a Tuesday. You can do it later that week, so it's more like a week and a half.

Mr. de Geus: I think that's a better scenario. It'll be difficult to do, but I think we should try and do that. It allows us to really update the report we send to Council. I think that's important. If the Commission ...

Chair Lauing: We should do—which date are you suggesting then?

Mr. de Geus: The suggestion by Commissioner Hetterly. If we meet on the 25th of October and then as soon after that as possible, that following week.

APPROVED

1 Chair Lauing: We could either do the 1st, which happens to be a Tuesday, but there's
2 nothing sacred about that. We could bump it to the 3rd to give you 2 more days.

3
4 Mr. de Geus: The 3rd is the date that the Council packet goes out for the 14th.

5
6 Chair Lauing: Then it probably has to be the 1st.

7
8 Vice Chair Knopper: Would that be like a special meeting?

9
10 Chair Lauing: By definition, yeah. Once you change the date, it's a special meeting.
11 That's how it works.

12
13 Mr. de Geus: We've done a lot of the review already. We're pretty comfortable with
14 Chapters 1-4 actually. We've reviewed those a lot. We've gone through Chapter 5 today,
15 and it still needs some work for sure. That's why I think it can be done, particularly if we
16 have a really good, really quality draft on the 25th.

17
18 Chair Lauing: Exactly. How is attendance going to look on the 1st for Commissioners?
19 Jim says no.

20
21 Vice Chair Knopper: I can do it. I'm good.

22
23 Chair Lauing: We're only going to be missing one?

24
25 Commissioner Cribbs: You might be missing me. I'm checking.

26
27 Chair Lauing: The day before is Halloween. That probably doesn't work either. Your
28 last point there, Kristen, is that they approve on the 12th because of two readings? They
29 get it on the 14th, and then you've got a final on 12/12.

30
31 Ms. O'Kane: Right. We would share the draft with them and then get any of their
32 feedback and then bring the final for adoption.

33
34 Vice Chair Knopper: What is the date for our December meeting, because this calendar
35 shows (crosstalk)?

36
37 Chair Lauing: We have to change that as well. We might as well look at that right now.

38
39 Commissioner Cribbs: I'm okay the 1st.

APPROVED

1 Chair Lauing: Is the 19th of December too late? Yes, it's too late? The 13th? That's the
2 day after the Council meeting. Does the 13th work of December? I'm not sure we're
3 going to be Commissioners then. I think it's November actually.

4
5 Vice Chair Knopper: Is it?

6
7 Chair Lauing: I don't know the right date.

8
9 Commissioner Reckdahl: I thought it was (inaudible).

10
11 Chair Lauing: I'm not sure. Can we pencil in the 13th? You'll make that change,
12 whoever is the keeper of the calendar. Is that Catherine now?

13
14 Commissioner Cribbs: The 27th is gone, and the 13th is (inaudible)?

15
16 Chair Lauing: Yeah.

17
18 Vice Chair Knopper: Are we (inaudible)?

19
20 Commissioner Hetterly: (inaudible)

21
22 Chair Lauing: On the 15th of December? We're going with the 13th of December and
23 we're going for the 1st of November, changing the December and November meetings
24 respectively.

25
26 Commissioner Moss: The Council is supposed to approve on December 12th.

27
28 Chair Lauing: that's what Kristen has here.

29
30 Commissioner Moss: Does that mean we need to meet on the 6th or not?

31
32 Chair Lauing: I suppose they could kick it back on the 14th, but that's a bigger problem.
33 If they're going to kick it back, I don't think it's going to be fixed in a week.

34
35 Commissioner Moss: Maybe the 13th is better.

36
37 Ms. O'Kane: Chair, can we review those dates, just so we're all on the same page?

38
39 Chair Lauing: Yeah. We're moving the November meeting ...

40
41 Commissioner Moss: Start with October.

Chair Lauing: October goes back to its regularly scheduled time and station, which is the 25th. November moves from the 22nd, which is the normal spot, to the 1st. December moves from the 26th to the 13th. Is that a wrap on that issue? Thanks for your time and efforts. Let's keep it moving towards that goal line.

4. Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates.

Chair Lauing: The next item of business is other ad hoc committees and liaison updates. Which ad hocs do we have? Do we have dogs?

Commissioner Hetterly: The dog ad hoc met yesterday to talk about what we can do to move forward with an near-term dog park. We've hit a few bumps, but we think we're still going to barrel ahead with something. We're hoping to get that sorted out soon and schedule some public outreach. Sounds familiar, right?

Chair Lauing: That is the next step. We're moving on it. Other ad hocs? David.

Commissioner Moss: The Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan, the staff did present their outline of what the Plan will look like. It looks very comprehensive and a lot of work. It seems like the right thing to do. I don't know exactly when we'll start the first chapter or the first step.

Kristen O'Kane: Daren and I put together a scope of work that will be used to obtain a consultant who will be actually preparing the Conservation Plan. We had some stakeholder groups review the scope as well as the ad hoc of one, Commissioner Moss. There's some other stakeholders that Daren has sent the scope to including Enid Pearson and Emily Renzel. They're reviewing it as well. As soon as we get their feedback on it and incorporate those comments, we're going to start the Request for Proposal process and obtain bids from consultants. Just a little bit until we start writing the first chapter, but we have the scope in place. Pretty close to being done with the scope.

V. DEPARTMENT REPORT

Chair Lauing: The next item is departmental reports. You still have the floor if you'd like to speak to that.

Kristen O'Kane: I will start out. I just have one announcement of an event coming up this weekend. Sunday, October 2nd, is what used to be called the Bike Palo Alto event. It's now Bike and Roll Expo. They've added an expo to the Bike Palo Alto event, which will be right outside at King Plaza. They'll have Bryant and Hamilton closed off in front of City Hall. There will be different vendors, demonstrations of alternative modes of

1 transportation. Just a lot of fun things to do. That event is from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. on
2 Sunday, October 2nd. I think Daren had some project updates for you.

3
4 Daren Anderson: Yeah, I've got four projects to give you a quick briefing on. The first is
5 the golf course. It's moving along. We're still in the beginning stages of the earth work,
6 which is kind of the bulk of the project frankly. It's 400,000 cubic yards that we had
7 imported. That's to shape and contour the course. Right now we are moving about
8 15,000 to 20,000 yards a day. We've got massive pieces of equipment, maybe 15-20 of
9 them, moving all day long reshaping and moving earth. Concurrent with that, they're
10 harvesting the good top soil and sand that had been part of the course in earlier iterations,
11 when we did upgrades. We've harvested about 50,000 yards of that and stockpiled that in
12 a separate area. About 30,000 more yards of that quality top soil to harvest. Ultimately,
13 that will be used to form that top 8 inches of really good soil to propagate our new grass
14 on and have a nice healthy condition. The next stage will be kind of concurrent with the
15 earth work, installing the drainage and irrigation. Around April 2017, we'll start building
16 the new cart paths, constructing greens and growing in grass. Again, the project should
17 be complete around November 2017. I would also note that we've started conversations
18 with the artist that had been selected to do the public art component of this project. Her
19 name is Joyce Soo [phonetic]. Just engaged her regarding where the new piece would be
20 set. It hasn't been built yet, so some things are up in the air. Most likely it'll be near the
21 putting green area of the course. Another briefing is on the 36.5 acres, the former ITT
22 antenna field. The last time we talked, there was a strong feeling that we should move
23 forward with dedicating it as parkland as soon as possible. I've drafted the staff report
24 and gathered all the background information and maps, deeds, etc., and drafted the Park
25 Dedication Ordinance. It's being reviewed by the City Attorney's Office right now. As
26 soon as they've completed that step, it'll be sent to go on the Council's Consent Calendar.
27 Another project I was asked about at the last meeting was the two Baylands projects.
28 Commissioner Reckdahl had asked for a briefing on where we stand. This is the two
29 existing CPIs associated but distinct. One is for the Baylands Nature Center itself, the
30 structural improvements to the facility. The contract was awarded. This is a construction
31 contract with Buhler [phonetic] Commercial. It'll start on October 24th, next month, and
32 be completed around the spring of 2017. I know in the past we had discussed some of the
33 concerns of—it's a little sensitive because we've got clapper rail issues. If you miss your
34 timing, your window could throw you off. I think we've oriented to the schedule around
35 completing all the impactful work, that is the noise pieces, in advance of the deadline,
36 where you can no longer do that, in time. If there were residual work that had to be done,
37 it would be inside the building and acceptable even during the clapper rail season.
38 Community Services, by the way, will continue the educational programs that they
39 typically run out of that facility, but they'll be doing it at East Palo Alto's Cooley Landing
40 Nature Center during the project construction. The other associated project is the
41 Baylands Boardwalk project. We awarded Biggs Cardosa the contract for design and the
42 environmental permitting for that project. They'll begin the work in October. Part of it

1 will be, as I mentioned, the environmental. That's an initial study and the environmental
2 assessment. This will come back to the Commission for a 15 percent design in December
3 of this year. There will be a little bit of a break while they work on the bulk of the
4 environmental assessment. As you know, that takes time, but they'll come back in the
5 summer of 2017 to the Commission with a 35 percent design and some details on the
6 environmental study that's associated with that one. The last issue I wanted to share with
7 you is we had submitted a request to address a problem with Los Trancos Trail. A bit of
8 a structural problem that you might recall I talked about. We had asked for extra money.
9 Council gave it to us. We worked with our existing trail contractor to do far more than
10 we had traditionally done, really restoring it to the way it used to be. This is what we
11 refer to as a wash-out area on the back side of this trail, where a good portion of the
12 hillside just regularly crumbles down onto this trail and makes it very unsafe. In fact, we
13 had a couple of accidents right before we made these improvements. The timing is good
14 that we're getting up and approved. Actually the substantive repairs have been
15 completed; they look great. I should note, though, that it's not the entire trail that had
16 been groomed perfectly. There are still elements of that trail—again it's almost 8 miles
17 long, so you can imagine how much time it takes to come in and make these repairs. The
18 bulk of the major issues have been corrected. Now, there are little things that staff will
19 come by periodically as regular maintenance and upgrade. I encourage you to get out
20 there and hike it. I just did it last weekend. It's beautiful, a great hike. It is open.

21
22 Chair Lauing: Any update on the hydrologic study?

23
24 Mr. Anderson: Hydrologic study is running right now. We're just at the stage of
25 completing the survey work. In fact, this last weekend the surveyor was up taking points
26 and doing measurements and completing that section of the project. The next phase will
27 be connecting with stakeholders and probably a public meeting. I would guess we'd be
28 looking at that in about a month or two. I'll bring it back to the Commission and make
29 sure you guys know about it.

30
31 Commissioner Moss: Any update on filling up Cubberley to replace Foothill?

32
33 Rob de Geus: That's a very timely question, because I was just at the City Council last
34 night discussing this. We did put out an RFP over the summer. We know that Foothill
35 College is leaving by the end of this month actually. They're the anchor lease at
36 Cubberley. They have 39,000 square feet of space that they had exclusively. We were a
37 bit nervous about it because we only have a 3-year lease with the School District.
38 Getting in a new, big anchor lease was going to be difficult. We don't have one new
39 lease; we have 17 new leases of a variety of nonprofit organizations providing a
40 community benefit of one or another. We have health and fitness groups, some music
41 groups and dance groups, education tutoring, different organizations. We're drafting
42 those leases now. We're going to be able to get close to the revenue target that Foothill

1 was paying, which is \$1 million a year, with the 17 new lease agreements. Be happy to
2 report on that. They'll moving in within the next couple of months, most of them in
3 November.

4
5 Commissioner Moss: How will that impact us as far as the overall Cubberley plan?
6

7 Mr. de Geus: The Master Plan work is going slowly, let's just say. We're 2 years into the
8 5-year lease, and we have not made a lot of progress. We talked about that last night with
9 the Council as well. They really want to see that thing get started and moving. Our
10 current timeline that we're thinking is to write a scope of services to get some support
11 probably beginning with some type of community needs assessment in the fall, and really
12 start in earnest in January. The thing that's holding us up a little bit is the School
13 District's still having a lot of discussion about their enrollment and the future needs for
14 schools. In fact, this evening it's on the agenda at the School District. There's an item
15 that talks about an additional school and what that might mean and some different
16 options. They're also considering that their administrative offices may be suitable for
17 relocating to Cubberley and not have a school at Cubberley. That's a big difference than
18 having a school at Cubberley. We think that answering that fundamental question, is it
19 going to be a education school-type of use for what the School District needs or
20 administration, we need to know that in advance of bringing on a consultant to help us
21 figure out what we might do there. I know the School District's very interested in moving
22 this forward as well. Dr. Max McGee, the Superintendant, has committed to moving this
23 forward with Jim. Be very interested to see how the discussion went this evening, so we
24 can move this thing along.

25
26 Chair Lauing: Any other announcements? Peter.
27

28 Peter Jensen: I think I touched on it last month. The Wilkie Way bike path has opened,
29 providing an access point to the Sommerset or Sommer Hills—I'm not sure exactly which
30 one it is. They do have a park there that's very close to Monroe Park. Those two parks
31 can now act in conjunction as one, because the newer part in the Sommerset homes has a
32 little bit more advanced playground than what we see at Monroe. We're also wrapping
33 up the renovation of Bowden Park. The playground is open, and there's a few last details
34 to take care of there. That project is close to being completed as well.

35
36 Commissioner Reckdahl: The new Sommer Hill park, is that owned by the City or is that
37 private property?
38

39 Mr. Jensen: That's private. I think the agreement of builder was that it would be a
40 public-used space. It is private; it's not maintained or renovated by the City in any way.
41

Commissioner Reckdahl: As things age, do we have any authority to force them to repair or we just have to hope that they repair it in a timely manner?

Mr. Jensen: That's not a question I can answer now. We can find out more about that, though.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you.

Chair Lauing: The next—I'm sorry.

VI. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Hetterly: I don't know if comments and announcements is where it goes. I have a question about the AT&T site next to Boulware Park. We've had public comment about that. We've received a number of emails about it. It sounds as though nobody knows how one would move forward on investigating whether that's a viable option. This is an AT&T property that's adjacent to Boulware Park, right in the heart of one of our search areas. I wonder what we can do to sort that out so that we can maybe move this along. This is a perfect example of a major opportunity cost. If this is something we want to pursue, we ought to figure out how to do it.

Rob de Geus: We're looking into that. I saw that lengthy email from the gentleman that's asking that question. We're going to work with the real estate office to see what the next steps are. I don't know all the information. Is it really up for sale or will it be up for sale? Is there an interest in selling the property? There's just a lot of questions at this point, but we can report back next month.

Commissioner Hetterly: That'd be great. I know we haven't done it, so we don't have a track record of how one would do that. Figuring out the how seems to me the first step and being able to communicate that back to these folks who are really interested in it and pushing it. Thank you.

VII. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR OCTOBER 25, 2016 MEETING

Chair Lauing: The next item on the agenda is to look at the agenda for October 25th. Are we getting to see the Zoo?

Kristen O'Kane: I think the Zoo is more likely to come in November.

Chair Lauing: We hoped that they were going to come today. They pushed out.

APPROVED

1 Ms. O'Kane: They did. Right now, all I know of for the October agenda is the Master
2 Plan. That may change between now and then. I'll communicate that with you as things
3 come up.

4
5 Chair Lauing: Any other items that we'd like to see for that agenda?

6
7 Commissioner Cribbs: Weren't we going to have some information about the aquatics?

8
9 Chair Lauing: Are you going to come back on aquatics?

10
11 Ms. O'Kane: Yes. Thank you.

12
13 Chair Lauing: Any other items at all? Otherwise, we'll entertain a motion for
14 adjournment. See if we can get a vote on that.

15
16 **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

17
18 Meeting adjourned on motion by Commissioner Reckdahl and second by Commissioner
19 Cowie at 10:00 p.m.