APPROVED

MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
November 16, 2016
CITY HALL
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California

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

Commissioners Absent: Jim Cowie

Others Present:

Staff Present: Daren Anderson, Rob de Geus, Peter Jensen, Amy Johnson, Kristen O'Kane

I. ROLL CALL CONDUCTED BY: Kristen O'Kane

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS:

Chair Lauing: The next item on the agenda is any agenda changes or requests or deletions. Do we have any of those? That stands pat.

III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Chair Lauing: Next would be oral communications. Members of the public can address the Commission on any subject that's not on the agenda. If we have a lot of speakers, which happily we do tonight, we're going to allow about 2 minutes per speaker, not for everybody. I have a number of speaker cards that apply to Action Item Number 2. Are there any speakers on something that's not on the agenda? No, okay.

IV. BUSINESS:

1. Approval of Draft Minutes from October 25, 2016 Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting.

Approval of the draft October 25, 2016 Minutes as corrected was moved by Commissioner Hetterly and seconded by Commissioner Cribbs. Passed 4-0 Knopper abstaining

2. Update on review of Aquatics Program Analysis

Chair Lauing: The second item on the agenda is an update on the review of the Aquatics Program analysis. I think we should do speakers before you make a presentation. Will that be all right?

Jazmin LeBlanc: (inaudible)

Chair Lauing: You want it after, okay.

Rob de Geus: Good evening, Commissioners. Rob de Geus, Director of Community Services. Good to see you this evening. Jazmin's going to lead us through the presentation. You all know Jazmin, who's our Strategy and Operations Manager. We have a new working title that I'm trying to remember. We also have some guests. We have Tony Batis, who runs the PASA program over here. We have Carol Macpherson in the audience, that has run the Rinconada Masters program for 43 years. They started the program. Two very important partners in our aquatics program. We have Tim Sheeper, who runs the aquatics program—he's at the table here—and was responsive to the RFP that we put out, that we'll talk about again here. We also have a lot of guests. Thank you for coming. That's probably my fault; I invited them here. We've been getting some emails about concerns about potential changes to the schedule and how that might impact some of the programs that exist out there. We want to hear their voices, so I invited them here. I'm glad we've got a good turnout.

Chair Lauing: That's great.

Mr. de Geus: With that, I'll pass it onto Jazmin, and we'll get along with the presentation.

Ms. LeBlanc: Thanks. Jazmin LeBlanc. I'm going to quickly go through where we are and what our program offers right now. Our current aquatics program …

Male: Could you use a microphone please?

Ms. LeBlanc: Yeah. Can you guys hear me better? I'm going to speak up. We offer a year-round, adult lap-swim program. In the summers only, we also offer family recreation swim, learn to swim lessons for youth, facility rentals for private pool parties. We have a year-round, competitive youth swim team, PASA Palo Alto Stanford Aquatics, and a year-round, competitive adult swim team, Rinconada Masters. The reason we're all sitting here tonight is because over the last 3 years, we've had trouble staffing the pool, which has gotten to emergency levels in some cases. In addition, we know that customers have been asking for additional hours of pool time and also additional swim lessons. In the summers of 2015 and '16, we ended up having to contract for summer swim lessons with Team Sheeper. They were able to come and do a quick response to our RFP to get summer swim lessons to occur. We could not get enough staff to provide the lessons that we had put in our catalogs. We continue to see staffing shortages while we frequently have to call on the Recreation Coordinator to come sit and actually work as a lifeguard into the fall. We even need to use Team Sheeper's staff just on an hourly basis to keep the lap swim program running as it is right now. In terms of the increased demand, when we looked at some recent years for youth swimming lessons, we could see that 50 percent of our lessons were full or wait-listed and that 70 percent of the swim lesson participants indicated to us that they would enroll in swim lessons if they were offered in the spring or fall. In addition to that, we've done some pretty in-depth surveys where we've gotten responses back indicating that half of the residents here would like to have more opportunities for recreational swimming. That's important or very important to these residents. We would like to be responsive to the needs of City residents. We are hoping to achieve the following with our Aquatics Program. We're hoping to be able to expand the swim lesson season and also provide more evening and weekend lessons, which are the most impacted times. We don't offer weekend lessons now, but evenings are the most impacted times. We'd also really like to respond to customer demands to increase recreational swimming, and we'd like to add open hours for lap swim and recreational swimming outside of the 9:00 to 5:00 weekday hours. We issued a Request for Proposal in December '15 that allowed for respondents to propose operations of any and all pieces of the swim program that we have. We received two proposals, and we went forward with Team Sheeper's bid. We felt that it was the best bid that we got. The criteria that we used. We're looking at City and resident costs; the quality of the service and customer satisfaction; and the diversity of programming and accessibility that we saw in those proposals. To continue on that, we really are aiming to try to make this program better. That's our goal. We want to be able to support the existing programs that we already have, which is Rinconada Masters, PASA, lap swim, recreation swim, learn to swim lessons, and aquatic exercise programs. Actually we don't have that yet, but it would be great if we did. We'd like to develop and grow existing programs where we have capacity, and be sure that we are really efficiently scheduling the use of the pool to balance increasing demand and making our programs more successful and making sure that all residents feel like they have good access to the pool. I'm going to let Rob chime in here.

Mr. de Geus: Thank you, Jazmin. I think the last slide is an important one, and important for the members of the public that are here to understand. While we're trying to solve a problem at the pool, particularly related to swim lessons, where we just aren't able to staff up sufficiently to meet the demand, we also think that there is opportunity to improve the Aquatics Program overall. I know that our Rinconada Masters head coach, Carol, believes that too, and so does Tony. We think Tim has a pretty innovative way of thinking and can be a great help to us in the Aquatics Program. Having said that, I don't think we're there yet in terms of what we would like to recommend. We have these seven sort of program areas. With the learn to swim program, we're at a point where we have enough information that we would like to go to the City Council and lock in a contract for Team Sheeper, Tim and his group, to continue the swim lesson program as he's done for the last 2 years. In addition to that, expand the lesson program into the spring and into the fall. We have many families that would like their kids to learn to swim in advance of summer. We're not providing that opportunity and that need. It's a real safety need. We have the pool sitting idle frequently in the spring. I'm talking mostly about the children's pool, the cloverleaf pool. The expanded lesson program will largely be in that pool. We're ready to make that commitment. We think that Team Sheeper can also help support and grow some of the other program areas, but we need more time. We need more time to hear from the public, from the Masters swimmers, the lap swimmers, the families that swim with PASA and also from those that don't swim at all yet. They just don't have access. The times just don't work for them. To understand that voice, which is a very important one. As far as we are this evening, our recommendation is really about expanding the learn to swim program with more outreach to occur for the other programs. We think that'll take a couple of months really to give that enough time to understand how we might improve the overall Aquatics Program.

Ms. LeBlanc: This is our proposed learn to swim program with Team Sheeper. What you can see is there is an increase in pricing, but we have done what we think is a—we have focused in on group youth swim lessons to try to keep the prices as low as possible and to still be accessible to our residents. You can see that we're proposing actually a $6 subsidy that the City would cover for residents doing group youth swim lessons. You can see there is an increase in the other lesson prices. We would point out that we've been paying for this subsidy. We've been paying the nexus of roughly $40 per lesson per student who's coming in for private youth lessons for the last 2 years. It limits how many lessons we're able to offer. In some way, that's nice that we can give people a really low-cost way to get private youth lessons. On the other hand, it means that we can only provide so many. What Team Sheeper is proposing is to be able to provide quite a bit more in the learn to swim program for a longer period of time and more lessons in general.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Is only the group youth lessons—is that the only one that has the subsidy?

Ms. LeBlanc: Yes.

Commissioner Reckdahl: All those prices are at cost then?

Ms. LeBlanc: Yes.

Mr. de Geus: That's a good question, Commissioner Reckdahl. The last time we spoke about this which was September—was that right? Our understanding is that one of the chief concerns that the Commission had was the group lessons and to make sure that they're affordable, that they wouldn't be a barrier for a family to have their kids learn to swim because of cost. We have a very, very low fee right now. Even if we were to continue the program in-house, we would increase the fees to be closer to what other public pools are charging. As we looked at this, we thought if we balanced the cost of additional swim lessons with residents where the City's subsidizing half of the increase and then the resident the other half, that's a reasonable compromise. We can add many more offerings of swim lessons throughout the spring, summer and fall.

Commissioner Cribbs: I had a question about the adult lessons, the private adult lessons. How are the charges for those?

Mr. de Geus: I understand we currently have an outside vendor already providing support for the outdoor swim lessons. We have a special contractor that helps us with that.

Commissioner Cribbs: They're now at 64 for residents, and then you're recommending 37?

Mr. de Geus: That's Tim Sheeper's proposal.

Ms. LeBlanc: It's a different model that they're proposing.

Mr. de Geus: Our lessons are an hour, and his are 30 minutes.

Commissioner Cribbs: I get it. Thank you.

Mr. de Geus: Carrying on with the learn to swim program, which is really the change that staff is recommending at this time. It's not such a great change, because we had Tim and his group provide the lessons for the last 2 years and have done a good job. But expand the program. I mentioned that we would invite Tim this time around so that you

could hear a little more about his program and how it's different and some of the unique things that he provides. I've had a chance to get to know Tim and his team somewhat and have been over to the pool they manage in Menlo Park. I think they do a very good job. That's not to say we want exactly what they have in Menlo Park. We don't, I think, for a whole lot of reasons. Tim is here to provide a service for Palo Alto residents and what fits with our group. This shows you an example of how many increased lessons and times of the year that we'll have lessons. Tim, if you wouldn't mind sharing a little bit about your program and how you see the differences that a family and kids will experience swim lessons with your program versus the one we've been operating.

Tim Sheeper: Yes, absolutely. Thanks for allowing me to come to talk to you tonight. This table helps us out. It shows that currently there's 9 weeks of swim lessons offered for the community. Our proposal is to do 30 weeks. What that is, is 10 weeks before summer, pretty much the 10 weeks of summer, and then the 10 weeks following summer to give you 30. Instead of running the model where it's 4 days a week of swim lessons, where a family could sign up for 2 weeks in a row and get eight lessons, there's a couple of options. First, we'll offer lessons 7 days a week. In the summer, they could still go with that model of the session base which the community is used to, or they can go on a perpetual model, which is getting a lesson every week at a day and time that they pick. We could run a hybrid model with what the City currently has and something that will allow people to do a perpetual basis for the 30 weeks, much like booking a piano lesson or a karate lesson or something per week. The different levels of instruction. Palo Alto currently has seven different levels, and ours would be a little broader. We'd offer 13 different levels. We'd add a water babies, water tots, swimming essentials, and then a bunch of different levels on top at the higher end. We call them swim lessons elite and so on. There's just a little broader range of offerings. In the table, it talks about the number of aquatics camps. We're also talking about giving swim lessons in a week-long aquatic camp, which is really popular. They can get a 45-minute swim lesson as part of their day camp where they're at the aquatics center for 5 hours, and they get their swim lesson. Maybe I could talk a little bit about the difference in our swim lesson or what we try to do with our swim lessons. Ours is very skill based. We teach one skill, and we focus on one skill at a time in our swim lessons. We get the individuals, the students to get a mastery of that skill. We have them perform that three times before they move onto the next skill. It's a layered system; they can't move on until they perfect one skill. It helps to build a really strong foundationally sound swimmer rather than just somebody who can be safe in the water. Of course, they're safe in the water, but it builds lifelong swimmers.

Mr. de Geus: We're almost finished with our presentation. Thank you, Tim, for that. You'll have a chance, of course, to ask questions of us and Tim. Now, we need to think about the other programs that exist at the pool and how might we evaluate what we can do there. The main thing I might iterate here is that we're not looking to change the existing programs in a negative way. Some of the emails that have been coming in

suggested that's an interest. It's not. We want to manage and operate the pool in a responsible way and be good stewards of this great asset, and see if we can have more Palo Alto residents take advantage of it. How do we do that? That's really the question. I think with the swim lesson program, Tim provides a great solution. I think there may be other improvements we can make to the overall program. I look forward to talking with the swimmers more about what that might be. We could improve opportunities for lap swimmers. I'm confident we can. I've talked with Carol at length many times about the Masters program and her interest in growing that program. We don't want to grow it without her; we want to grow it with her, with Carol and Tim working together to build the Masters program in a way that doesn't take away from what exists today but builds on it. I think it would be a wonderful thing, and we'd get more Palo Alto residents participating in that great program with Carol as the head coach, of course. The same is true for the PASA program, which certainly seems like it's at capacity. I was at a meet the other week, and it was a zoo out there. There's also limits to what the pool can handle. If I'm hearing some of the concerns correctly, the pool is at capacity at certain times. In the mornings in particular, I think that's the case. It really isn't going to be an opportunity to do a whole lot. We think there is an opportunity to do a little more sharing in different ways, and we would like to test some of that. Where it is at capacity, adding just more program is going to diminish the experience for everyone. We're not interested in doing that. In any case, we're going to work with the different groups and the swimmers to see how we might operate the pool more effectively and not only support the existing programs but grow those programs. Over the next couple of months, we hope to be able to come back to the Commission in the new year with some additional recommendations. That's where we are. Next slide, I think. This is just an example of the current schedule that we have. We have a very sort of block-type schedule, where one group uses the entire pool. They stop, and another group comes, and they use the entire pool. We're still looking at the data closely. Is it really using the pool in the best way? Is it at capacity at all these times? Is there an opportunity to do a little more without compromising existing activity and programs? We think there is. We've drafted a few different schedules to sort of play around with some ideas, but we don't have anything really yet to propose. We think there's opportunity. This is another time—Tim, maybe you can help a little bit, talk about a more integrated Aquatics Program overall. I have to say I have some interest in that. When we run a program—I think about the golf course which we operate also. We have a maintenance company that's a standalone maintenance company. We have a restaurateur that's a standalone restaurateur. We have a golf professional, Brad Lozares, who's a separate group. We have the City that's also—we're trying to make sure that everybody's on the same page and we're running a seamless golf course where the customer doesn't see the differences in customer service. It's challenging. It's not very efficient. If we can have a more integrated program, where there is an operator that's overseeing more of the programs so that they can be sensible, efficiency sharing of the pool. We think there's an opportunity there that will result in more residents having access to the pool and participating in the program, able to lap

swim, able to join the Masters program, things like that. Tim will share what's happening at the Burgess pool. They have a very integrated program there. My experience in observing that is it's very interesting to see, but it does seem overwhelming to me and, I think, probably not what Palo Alto wants to see at Rinconada. We're not bringing Tim in to replicate what's at Burgess. He's coming in to provide a service for Palo Alto residents, and it has to be in Palo Alto residents' interests. He understands that, as do I. We have to understand what is in their interests, and that's the process we're going through now. Tim, if you wouldn't mind talking a little bit about that integration.

Mr. Sheeper: Looking at the current summer schedule that you have up, it's a combination of the block schedule that you talked about and the integrated schedule. You have a little bit of both. For example, the morning is the block schedule. The afternoon and the evening is integrative. Just to use and see more of that integrative throughout the entire day is the direction that I would like to see with Rinconada pool. It's something that's already in place; I'd just like to see a little more of it so that the pool is serving more of the community more of the time.

Mr. de Geus: This is the non-summer schedule. Again, we think there's opportunity here to do some more integration, even more of a block schedule here. By the way, this is just the main pool, not the children's pool. The children's pool schedule is closed essentially much of the time outside of summer. We'd like to open that up for more recreation swimming, more swim lessons. Even some periods of time during the non-summer schedule, even the main pool doesn't have activity. That's the yellow maintenance time. There's an opportunity for maybe more lap swim, additional aquatic programs that the community might be interested in. I think we're at the last slide. Is that right, Jazmin? We're at a point that we would aim to recommend a contract with Team Sheeper for the learn to swim program. We have a catalog that we need to put out for the summer. There's some urgency there. We've put it together already, and it gets printed in late December and out in January. We have our summer camp fair and all those things. We do need to know what we're planning to do with the swim lesson program. Very much would love to be able to offer an expanded swim lesson program for residents this spring, if we can do it, and I think we can. As far as any changes to the other programs at this time, not recommending any at this time. Interested in hearing from the variety of user groups. We've done a couple of surveys. There's a survey out currently, which we've received a couple hundred responses on. It's really interesting. We certainly are hearing that people want to see more access and more opportunity for their different swimming interests and needs. We'll be doing additional intercept surveys. Just going to the pool and talking to people, particularly important with lap swimmers that aren't an organized group. They just come, and some come very regularly, some obviously not as regularly. Just trying to get a sense of where they're at. Perhaps a community meeting we're thinking also. We're continuing to study the data and looking at each of the months of the year and what have we been experiencing in terms of lap swim or Masters, when they

have 14 lanes and at that particular time of the day, is it at capacity and we have all swimmers or are several lanes empty frequently. If that's the case, is there an opportunity there that we could more efficiently use the pool? That's where we are. That's the next steps, and then back to the Commission in January/February timeframe.

Chair Lauing: What's that going to be? More recommendations?

Mr. de Geus: It could be. I think so. We'd see if we think it does make sense to expand Tim's contract to support some of these other areas. I have to say we're working closely with Tony from PASA and Carol with Rinconada Masters and meeting together as a group and with Tim to understand what their interests are, how they want to grow the program, where they think it's going to be a real problem. We had a couple of schedules that we put out as an example, and it was clearly going to be a problem for at least one of the programs. That's exactly what we need to know, so then we adapt and see what is just the right fit. They've been great, by the way, Carol and Tony, extremely supportive and have been doing a phenomenal job for many years for Palo Alto. I don't want to speak for them, but I think there's real hope here for improving and enhancing their programs as well as the overall program for Palo Alto. With that, happy to answer any questions or listen to the public.

Chair Lauing: We really welcome all of you. Love to hear voices directly from the public. I'm pretty sure this group here is more than all we've seen in 2017, which is great. It shows interest around this. We also have quite a few speaker cards. I'd like you to be sort of prompt. I'll announce who going to go up, and then who's going to be next so you can get ready. Assuming that there's going to be some overlap in some of the comments, which is fine, we'd like to keep it to 2 minutes because we have about 20 speaker cards here. That's going to take a while to get through. Twenty-one. To give everybody a chance, we're going to run a timer here and be somewhat strict about that just in the spirit of cooperation. The first person—you need to use the mike because this is all being recorded as well as being broadcast. You need to be at the mike so that we can record. Yes, Commissioner Cribbs.

Commissioner Cribbs: Thank you very much. I just wanted to say in the interest of full disclosure, as I'm sitting here as a Commissioner, I have known Carol Macpherson since we were kids together and swam at Santa Clara Swim Club. I also sat in the room where she and Tom Osborne and Cindy Baxter and I started the Masters program at Rinconada, when we were looking for a place so that the swimming could go on year-round. I have a real attachment to Rinconada Masters. I have been a member, but I'm not currently. I coached at Palo Alto Swim Club in the 1980s and know Tony and Tisha incredibly well. I'm so proud of what they've done for Palo Alto, carrying the name forward in the swimming world. I'm also on the Board of Directors of the Rich May Foundation. We recently, within the last year, hired Team Sheeper to monitor and take care of our field in

East Palo Alto. He is absolutely doing a great job. Those are my connections as I'm asking questions. I thought everybody should know that. I'm also so happy to see all the swimmers in the audience. Thank you.

Chair Lauing: The first speaker is going to be David Levison, to be followed by Carol Macpherson. These are pretty much in the order that we got them submitted.

David Levison: I've been a member of the Rinconada Masters swimming program for 40 years. Carol Macpherson has been my coach the whole time along with Cindy Baxter, who retired several years ago. One of the reasons I moved to Palo Alto was to be close to Rinconada pool so I could ride my bike to the workouts. In college, I was on the swimming team, but I was a relatively mediocre swimmer. I always believed I had more potential than I had demonstrated. In the Rinconada Masters program, coaches Carol and Cindy worked with me and developed my stroke mechanics and conditioning to such an extent that I won eight national titles over the years including several in the grueling 400 meter individual medley and 200 meter butterfly. Now that I am 66 years old and retired as a competitor, I depend on the Rinconada Masters program, which has been such a major part of my life, to keep me healthy and fit. You might imagine that it came as a great shock to me when I found out that seemingly out of the blue and without consulting any of us swimmers, the City is proposing to degrade both the Rinconada Masters program and the lap swimming program by going from the present system, which nearly every swimmer in both groups is happy with, to a poorly thought out hybrid system, which we don't need or want. Right now the lap swimmers have exclusive use of all 14 lanes early mornings on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, and the Rinconada Masters have exclusive use of all 14 lanes early mornings on Monday, Wednesdays and Fridays. Giving us each seven lanes six days a week during the same time period is unworkable. Lap swimmers want to do their own thing, but Masters swimming involves organized workouts and timed swims. Trying to combine the two during the same time period would lead to chaos. Please leave our mornings status quo. It would be a personal disaster for me if the Rinconada Masters swimming program I have been perfectly happy with for 40 years were to be destroyed.

Chair Lauing: Thank you. After Carol will be Anne Harrington. After Carol.

Carol Macpherson: Am I next?

Chair Lauing: Yeah, you're next, definitely.

Ms. Macpherson: I'm going to read mine so it'll be faster, so I can stay within the 2 minutes.

Chair Lauing: Thank you.

Ms. Macpherson: My name is Carol Macpherson, coach and founder of Rinconada Masters along with Cindy Baxter, who's retired. In 1973, we started Rinconada Masters, and we were the second Masters team on the Peninsula, San Mateo being the first. Within 1 year, we had over 100 swimmers. Rinconada ran two national meets at Santa Clara within the first year and won the first one with 90 competitors; competed in the World Games at Stanford in 2006 with 27 relays, being four person per relay. We had a lot of swimmers at that time. Anne Cribbs ran that. Every year we put on a meet at the Rinconada Pool, which is for the community of swimming in the Pacific Association. We do that to help out with meets like the Pacific does the same thing. Let me get my place. Since then we have evolved to more of a conditioning team but have still swimmers competing in meets, open waters and triathlons. We have trained three swimmers for the English Channel, which all three of them made it. That was good. That's like 26 miles or something. It's grueling. We also trained a swimmer who just recently—Jeff, who's here tonight—swam the straits of Gibraltar. We have a new, revised website now and are attracting more swimmers each month. We are now slowly building our numbers back up. We need the Monday, Wednesday, Friday and Saturday and Sunday workout times to stay the same. That is where most of my swimmers train. We are willing to share the Tuesday, Thursday and Tuesday, Thursday night. Tuesday, Thursday night we're already sharing with Palo Alto Swim Club. We've been doing that for 3 years. The noontime is just hard for people. During the summer, my swimmers don't want to come because there's so many kids in that dressing room, it's not worth even looking at. It's bad. Swim for fitness was a program that I founded 3 years ago, and that was to feed into the Masters program. I take adults, some that can't swim, some that just want stroke technique, and I train them so they can move into the Masters team with no problem. The Masters do not need the other hours at this point. It was suggested by Team Sheeper that we take Tuesday and Thursday for Masters. Right now, we really want to build our Monday, Wednesday, Friday program. When we overflow with that, then going into Tuesday, Thursday would be an option, but right now we don't need that. Just as a matter of fact, when I was 7 years old I learned to swim at Rinconada. I've been there forever. We've been there 43 years with the Masters team. Also years ago, Cindy Baxter and I taught swimming lessons at the Rinconada pool for about 10 or 12 years, I think. We did that there too. What I would like is a 3-year subcontract with Sheeper or the City and to see what happens after the 3 years. Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Thank you. Anne Harrington, and next up will be Gwen Fisher. Please try to stay to the 2 minutes.

Anne Harrington: Good evening. I'm Anne Harrington, a longtime resident and a longtime lap swimmer, one of the … There are a number of things I thought about speaking about, but I'm just going to talk about two things. I'm really glad to hear that there's going to be increased outreach to the lap swimmers and recreational swimmers.

This has come as somewhat of a shock. I certainly second keeping Tuesday, Thursday morning for the lap swimmers, because that's when people who work come and swim. I have reservations about the way the financial arrangements are being set up, as described. There's been a lot of discussion about this pool as an asset, and it really is. A setup where 90 percent of profits are going to another organization while the City is bearing the operational cost, the ongoing expenditures and maintenance and depreciation doesn't seem like a very good return on investment to me. My main concern is this pool is a community asset. It's been built with the dollars and good will of the community over many, many years. To turn it over to an outside organization, essentially giving up control while bearing the cost, would truly be a privatization of a public asset. I don't think we want to see that. City staff would be relinquishing control, having no say over the schedule or daily operations essentially. I know the Master Plan recognizes that there might be benefits from public-private joint ventures, but this isn't like the Magic Bridge joint development. This is turning a public asset over to a private entity to run and profit from. At a time when there is increasing pressure nationwide to privatize our parks, please don't do that here.

Chair Lauing: Thank you.

Ms. Harrington: Palo Alto can and should do better than that. Find a way to manage the pool in-house or a minimum arrangement that doesn't cede total control.

Chair Lauing: Linda Fletcher, you're up. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Did I skip Gwen?

Gwen Fisher: I'm Gwen.

Chair Lauing: Good, good, good.

Ms. Fisher: As I said, I'm Gwen Fisher. I've been a Palo Alto resident for about 15 years. I've been a user of the pool for 15 years. All my children learned to swim there. I was a lifelong runner; my knees have told me no. I have been a lap swimmer for 9 years, 4 days a week for 9 years, committed lap swimmer on Tuesday, Thursdays. As a non-lap swimmer, I can understand. When you look at Team Sheeper's proposal, that looks like a great idea. We all share; we all get a little. Let me give you a visual. Think about somebody who says to a football team, a baseball team and a soccer team, "You're all going to use the same turf for your practice. You're all athletes. You'll all get a little. No problem. Your workouts will be great." It doesn't work. The same with the sharing of our pool. We are different types of athletes, different types of swimmers. We have different needs, different wants. In our group, the lap swimmer group, we have everything from octogenarians to pregnant moms to women and men rehabbing injuries, post-surgery rehab, me being one of those. I couldn't have rehabbed my shoulder in the pool if I had to share these lanes with everybody. To think that would work is very

misleading. I want to give you some numbers from just yesterday morning, a chilly, dark November morning prior to the Thanksgiving holiday. Pool opens at 6:00. 6:04, 17 swimmers in the pool. That's already more than—that's one swimmer per lane with several having more than that. At 6:40, I got out, and I counted the numbers. Twenty-seven swimmers were swimming; three were getting ready to get in. Thirty swimmers at about 6:45. Team Sheeper's plan is proposing that all 30 are swimming in six lanes. My arm span is just a little bit short of what the width of the lane is. His proposal is to have five of us swimming and sharing that space and figuring out a way to make that work. We don't have a coach that organizes us by speed or technique. We would have to fight and muddle and figure out a way to do it. It won't work. It won't work. Masters is happy with their schedule. We're happy with our schedule. We don't want more. They don't want more. We're happy. Please leave it as it is. Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Thank you.

Linda Fletcher: I can keep this really short, because I can say ditto. I'm Linda Fletcher. I'm a lifelong Palo Alto resident. I'm going to plot my age; I'm 53. I was born swimming at Rinconada pool. I was swimming pregnant. Both my kids swam at Rinconada pool. We're lap swimmers. We're a family. We don't have a person that's heading our program. We don't have somebody that's standing up for us, but look at how much we came out. We support each other. We go to the pool in the morning. We are recuperating; we're pregnant; we are supporting each other through stressful times, no more stressful times than what we're going through right now. Also being a teacher, we are telling our kids we're really striving for wellness in our community. There's nothing better than getting in the water, relaxing. If we have to change that by crowding into lanes and sharing and trying to join Masters and do a workout that's scheduled, that's timed, it doesn't work for all of us. Our family sat with Masters swimmers outside. We're all in agreement we like sharing the pool. We can work this out. For our wellbeing, please listen to our families. Thanks.

Chair Lauing: Cathy Mak is next up, followed by Cindy Ainsworth.

Cathy Mak: Hi, I'm Cathy Mak, and I'm also a Palo Alto resident. I've been swimming for almost 10 years at the pool now as a recreational lap swimmer. I go early in the morning before I go to work, before my kids get up and get them out the door to school. I love the loose knit community of people that I swim with in the mornings, but we all have our own styles of swimming and we all have our own speeds. We're just there to do what we want and what we love. I think that speaks strongly that the block schedule that's currently in place, as people have mentioned before, works best, where lap swimmers can swim at their pace and in their space, and Masters swimmers have their own dedicated time in the pool to help them achieve the goals that they want to as Masters swimmers. I understand that the status quo of the pool might not work now, and

there's many issues with swim lessons, which I don't really fully appreciate. I think that's something that can be worked out on a part-time basis. I think the wholesale handing over the pool to private management is not in the interest of the community, and it's not in the interest of the swimmers. It would be best if the City takes their timeline that was proposed in their September meeting, which was handing over the pool to management by January of 2017, to reconsider that and say, "Is this something we should bring to the broader community? Is this something that we should think about not wanting to give up this valuable resource and not give it to a private investor?" Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Cindy Ainsworth next, followed by Timothy Groves.

Cindy Ainsworth. I'm Cindy. I've lived in Palo Alto—I don't know—35 years probably. I've been a lap swimmer at Rinconada most of that time. I think people have already made clear that the block schedule—we really like the block scheduling, the way it works. I just want to acknowledge the City for having listened to us. If you want people to work with you on tweaking the schedule, clearly you have lots of people who would really love to help you find a schedule that's going to work.

Chair Lauing: Timothy and then Terri Baxter-Smith.

Timothy Groves; Hi. I'm Tim Groves. I'm a Palo Alto resident. I first joined the Rinconada Masters in 1978. I'll just say two things briefly. One is it's a great program. As long as I can remember, we've relied on Monday, Wednesday, Friday in the early mornings. I'd sure love to see that continue. If there needed to be a safety valve, it might be in midday or evenings as Carol suggests. I'd also like to say that—I might be stepping outside my expertise here—it's normal for the City to have contractors to do things on the assumption that contractors know what they're doing. I think Tim Sheeper knows what he's doing. At that point, it becomes a matter of (inaudible) the services. Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Thanks very much. Terri, Terri Baxter-Smith. Next up is Richard—excuse me—Hermance.

Terri Baxter-Smith: I will talk really fast here. I am Terri Baxter-Smith, assistant coach of Rinconada Masters. I am the daughter of Rinconada Masters cofounder Cindy Baxter. Graduated from Paly High School in 1982. My mother and father graduated from Paly in 1949 and 1950. All my aunts and uncles and brothers and sisters graduated from Paly. I say this because of my connection to our community and also to Rinconada Masters. I'm a 1980 Olympian. I made the 1987 Pan American Games. My background in aquatics is quite extensive. I was a YMCA aquatics directors in western Pennsylvania and assistant pool director at Franklin & Marshall College in central Pennsylvania, and I coached age group swimmers for 13 years. Rinconada Masters has always had a contract since our inception in 1973 with the City of Palo Alto. We are a self-governing entity with an

advisory board. We have put together just recently a recruiting committee. We purchase our own equipment, and our coaches are certified by United States Masters Swimming; therefore, we need no lifeguards on the pool when we're swimming. Our main concern is the reduction in lane availability beginning the summer of 2017. Our most popular workout times are Monday, Wednesday, Friday mornings and Saturday and Sunday mornings. Our team finds it necessary to keep the 14 lanes available to use and not reduce it down to eight lanes on the weekdays and ten lanes on Saturdays and Sundays. Our Masters swimmers are not opposed to having multiple people in a lane to share lanes. When having multiple people in one lane, the swimmers need to be of the same ability level; that is extremely important. We have a very diverse group of swimmers on our team. They consist of competitive and noncompetitive swimmers of all ability levels, people who swim for rehab, people who swim due to health issues. We have 80 and 90 year olds on our swim team, and we also have swim for fitness on the weekends. Carol and I can accommodate and coach all of these wide range of abilities and needs.

Chair Lauing: Thank you.

Ms. Baxter-Smith: To condense these groups down to eight lanes or nine lanes, I assure you we will lose swimmers. They will not have fun. Their fitness routine will be compromised, and they will go elsewhere. Our goal is to increase our membership but at the same time make swimming for the Rinconada Masters enjoyable, meaningful experiences for all ability and physical levels. Thank you and …

Chair Lauing: Thanks.

Ms. Baxter-Smith: … happy Thanksgiving.

Chair Lauing: Richard, and next up is Barbara Reeder, if I have that right. Go ahead, Richard.

Richard Hermance: My name is Richard Hermance. My wife and I have lived in Palo Alto for 35 years, and we've been lap swimmers at Rinconada pool for 35 years. We were surprised when 2 weeks ago we first heard about a proposal to change the management and program at the pool. As longtime lap swimmers, we were disappointed that our inputs were not solicited prior to issuing the RFP. I realize that you are only being asked tonight to approve employing Team Sheeper to manage the swimming lessons program for summer 2017. However, I want to provide you some inputs regarding the proposed changes to the lap swimming schedule that Team Sheeper included in his response to your RFP. We swim three times a week at either the early morning lap swim or the noon lap swim. Usually there are two swimmers in each lane, and this has been a consistent number over the years during these peak demand times. Mr. Sheeper's proposed plan adds lap swim hours throughout the day but cuts down the

lanes during high-use periods. Reducing the number of lanes during high-use times forces three or four people into each lane, which is not satisfactory as you've already heard. Lap swimming during the current early morning hours and midday peak demand times needs to be a dedicated activity using all of the lanes to best meet the needs of working people. In addition, I question the need to outsource the management to a third party. The pool has always been a unique benefit for Palo Alto residents, and the City should be able to provide the programming and services that will best satisfy the needs of our residents. For example, Team Sheeper is going to raise the rates to use the pool. The City should be able to do this. Team Sheeper is going to increase the salary for lifeguards. The City should be able to do this. Finally, the City already has employees, namely Tyler Stetson, who do a terrific job and understand better than anyone the needs of lap swimmers. His knowledge, work ethic and people skills cannot be outsourced.

Chair Lauing: Barbara Reeder and then Jeff Everett.

Barbara Reeder: Hello. My name is Barbara Reeder, and I have lived in the same house in Palo Alto about 4 1/2 blocks since November of 1962. I'm a lap swimmer. I've taken my children to that pool along with their neighborhood friends, my grandchildren. My husband and I are noontime lap swimmers. I call it our exercise, play and stress reduction. It has definitely contributed to my health and wellness. I think it is really sad to see the changes—hear about the changes that are being proposed. There is some sharing that goes on during noontime. There's someone that gives a lesson in one lane. I've only noticed that there's one student. I don't think that there's a huge demand for the lessons. I think Tyler Stetson, particularly this last summer, did a remarkable job as far as accommodating noontime lap swimmers with the children's swim program. It worked really smoothly as far as I was concerned. The other observation that I made during this past year is that there was a delightful young woman who offered free Zumba lessons, taking one or two lanes. She discontinued those free lessons because they weren't being used. In terms of what's (inaudible), I think that between the Masters program and the lap swimmers, we've been delighted with this community service. I will be unhappy personally to see it substantially change.

Chair Lauing: Mr. Everett. Thank you. After Mr. Everett is going to be Al Kenrick.

Jeff Everett: Hi. My name's Jeff Everett. I'm here to speak on behalf of Carol's proposal for the Rinconada Masters. In brief, the access to the night and morning workouts and the quality of the workouts and the attentiveness of the coaching has been a key factor in realizing my dream of swimming the English Channel and most recently the strait of Gibraltar. Thank you, Carol. I hope that we can continue with the great program. Thank you.

Chair Lauing: That's absolutely terrific. Mr. Kenrick, and then Joanne Chace, I believe it is.

Al Kenrick: My name's Al Kenrick, and I'm a lifelong resident of Palo Alto. I also learned to swim at Rinconada pool. I'm here to throw my support to not changing the open swim hours. I think the Masters program and the open swim hours both meet different needs. Consistency is really important for any kind of exercise. Having a system that works is working for a lot of people. I've swam at Burgess before, and there was four or five people in a lane. It's just not the same, and it's not very enjoyable. I urge you to not change the current schedule.

Chair Lauing: Joanne, and then Sharon Sass, I believe.

Joanne Chace: Hello. My name is Joanne Chace. I've lived in Palo Alto since 1970. I too—thank you, Dave. I'd like to add my support to the notion that the Masters program is working very well as it is, that we need structured workouts, that we can have more people to a lane. I would be very happy, we would all be happy to have more people move into the Masters program. I'm here to say it's not so hard to do. When I joined the program in 1975, I went to talk—I dropped in at the pool; I talked to Carol. I said, "I love to swim, but I don't swim very well. I can swim pretty well, maybe some 100 yards." She said, "Can you swim 600 yards?" I said, "I can swim 600 yards I think." I started out in 1976 swimming my 600 yards. I've been swimming for a long time with that program. Now, my morning swim is 3,000 yards. That is the advantage of having good coaching and having structured workouts. I would like to thank Carol and Terri and all the others who put that program together and held it together over the years, and to invite anyone who would like to share my lane with me and work to that length any morning. Come on. When I started the program in 1975, I was in my 40s. Now that I'm doing the 3,000 yards, I'm 83.

Chair Lauing: That's a longevity program. That's wonderful. Is this Sharon?

Shawn Sass: Shawn.

Chair Lauing: Sorry, Shawn. I didn't quite …

Shawn Sass: My name is Shawn Sass [phonetic]. I'm …

Chair Lauing: Jay Rosser is next. Excuse me.

Ms. Sass: I'm both a lap swimmer and a Masters swimmer at Rinconada pool. I've been swimming there for 15 years and love it. I think it's really great to see everybody here tonight considering that 2 weeks ago nobody really knew about this happening. It's really

nice to see everybody here and coming out and expressing their opinion. I think a lot of us have a similar viewpoint. One of the biggest issues here is sharing the pool, having shared users at the same time. Right now it really works to have lap swimmers on their day, Masters swimmers on their day. It's a mess when you try and combine them together, because the lap swimmers have their own ages, speeds, strokes, time of arrival. It's very difficult to know if you're going to get a lane or not or if you're going to be sharing with three people, four people. Right now, the way it exists, you know you're probably going to have a lane, maybe two people at the most, occasionally three, rarely. That works for lap swimmers. It's nice to have our Masters team. It's a great team. We've had it for a long time. We have people of all ages who swim on it. We have people who are 90 years old, who are on our team. They kind of need their own lane. It's the one team in this area where these swimmers can come and actually do their workouts and be a part of a group and even compete at that age. Our 90-year-old swimmer competes. I would hate to see that go. I hope in considering the proposed schedule you'll keep all of this in mind and what everybody said here tonight. Everybody is very passionate about this. They came here in short notice to speak what they really feel about this pool. It's a community; it's a core community. It's a culture. It's not just looking at facts and numbers at a desk. It's knowing everybody who swims here and working with them to get a solution that can keep what we have and that culture that we have. Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Thank you. Jay Rossiter and then Lisa Krieger.

Jay Rossiter: Hi everybody. It was great to—this is my first time ever being at a City Council meeting. I've lived here for 22 years. This brought me out, and it's great to actually see everybody involved. I'll just be brief because you've already heard a lot from everybody. Since I'm here, I just wanted to—I don't know whether you record each person or what you do. I'm a lap swimmer. One of the key points that I agree with, that I've heard tonight is people who swim, lap or Masters, have different goals and they have different abilities. Especially for many of us, your abilities go up and down and your goals go up and down over time, depending on how you feel and how you're doing physically also. I think what happens is as the pools get denser and usage gets denser, the quality goes down. I know from myself—I swim everywhere. I swim in all countries and cities and pools. When it gets dense, then the quality goes down because you end up with a herd kind of thing going on where you have to keep up with the person in front of you and behind you and that kind of thing. It's really important to not lose your quality of life like we see what's happened in the Bay Area with the traffic by overcrowding the lanes. I learned something tonight. I'm going to actually join Masters now. I didn't realize you had people with different levels of ability. You certainly have that with lap swimmers. If you get too dense, you will actually lose that and the whole quality of life will go down. One of the big reasons of living in Palo Alto are the parks, the pools, the schools. Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Thanks. Lisa Krieger and then Scott van der Lippe.

Lisa Krieger: Hi. Lisa Krieger;; I'm a lap swimmer also. Just want to reiterate what everyone else has already said. As this valley gets more crowded—I commute every day on 101, long distances. The streets are more crowded. The stores are more crowded. Everything's crowded. The pools are Walden Pond. It really is. Just very briefly, for an hour we decompress, and we're with our tribe. We come out stronger. That's what makes this town so great. I brag about it all the time. Please don't take that away from us. Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Thank you. Scott.

Scott van der Lippe: Thank you. I'm actually from Los Altos. I know I'm kind of an outsider here. This is my favorite pool. I go to Mountain View; I go to Palo Alto, and I also sometimes go to Menlo Park. I can tell you if I had a choice, I always come to this pool because it's very relaxed. Menlo Park is—what is it—$8. I can swim in Palo Alto for 4. Literally, Sheeper has a nice thing over there, but it's—I kind of look at the cost. I've got to come to Palo Alto because it's a whole lot cheaper. Of course, I like the pool environment; it's so much more relaxed. It's a little high stressed over in Menlo Park, and I hate to see that management style applied to our very nice pool that I've enjoyed for probably 20 years over there. The cost is a big thing. You're going to lose a lot of—a lot of swimmers are going to go, "Eight bucks to swim." You're here for 30 minutes. I'm not going to pay the equivalent of $16 an hour just to swim. That's pretty expensive. Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Thanks. Again, just overall love to have this kind of turnout on any issue and have direct feedback from our residents. Would you like specific comments now from us on this whole document or are we going to just focus on the item that you want us to talk about tonight?

Mr. de Geus: I think you can ask questions about any of it, anything that you heard, anything that you heard in the presentation, the concerns that you might have, questions that you have for us for clarification. I would just reiterate that we're not trying to degrade the program. I like hearing the voices about how great the pool is and how great it is for your health and wellness and stress reduction and it's this special place. I think it is. Our interest is how do we make that accessible to more Palo Alto residents without making it a bad experience. I think there's a way we can do that working together. Tim's a great professional. He's here to provide a service for the City of Palo Alto. It's a contract; it's not passing the pool over and then turning away. It's writing a contract that represents the interests of the Palo Alto residents. That can be very specific about schedules and what we would like to see with the Masters program with Carol's

leadership. Those are things we define in a contract and monitor it closely. I'll leave it there. Happy to answer questions.

Chair Lauing: Just on that point, which I think is a very helpful clarification, it's an outsourcing process or a subcontracting process. The City doesn't lose control. You're completely in charge of the contract and the asset of the pool.

Mr. de Geus: That's correct. It's about how do we best operate the pool in the interest of Palo Alto residents. That's what we're trying to accomplish here. It is supporting the current swimmers. That is one element. There's another piece too, people that don't currently swim because the pool's not available to them when they're available. We need to think about how we can create opportunity for others to have access to this pool. I get the sensitivity. Overcrowding doesn't work. We're not suggesting that, but we do think that some sensible, fair sharing at certain times when there is low demand is possible.

Chair Lauing: Comments? I'm looking at our resident water sport expert here. If you would like to go first, I think that'd be appropriate.

Commissioner Cribbs: Thank you very much. First of all, I'd love to say that I think it's great that we have so many people interested here, coming out tonight to share their comments. I think we're going to learn a lot from all of that. I think the staff is excited about that too. Thank you all very, very much. You all know that in September I was concerned about the cost of lessons. I really want to be very careful whatever we do that we make sure that we can offer swimming lessons to all children, because it's so important for kids to learn to swim and for their parents to learn to swim as well. We have a lot of parents who don't swim yet. That's why I was asking the questions about the swimming lessons and if we can subsidize those and keep the cost down and also offer the lessons at a longer time, so that we can utilize the water, so it's not just in the summertime. We start in early April, and what you've suggested is also go through to the fall, because a lot of people want to take swimming lessons. There's a lot of people that go year round. I'd even love to see us do the (inaudible) that we talked about, but I know that's a little bit far in the future. The cost of lessons was a concern for me with this new particular program. I'm okay with that now. I think this will work. I do want to mention, even though we're not talking about doing the lap swimming right now, the cost of the lap swimming for seniors seemed to me to be disturbing. I believe we're increasing the cost for many senior swimmers. We heard some here tonight who are swimming because their knees have gone away. It's important for seniors to have a great outlet to swim as well. Whatever we do with lap swimmers, I hope we don't increase the cost for seniors. Finally, from my perspective I'm very concerned in the future about the background and our relationships with Rinconada Masters and also with PASA. I'd really like to understand in the future, Rob, what the swim teams are going to get from the relationship with Team Sheeper, how that's going to help them in the future. If it does move forward,

what the City is going to get from that as well, whether it's just a matter of cost or whether there's are some other benefits that will accrue. I'll stop there and let other people …

Chair Lauing: It might be best if staff responds as we go.

Mr. de Geus: Those are good questions, Commissioner Cribbs, and comments. We do have Tyler Stetson on staff. He's a Recreation Coordinator helping oversee the aquatics program. He's one full-time entry-level sort of professional position that we have focused on aquatics. He's doing his best but struggling to staff up the pool. What someone like Tim can bring is a whole team of people and a pool of professional coaches that teach year round and are there to support and develop the existing programs. I would hope that's what we would have. We've talked about Rinconada Masters and we want to grow that program. Carol Macpherson wants to grow the program. You heard some of the Masters swimmers. There's a relatively small group of swimmers in the Masters program. I get they love that they're family. It is relatively small; I want to say it's 56 residents or something like that. Carol, something like that, is that correct?

Ms. Macpherson: We have a lot of drop-in swimmers too that don't show on our numbers.

Mr. de Geus: We think that if Tim and the knowledge and experience and expertise he brings in aquatics is closely partnered with Carol and the advisors to say, "How might we grow the program into the future that doesn't lose what's really good about it, but allows more Masters swimmers to come join the family," I think that would be more than what we offer with one staff person in Tyler Stetson.

Commissioner Cribbs: Is there a goal for the Masters swimmers at this point, what you see in the future, how many you'd like to see on the team?

Mr. de Geus: We haven't defined a goal. We want it to grow. It has been dropping over the years. I would like to see a goal and a plan be developed with Carol and her group and Tim working together. It's still her program. She's going to manage the program and lead the program as the head coach. Tim would want to see them be successful. That's what he wants to do. We're trying to work on what that looks like. If the City does go forward with an expanded contract for Team Sheeper to oversee more operations of the pool, we'll write that into the contract and be pretty specific about expectations of lanes for the different groups that use the pool. If there are going to be changes to the lanes, we can also define how those changes will be made. They won't be made just independently by Tim. We would likely write something in there that there is a process where the City's involved and the key user groups are involved in making those decisions. Does that help?

Commissioner Cribbs: Mm hmm.

Chair Lauing: Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: To me, there are kind of two separate issues. One is what are the hours, what's the schedule and who does the management. I suspect that if we had the status quo hours and nothing was going to change with hours, a lot of these people wouldn't be here. Still, besides that, it's important to understand the management. What would be the scope of Team Sheeper's management of the pool? In particular, in page 10 it talks about that Team Sheeper would handle the registration. I don't see the benefit to that. Can you talk more about the scope of what would be done by the City if Team Sheeper came in for management and what would be done by Team Sheeper?

Mr. de Geus: It depends. We haven't defined the scope yet. Team Sheeper bid on all of the programs, so that's part of their proposal. The City can choose to say, "We want you to do one piece of that, two pieces or all the pieces." At this point, we're comfortable with the learn to swim program, that we want to bring him on to do that and lock that in. The other elements of the pool, I think, we're sort of in the process right now of figuring out does that make sense, will there be value added to the program overall. Not only the existing swimmers, but the program overall and potential new swimmers that might enjoy the pool. We don't have that yet, and we don't have a schedule yet either. By the way, when we do have a schedule at some point, if we get to that point, that's also going to be somewhat tentative and flexible to see how the community's responding. Is it working, is it not working? Ultimately it's the residents' pool, and we need to adapt and adjust the schedules that it works for the residents. That's what we'll be aiming to do. That's the contract we'll have with Tim. That's what he's responsible for doing, making sure that happens. Specifically, you asked a question about registration. There is a change there for families that are registering kids for swim lessons. They would no longer do that through the City and the City system. They would do it through Team Sheeper's system. We don't have to do it that way. We could continue to register through the City's system and share the information with them about enrollment. It's not very efficient. We've done that the last 2 years. With swim lessons in particular, there's lots of transferring between classes and lessons. You get the parents whose son is in Level 1 and jumps in the pool, and he's not. He's in Level 3 or something. That happens all the time. These changes happen on the deck. Really it's much more efficient for the operator and the family to have that close connection to be able to make those transfers. That's the added advantage. It's less efficient if we were to continue the registration process.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Commissioner Cribbs also talked about the importance of having everyone to be able to afford the swim lessons. Currently, we have a financial aid program. Can you describe that?

Mr. de Geus: We have a fee reduction program for all of the Community Services programs. That has a cap of $300 per person and a maximum of a 50-percent discount on the fee itself. We would expect and write into the contract that all families would have that same benefit or more when there's an additional scholarship program that Tim has, that can also provide additional discounts beyond what the City is currently offering.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Who funds this new scholarship program?

Mr. de Geus: I would ask Tim to explain that.

Mr. Sheeper: About 4 years ago, we set up a scholarship program through Beyond Barriers Athletic Foundation to subsidize our lessons over at the Belle Haven pool in east Menlo Park. They have subsidized 90 percent of the lessons that have happened over at Belle Haven. Beyond Barriers is currently in discussion with Rob's team about subsidizing the lessons and the programs at Rinconada and JLS.

Commissioner Reckdahl: This is a separate charity that would be funding this.

Mr. Sheeper: Correct.

Commissioner Reckdahl: It wouldn't come out of the City or it wouldn't come out of Team Sheeper. It'd just be an unaffiliated charity that is just funding lessons.

Mr. Sheeper: Yes.

Commissioner Reckdahl: We'd have to have some cooperation with that and the current fee reduction program.

Ms. LeBlanc: Yeah. If I could just clarify. We haven't determined if we would—we would most likely keep both programs. It is possible that—we have to sort of work out whether we want people to be able to double up on these programs or not. We spoke with Beyond Barriers, some of the Board Members. It seems like a really wonderful opportunity for us to participate. No matter what we do, they're interested in just getting as many kids to learn to swim as possible. They focus in this region. It's a group we'd like to work with. They have some different standards actually. It's kind of boring policy work, but their definition of the poverty level is slightly different than our definition of the poverty level. That's why I wouldn't want to get rid of both; some people are going to qualify for ours but not theirs and so on.

Commissioner Reckdahl: In the report, you talk about the SEIU and how, for example, we only have the ability to hire staff who work less than 1,000 hours per year. It talks

about the impacts of SEIU hourly employment. Can you give us some more details about what happens?

Ms. LeBlanc: We have right now a certain amount of staff that's budgeted in the program. They are, aside from Tyler, all part-time staff. We have a limit for part-time staff that once they hit 1,000 hours in a year, they become eligible for CalPERS pensions, which dramatically increases the price of providing the service. As soon as we hit half-time, we need to increase—the cost goes up for that employee. We really don't try to do that.

Commissioner Reckdahl: How much does it go up, do you know? Can you give an estimate?

Ms. LeBlanc: I want to say it's roughly $50,000 per person per year. It's a very big increase.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Even if they're just a part-time employee, once they hit the 1,000 hours you have to shell out 50,000 per.

Ms. LeBlanc: It's a rate; it's not a flat amount. It's a very expensive rate. The Budget Office and HR can provide more detail on that. Occasionally we do look at that as we're considering adding positions in different places around the department. It suddenly becomes very expensive.

Commissioner Reckdahl: If we outsource, there's no restrictions and people can work as many as we want and we have no commitment to …

Ms. LeBlanc: Right. Once it's not a public employee, it's not a person who's subject to participating in CalPERS.

Commissioner Reckdahl: When I compared the schedules …

Male: Can I ask a question?

Chair Lauing: I can't do that now.

Commissioner Reckdahl: When I compared the schedules, especially the new schedule looks rather fragmented. During the summer, during the midday, we have three different things going on. Do we have a copy of that to put up on the screen, of the schedule?

Mr. de Geus: We can get to it. Tim can speak to it.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Is it useful to have open swim in three lanes or open recreation in three lanes? That seems so narrow. Would that be slicing the bread too thin?

Mr. Sheeper: I think I know what you're talking about.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm looking at page 16 if you have a …

Mr. Sheeper: I don't have it in front of me. I think you're talking about the summer of '17.

Commissioner Reckdahl: (crosstalk) midday summer is when it really gets divided up.

Mr. Sheeper: That's a lot of usage of the pool. There's a diving board on one side. Open swim has five lanes, and then there's lap swim and then there's swim lessons at some points in time too. The pool is divided up into three unequal parts to be able to use the diving board on the deep end, to be able to do lap swims in the middle, and then to be able to do lessons and/or open swim on the shallow side of the pool.

Commissioner Reckdahl: During this time in the summer, what's going on at the JLS pool?

Mr. Sheeper: Lessons.

Commissioner Reckdahl: They're just purely lessons?

Mr. Sheeper: Yeah. Lessons start at noon currently at JLS. They have for the past 2 years.

Commissioner Reckdahl: When I see the Rinconada pool divided so finely, couldn't we use the JLS pool and move stuff between it so you have larger chunks and more functional chunks than having it split up so tight?

Mr. Sheeper: I think that's what has been tried. I don't think the demand—people haven't used the JLS pool like they have used the Rinconada pool.

Mr. de Geus: I just want to be clear about this schedule. It ought to say draft all over it, but it doesn't. That's what it is.

Commissioner Reckdahl: It's a straw man.

Mr. de Geus: That's what I asked him. He talks about more integration, some sharing. We're concerned about that, recognize that can take away from a program. I said, "Put

something together. What does it look like in your view?" This is the first cut of what it looks like. It's not right. It doesn't work in several areas particularly in the morning for lap swimmers and Masters. That's going to change. It'll change in other ways as well. We're not proposing that this is the schedule.

Chair Lauing: If we could stick to sort of more policy-oriented issues like do you think it's too crowded, that type of thing.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The reason I ask this is to say instead of looking at Rinconada by itself, we really should be looking at the pools as a whole in the City and coordinating their schedules between the two as opposed to saying this is the schedule for Rinconada and we're going to slice it up with no regard to what's going on at JLS. With that said, what about JLS during the year? Do we have any possibility to do evening swims at JLS or anything like that to offload Rinconada?

Mr. de Geus: We don't do that currently. I'm interested in that, in more collaboration with the Unified School District. JLS isn't the only pool. By the way, it's not their best pool. It's not one that I'd choose as the one we get access to. I would absolutely be open to that to get more kids able to have swim lessons at different times of the year in different locations around town. I think Tim has the capacity to do that.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Before we hear this in January, are we going to have better demand numbers about when is the pool being used and when isn't it being used?

Mr. de Geus: Yes.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That's it. Thanks.

Commissioner Hetterly: I'm a little confused about what you are really looking for most feedback on tonight. The staff report was mostly, it seemed to me, about the total suite of services, and that's what the schedule is with the lane distribution, this one. The next step is you're going to propose to Council a contract for swim lessons and summer camp for 1 year. We don't have the same kind of detail for that program as we do for this potential longer-term program. It was very difficult looking at the staff report to understand what the impact of the impending decision is. I think it would be helpful to understand how the lane distributions would work. We know the number of days and weeks, that we're going to have more weeks and more days of lessons, but it's hard to translate from that into how many more lessons that is relative to demand. In the staff report, when you're talking about the full program, it's a six times increase in swim lessons. That raised a flag to me; it wasn't clear at all that we have a demand for six times more lessons than we currently offer. I don't know if this 1-year summer plan is also a six times expansion of swim lessons. If it is, it seems likely it would have a similar impact on the lane demand

at Rinconada. I'd like to know more about how the demand meets the supply in that initial summer.

Ms. LeBlanc: Thanks. It is the same proposed summer swim lesson program that you see in there. It is increasing it by six times. I think the thing that is nice about working with Tim Sheeper on this is that they can kind of match our demand. That's part of what's nice about this. If there aren't a lot of people who want to come swim at 2:00 p.m. on Wednesdays, they just wouldn't have their staff over at our pool to operate that. If there is, then we're able to provide that service to residents. Unfortunately, we only can tell you how many programs get full or have a wait list. We can't tell you how many people are not even signing up, because the program doesn't work for them or it's full before they get the opportunity to get onto our Enjoy! catalog and register. I think the first year of this program will be a learning opportunity for us and for Tim Sheeper and his staff in terms of what residents really do want in the lesson program. We think the nice thing about this lesson program is, at the rates that we've set, it strikes a balance of being accessible to most all families and still has the fee reduction programs in place and extends that and also keeps the price roughly the same as our contracts have been for the last 2 years. We can dramatically increase—I'm running out of power and didn't bring my thing. I'm going to close this for a minute. We think that this is a great opportunity for us to see how much demand there is. In terms of the impact on lanes, actually we've discussed that with Tim quite a bit as well. We don't think it will have a huge impact because they'll be doing a lot more lessons in the round pool. Tim can elaborate if you'd like.

Commissioner Hetterly: I would like some elaboration on it, but let me expand my question. I also would like to better understand—it seems like even … I think we've heard very clearly tonight that there's a lot of concern about impacts on other users of an expansion of this size. I think it makes a lot of sense to think very hard about the demand. Maybe six times as many lessons is too ambitious for a first year try-out a new season. I would love to see something less ambitious so that we can actually learn something from it before we risk turning people away from the pool. I don't know how that plays into the financials. If you don't have as many swim lessons, then maybe it's not financially feasible to use Sheeper. I don't know how that works, but it seems to me something that you all ought to think hard about. With that, if you did still go forward with that ambitious schedule, it seems to me that this breakdown doesn't work on a lot of different levels, not just for Masters, not just for lap but also for open rec swim. I think there are qualitative impacts on the experience in the pool once you shrink down lanes, for example. If you have only three or five lanes dedicated to open swim, that's a much narrower area. It really limits the kinds of things that you can use it for. I would love to see staff and Team Sheeper work a little more with the community to understand what all of those qualitative impacts are and see if you can fit them into the quantitative numbers

that you're collecting. That's basically my comment. I would love to hear more about how the lessons are planned.

Mr. de Geus: Tim, maybe you can share a little more and also your experience about demand generally, managing a pool very close by.

Mr. Sheeper: Thank you. I'll address the demand first. Since we've stopped running lessons at Rinconada this summer, we've continued running lessons at Burgess. In that period of time, which has been all of September, October and November almost, so far we've given 12,000 more lessons. The demand is out there, and we still have wait lists. That's equivalent to anywhere from 1,100 lessons—it's about 1,100-1,200 lessons per week that's happening 2 1/2 miles away. To do those lessons, it's mainly from real entry level, smaller kids. The best thing is in a warmer pool. Currently, the play pool that you have is going unused. The discussion with Rob and the team is let's see if we can get that pool online and heated up, and use that as an instructional pool because it can be used. We use just three lanes to do our swim school, so that's six instructors teaching 24 kids every half an hour. We're only using three lanes, but they're warm lanes. The pool is 86 degrees. To teach a lot of kids in the performance pool that you have at Rinconada, we'd use that pool very sparingly for lessons. The other thing is we're looking at summer, this schedule that you talked about. Summer at every pool is a very condensed time. That's when the kids are out of school. You're looking at 8 weeks of the 52 weeks of the year. Every pool is impacted. Rinconada being in a landlocked area where there's no access to a lot of water, people are going to come there. To make this all happen, there has to be a lot of sharing to serve all the groups. I did run some numbers, thinking into the fall of 2017, after the impact of summer has happened. For instance, currently the lap swimmers—I measure things in lane hours—have 553 lane hours per week, 553. In the fall of 2017, the proposal that we have is to increase that to 734 lane hours per week. It's more than a 30 percent increase in the amount of lane hours that the lap swimmers have to be in the pool. That's a large increase. I heard a lot of talk about the exclusivity, and there was—we want the 14 lanes. Looking at this, this is highly impacted. In the fall, it spreads out. Currently, there's 36 hours that the lap swimmers have exclusive use, 36 hours per week that the lap swimmers have use. Under the model that I proposed, it would cut down to 33. There would just be 3 less hours. More time to swim, but there's still open space in the pool. I think that addresses the impact that you talked about in the summer and the demand that's out in the community. I don't know if Palo Alto even realizes the strong need that's out there right now.

Mr. de Geus: Thank you, Tim. Increasing hours for lap swim is important, and that's one piece of it. What I'm hearing also from the public is how those lanes are distributed and what times of day can make a very big impact. You could have more hours, but it doesn't work as well as it currently works, at least for the current swimmers. I think we need to really work through that and understand what we're hearing and why we're hearing it so

that we can see if we can come up with a program that really does make sense, that does improve access without degrading quality.

Commissioner Hetterly: That's good. Of course, in the summer in particular as you move lessons into the small pool, then the users of that pool during those times can't use it. There's always an overflow. Whenever you add, somebody's going to give up time for it. I don't think that's necessarily an insurmountable challenge, to figure out how that works, but it is a challenge that I don't think we've resolved yet. Again, I would encourage a less ambitious plan. I also would love to see you talk to the School District and see if there isn't a way to get a second pool. If it's a matter of pool space and we could get access to another pool during the summer time is all I'm talking about here. I don't know anything about the cost of that or how that works between the City and the School District. It sounds like summer demand everywhere for pools is really high. I know our School District pools are not fully used all summer, I think. I don't know; I think. That's something that I'd love to see you all look into. I think Team Sheeper offers an opportunity to be able to staff more space. In the past, we haven't been looking for that because there was no way we could manage it. Maybe between Team Sheeper and the City and the School District we can find a way, at least for this first summer, to meet everybody's needs while we figure out a long-term plan. Thanks.

Chair Lauing: Commissioner Moss.

Commissioner Moss: I've been hearing a lot about the needs of the lap swimmers and the Masters swimmers versus the lessons. On the side of the lap swimmers and the Masters swimmers, our population is getting older. There are more seniors. One of our goals is to be a Healthy City Healthy Community, and the people here are extremely healthy. We wish we had more. It's a nationally recognized program, as I hear. I don't think it's either/or; I think it's just a matter of scheduling. To throw out the whole program in the name of lack of privatization, I don't think is an option. I think with careful oversight by the City, we should be able to come up with a schedule that serves both groups. The problem is when we talk about the number of swimmers for lap and Masters and then wanting to increase that number of swimmers versus the lessons. Going from 5,500 lessons a year to 32,000 lessons a year, it's not all going to fit. Something has to give. I agree with Commissioner Hetterly that we might want to scale back the number of—instead of six times the number of lessons, maybe it's only three times the lessons. Also I fully agree with Tom Sheeper about using the round pool and using JLS and using Paly and using Gunn pools as much as possible. When you talk about six times the number of lessons, I don't think it's going to be six times the number of lessons during the summer, but rather spread out over more months. Maybe it's only two times the number of lessons in the summer or even 1 1/2 times the number of lessons in the summer. If there's a wait list, you push them out to the side. I could even make the same argument for the Masters swimmers and the lap swimmers that it seemed like there's this core number of hours

between 6:00 and 9:00 and maybe between 4:00 and 5:00. Maybe people need to push towards 10:00 in the morning instead of having everybody try to get in between 6:00 and 8:00. I think there's room on both sides for pushing out the edges in the schedule. If we can work those things, I think we have a really good chance to work a schedule that will improve in both areas, maybe not as much as we'd like, adding the number of Masters swimmers, adding the number of swim lessons. Also, back to what Commissioner Hetterly said, I'd like to see the demand for lessons. It sounds like we need Palo Alto first, meaning if some of these lessons are not Palo Alto residents, maybe we can't accommodate everybody. We should always give Palo Alto residents first. The same thing with the Masters swimmers. We have a nationally recognized program, but maybe we need to have Palo Alto first as well. I think if push comes to shove, we can do something like that because this is a City asset, as you've said over and over again. Palo Alto first. That's my comments.

Chair Lauing: Commissioner Knopper.

Vice Chair Knopper: Thank you. Hello. Clearly we have a passionate constituency, which is awesome. It's a valuable resource. I think we've had enough discussion, as far as I'm concerned, with regard to lap assignment, so I'm not going to discuss that. What I did want some clarity, Rob, if you don't mind, is on the cost recovery expectation that was in our report. There's an approximately $35,000 differential, if we outsource, to the City's General Fund as a plus net advantage to us. I guess my question is because there is a tremendous amount of demand on a facility that is already needing, as we discussed in the Master Plan, a tremendous amount of improvement. The locker rooms, food, snack areas, lounging areas, everything else out of the water needs renovation. Are we thinking of, as we're contracting out, keeping that money and our control—not letting that $35,000 get sucked into the vortex of everything else we need in the City? Is there a way to redirect it and earmark it for, if we are increasing demand on this facility that already has tremendous stress on it, where we can turn that money into the pool and offset some of that budgeting that we need to improve it?

Mr. de Geus: Interesting question. We're not contemplating that at this time. Is it possible, if the cost to run the program with Tim, provided that it's a better program for residents—if there was a savings to the City for running the program that way, could we start a reserve that would support future improvements to the facility itself, that facility? That's something that we can certainly recommend to the City Manager and City Council. I think you're right that we have a lot of needs there. As we know, in the Master Plan we have a variety of things we'd like to do there, and there isn't a funding source to do all of those. We can certainly look at that. Regarding the terms of the contract with Tim, we haven't developed those yet, but they're all valid points. How does the revenue flow? What is the expectation of maintenance and other things? Those things still need to be worked out.

Vice Chair Knopper: Thank you.

Chair Lauing: That's a good segue to the exact same page but a different question that I had on that. Looking at the downside, are there any risks to the cost there with whatever increase the number of users such that this 540 goes to 640? Is there any sort of expense risk?

Ms. LeBlanc: This is assuming that we have—I can't remember exactly the percentage of those newly offered swim lessons being filled. It's not all the swim lessons that Tim Sheeper would potentially be able to provide. I think it's around 15 or 20 percent more residents were to enroll in the group swim lessons that we are proposing to subsidize. We would be paying $6 per child per lesson beyond that assumption that we have for what we'd be subsidizing. It could go the other way. If we have fewer residents enrolling and we don't see the demand that we're anticipating, then we would drop that number. I think that's the biggest unknown factor in what you're seeing here. If I could add one other thing about the demand in here. Just a few years ago, we offered and had enrolled about twice as many kids in swim lessons as we do now. Through the trouble that we've had in hiring, we haven't been offering as many lessons, and we haven't been offering them at the same times of day, so we've seen a drop. In terms of the scale, six times more lessons sounds very intense and scary when, in reality, it's more like three times, two or three, from where it was just in 2013 or 2014.

Chair Lauing: The short answer to that is it could go either way.

Vice Chair Knopper: There might not be a cost recovery.

Chair Lauing: Just two other comments. I'll go in reverse order. I'm really pleased that, on page 10—Commissioner Reckdahl touched on or two of these things. I'm really pleased on page 10 that you called out these serious reservations or serious issues that we need to look at. Very much appreciate that transparency. Let's not keep anything hidden under rocks. Particularly the last two—all three of them actually are real problems. I agree with that. They need some digging to be looked at. We've talked many times here about how parents, when they're signing up, want to do it all in one place and all at one time. If they're on two different systems, that's going to get some push back at the time of registration. You addressed the financial aid—that was a question—which is great. You heard about the conflicts of sharing the pool. The only other thing I wanted to add just almost a stylistic point, which has caused some of this maybe. I notice on page 5 you say that Team Sheeper's philosophy is one of maximizing usage. Now, words are important. We're not hearing anybody in this room say maximize usage, like as many bunkbeds as you can get in one room. It's making it efficient, increasing the amount of

access that folks can get that aren't using it right now. That might have kind of driven the discussion or even the contract—I don't know—in a slightly different direction.

Mr. de Geus: Appreciate that point. I think that's exactly right. The point you made before about some of the changes in experience in terms of registering, they are important and we need to weigh the pros and cons. We hope and we think that it will be maybe inconvenient at first to go to a different site to register for lessons. The fact that you have many more lessons to choose from in the spring, summer and fall and somewhat ongoing will be the added value that makes it okay.

Chair Lauing: Just put somebody on the phone that day, because you will get questions during the transition, if that's what it is.

Mr. de Geus: For sure, yeah.

Chair Lauing: I don't know if you want sort of a sense of the Commission on the first point that was mentioned, which is the first part of the contract.

Mr. de Geus: That would be great. I think we heard from everybody. If there's more that the Commission wants to say or ask …

Chair Lauing: (crosstalk) not a particular motion, but relative to what you propose, I think we could just get a nod or an up or a down. From my perspective, what you're proposing here on that first piece of it and then investigation of the rest of it is acceptable. (crosstalk)

Mr. de Geus: What we're really saying is it's an expanded swim program whether it's what we presented here or less. What I'm hearing is at this time we want to be sure that it has relatively no impact to other programs and their schedules, because we still have some things to work through there. We think particularly with the small pool and utilizing it when it's not just being used, that's something that we'd like to do now.

Chair Lauing: I don't mean to speak for all the Commissioners. Commissioner Moss.

Commissioner Moss: I have two more questions. Talking about hiring Palo Alto students during the summer, is that going to be doable for you and still make your profit?

Mr. Sheeper: Yes.

Commissioner Moss: The second thing is if we didn't have six times the number of lessons, we only had three times the number of lessons, would you still be interested in

the contract? What if it was only two times the number of lessons, would you still be interested in the contract?

Mr. Sheeper: Yes, still interested. We've been doing lessons for 2 years already at the level.

Commissioner Moss: If it was double, you'd be happy. Not six times, but double the number of lessons you do today, you'd still be happy?

Mr. Sheeper: I'm always happy.

Commissioner Moss: One other question. You said there were two styles of lessons. One is the one where you are skills based, and one is sort of what we have more today which is not so much skills based. I'll call it the fun factor, more fun and less intense. Do you have two different styles or just one style?

Mr. Sheeper: You're speaking of lessons?

Commissioner Moss: Yes.

Mr. Sheeper: There's a Red Cross way, which is what is adopted by Rinconada previously. There's our own proprietary curriculum that we have, that we teach.

Commissioner Moss: You're going to offer both or just yours?

Mr. Sheeper: Just ours. I was speaking to how people can register. They can register for a 1-week session every day or they could register 1 day a week for 20 weeks.

Commissioner Moss: In both cases, it would be your style.

Mr. Sheeper: Same curriculum, yes.

Mr. de Geus: Fun is very important. It's got to be a fun experience, particularly for kids in their learn to swim program. We haven't talked about this or heard about this. We've heard from a lot of parents wanting a less competitive recreation swim program outside of what Tony and the PASA organization does. They do a great program; it's a competitive swim program. This is another area I have a real interest in. Is there a way we can figure out how to support some of these families that want their kids on a team but not so competitive? Just in talking about how we might manage the pool in an improved and enhanced way, some ideas are coming up from Tony and his organization. Then, working closely with Tim to try and figure out how might we do that so that it doesn't impact the other programs. Working with PASA we can have this recreation

swim program, not taking a lot of hours but another opportunity for kids that might not be at that competitive level but still want to be on a team. Those are the kind of things we're looking for, and we hope to really improve the program. I know we're wrapping up. I just wanted to finish on one thing here that I think is important. The Community Services Department does a lot of programs and services. We oversee all of the parks and all of the open space and trail systems, the Palo Alto Art Center, the Junior Museum and Zoo, the Children's Theatre, recreation programs, special events. A $26 million budget, and it's not going up. We look to deliver those services in the best way we can for Palo Alto residents. Sometimes that's in-house, and it's with staff, and it's just the best way to do it. I think that's the case with our open space ranger program, for example. Sometimes it's a partnership with a nonprofit group that supports a program. Palo Alto Art Center Foundation is fantastic. They helped us rebuild the Art Center. Sometimes it's partnering with the private sector, because they have an expertise and a quality that on balance is in the best interest. Just to the point about we're just outsourcing and it's not thoughtful, that's just not the case. That's not what we're doing. We realize we've got some things to work through still, but we're really trying to look out for the residents ultimately and hope to get it right. I do want to thank everyone for being here and that we're hearing you. My office is at the Lucie Stern Community Center, and you can call me any time or drop by if you want to talk to me about it or tell me why it's wrong. My card is here. Let's see if we can figure this out. Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Just from the standpoint of giving feedback to the City, is there any Commissioner that thinks that we at this point shouldn't give preliminary support for the swim lessons? As was pointed it, it's already happened for the last 2 years.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I have one question. In the staff report, it says recommending both the swim lessons and the summer camp. Summer camp right now on the schedule doesn't appear anywhere. Where would that appear and what would it be displacing?

Ms. LeBlanc: It would be kind of displacing what you see as the swim lessons. The swim camps—Tim can elaborate—are not in the pool for the whole time that they're in the camp. What they do is sort of a super lesson each day. Instead of doing a 30-minute lesson, the kids would be doing 45 minutes. I think they might have another half hour for some of the more advanced kids. They would be taking over those times, which are most of the times where we have very low demand. That's where you do not see the wait lists for swim lessons. We think there would be really minimal impact to the lap swimmers during the summer when we add those summer camps.

Commissioner Reckdahl: How many hours a day are the swim camps?

Ms. LeBlanc: I will let Tim chime in.

Mr. Sheeper: I think you explained that well. It's 5 hours a day, 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. Their 45-minute lessons happen in the morning, usually around 9:30. They'll get back in the pool in the afternoon in the open swim times. They're mixing with the current open swim.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Some of it's in the round pool, and some of it's in the (crosstalk)?

Mr. Sheeper: Yeah, depending on their age.

Commissioner Reckdahl: My take is if you can fit the camp and can fit more lessons in without affecting other people, then I'm for it. I'm just nervous about how packed we're going to be.

Commissioner Cribbs: Could I just clarify one thing? You're also retaining the lifeguards. The lifeguards will be reporting to you as well as the swimming teachers, right?

Mr. de Geus: At this time, we're not recommending that. We may come back with that recommendation after we work through this. What we will include in the contract is under emergency circumstances, we can call on Tim to provide lifeguards. I can tell you it happens even now for lap swim. We don't have the staff to be there. We will draw on Tim's staff to come over and help us.

Commissioner Cribbs: It was actually David who brought that up, because he was asking about hiring Palo Alto youth to be swim teachers and lifeguards. I thought, "We haven't talked about the lifeguards; maybe you're doing both." It's just swimming teachers at this point, right?

Mr. Sheeper: That's what we're talking about.

Commissioner Cribbs: Thank you very much.

Commissioner Hetterly: I'm not gung ho to go forward with the plan as it is, to respond to you. This is not an action item. As I understand it, Tim, you've managed our summer lessons for the last 2 years. From everything I've heard, that's been very successful and positively received. It's on this scale, the status quo scale, and not this scale. I really strongly encourage you to find something that's somewhere in the middle before you move forward with something for this coming year. I think it offers a great opportunity to try it out. It's a 1-year contract, right? See how it goes before you do something scary that upsets a lot of people. I think this is an opportunity for us to take it another step

further, building on the relationship and experience that you all have with Tim and his staff to make it better, see how it goes bigger, and see where we can go from there.

Chair Lauing: Thanks to the public. That's the conclusion of this item. Thank you, staff and guests.

3. Parks, Trails, Natural Open Space and Recreation Facilities Master Plan.

Chair Lauing: Thank you. We're going to move onto the next agenda item. If the public could please move outside to continue your discussions if you don't have a comment to give on the next agenda items. That 45-minute item took 2 hours. We'll see if we can zip right along here. The next item is the Parks, Trails, Natural Open Space and Recreation Master Plan, version 73 or whatever we're on. Kristen, take it away.

Kristen O'Kane: Good evening. Kristen O'Kane, Community Services. In your packet, you received a draft version of the Master Plan in its entirety. What we're going to talk about today is first a summary of the community meeting that we had on November 1st, and then briefly go through Chapter 5 because in the copy of the draft Master Plan that you have in your packet, that was the chapter where most changes occurred. We'll also talk about how the public will have an opportunity to review the draft, and then next steps and the schedule. Community meeting. On November 1st, we had a good turnout, very positive feedback, and a lot of support. Thank you, Commissioner Moss, for attending and for speaking also at the community meeting. That was very thoughtful. Some of the comments we heard. I've sort of broken them down by service or program area. The first was recreation facilities and recreation programs. We heard a lot about pools, both the Rinconada pool, liking the pool the way it is, and also the need for an additional pool. We also had some questions on the tennis courts and support for an additional public gym and also pickleball courts. There were quite a few questions as well on Cubberley and the Master Plan effort that we're embarking on and what that would entail and what that would include, for example, would it be a gym, a pool, a senior center. Of course, at this time we don't know what we have in store for Cubberley, but we are starting that process. We also heard support for collaborating with the School District to access facilities and also support for unstructured play and connection to nature. Related to …

Commissioner Reckdahl: One question about pickleball. Are we having two pickleball courts on each side of the tennis net and they're using their own net or are they going with the tennis net and using the tennis net?

Ms. O'Kane: Are you asking what they're doing now?

Commissioner Reckdahl: No. What's the proposal when people talk about pickleball? What do they want? Do they want to use the current tennis net?

Ms. O'Kane: They want to have dedicated pickleball courts. Not shared with tennis but dedicated for pickleball. For parks and open space, we heard some comments related to the 10 1/2 acres. The first comment was to add active recreation use. A subsequent commenter said it should be passive recreation use. The policy as it says now doesn't address either of those. I think it's best to leave it as is. As we go through the process of deciding what to do with the 10 1/2 acres, we can address it at that point. Just briefly, we had support for benches, turf fields both natural and synthetic, support for restoration of natural areas, dog parks. Some question on adult fitness areas; really the comment was please don't add adult fitness areas to every park. We agreed we would do it as a pilot effort to see how it was accepted in the community. Also, a request for a restroom at the Magical Bridge Playground, and questions related to access to creeks, and also a comment to provide free shuttles to the open space areas. Finally, some of our bigger comments we received were how do we prioritize the priorities. We've talked about that. What is a process for future improvements? Will the public have an opportunity to weigh in at that time? Of course, we said yes. Some discussion on demographics and accessibility, and then ensuring that we integrate the Master Plan with the Urban Forest Master Plan, and then some conversation related to potable water use at our parks. That was the community meeting. Again, it was overall very supportive. We had a great turnout. I don't know if anyone else wants to chime in. Commissioner Moss, if you have any comments?

Commissioner Moss: You did great.

Ms. O'Kane: Shall we move on?

Chair Lauing: Yeah.

Ms. O'Kane: Chapter 5 outline. Again, this is the chapter where we had the most changes since the last version. Just briefly, the way it's organized now is we talk about prioritization including the prioritization process. We've reordered the projects and programs so that the—I'm sorry. I jumped ahead. The prioritization process, and then we talk about high priority projects and programs implementation, considerations, and then we get into the descriptions. We still have the action plan, funding strategies, and how we're going to evaluate future projects, and then our progress reporting. Key updates to Chapter 5. We've added two additional high priority projects. One is improve the Rinconada pool facility. The last time we had that sort of combined with aquatics programming, so we separated those out. Another one that came up when we met with the ad hoc was to include golf course facility improvements. This is specific to the clubhouse, the actual structures that are that golf course, that weren't included in the current reconfiguration project. We've added that as well. We've reordered the high priority projects so that the projects that need further study and strategic funding are

listed first, and then it goes to the short-term projects and the programs. We've also expanded the definition of urgency to include the things we heard from the Commission last time such as time sensitivity and if we fail to act on something, do we miss an opportunity by not acting. That's all been added to that chapter. That's all I have on Chapter 5. I'll continue.

Chair Lauing: Might as well give the whole review.

Ms. O'Kane: Do you want to take over here, Peter?

Peter Jensen: Sure. Currently the full document of the Master Plan report is online. It can be accessed through the website for the community to review by clicking on the green. You see there, it's very similar to how our last online survey was structured, where it takes you to a form. This one has specific questions it asks about the document, and it also allows you to provide feedback, whatever that may be, specific comments for specific pages or just general feedback in itself. You see there the two links taking you to the plan body which is the full document or the appendix. The public can see both of those. This will run through November and into the first week of December for the community to review and supply comment on.

Chair Lauing: Who wrote that?

Mr. Jensen: Say again.

Chair Lauing: Who wrote it, who created it?

Mr. Jensen: The project team staff and MIG worked together to put this together.

Ms. O'Kane: I'd like to add that there are specific questions where we're trying to get specific information, but there also is an open-ended question at the end where people can provide additional comments.

Mr. Jensen: The next steps. PRC review of the document. We're hoping to get your comments back by December 5th. That will allow us to incorporate those into the final draft, coming back on December 14th to your meeting. The community will have a few days after that to supply further comment that will also be incorporated into the draft. We're looking at going to Council for the study session that we were hoping to have in December in January. I think it's right now tentatively January 9th. This all coincides with the CEQA work that is going on and that will take place through January with the public review, a portion of that, occurring at the end of January and into February. Finally, hoping to take the plan for adoption to Council in March. That's our current schedule. It mostly depends on the CEQA work that's taking place to meet those dates.

Chair Lauing: Go ahead.

Commissioner Hetterly: Can I just ask a quick question about the CEQA process? That will include a public comment period. It would be great if you would add to the website, if it's not already up there, some announcement that that's happening so that people can have in mind that this is going to be the timeline, and you'll have an opportunity to comment and any details you can provide about how to do that. Thanks.

Chair Lauing: Would it be appropriate to get Commissioners' comments on Chapter 5 as a starting point here?

Ms. O'Kane: Chapter 5 or any of the document is fine.

Chair Lauing; It just seems like there are more changes to 5.

Ms. O'Kane: There are more changes to 5.

Commissioner Hetterly: Why don't we start in 5 and then go to the rest?

Chair Lauing: I was going to ask if members of the ad hoc wanted to state anything relative to the progress, other than what she put in the slides, which I thought was a pretty good summary. No. I'll look to non-ad hoc members who haven't seen this before they got it in their packet. If there are any comments on 5 in terms of the batting order, the way things were shifted around or anything at all.

Commissioner Moss: I just want to say that it looks fantastic. I didn't think you could make so many changes in just that couple of weeks, but you did incorporate all the things that we talked about last time. I think it looks great. I don't have any changes.

Commissioner Cribbs: I would just add to that. I thought it looked terrific. I have yellow sticky notes all over this, and they all say great, I really like this, I like this list, I like the way the prioritization was going. I love it that we have the page with the big projects where everybody can see them, that we've really called out Cubberley and what we're going to do with property and all of that. I think it's terrific. The piece at the end about the fundraising and the opportunities for fundraising, the different kinds of fundraising, to explain that to people is really terrific. At some point, I'd like to see some sort of a timeline. It's probably not appropriate in here, but how is that going to get done, is there going to be a committee formed, will there be a consultant, and all of that. That's probably pushed off later. Otherwise, I just was pretty pleased about it. I was like, "How did that ad hoc committee do all that work in such a short time along with the staff? How did that happen?" It's terrific.

Chair Lauing: Abbie, any questions?

Vice Chair Knopper: I missed last month's meeting. I wasn't here for the discussion. It was just a really easy chapter for me to read. I was thinking back when we started this process a year and a half ago. I remember reading and thinking how confused I was when we first started working with the consultant. It was like one non sequitur after another. I'm like this was just so pretty (inaudible) in comparison. It's taken so many hours of staff work. So many hours, but it's so reflected in it. I know this is my second to last meeting, and I just wanted to make sure I said it. I'm done.

Commissioner Cribbs: I found three little short questions, if I could. Only one gym. Did we want to say plural gyms or is there just one gym to be discussed? That was one question I had.

Chair Lauing: Page?

Commissioner Cribbs: On page 89. Would we contemplate a set of gyms, like Cubberley has right now with the big gym, the pavilion and two smaller gyms? Sometimes those are useful. If we're thinking about building, maybe we should do that.

Commissioner Moss: A gym complex.

Commissioner Cribbs: A gym complex maybe, right. Did we lose the idea of perhaps another pool someplace or is it just rebuilding Rinconada? Is there a point …

Chair Lauing: If not, I think that's a wording omission. We've generally said we need to investigate …

Commissioner Cribbs: Another pool.

Chair Lauing: Yeah. The pool needs or something to that effect.

Commissioner Hetterly: We have in other chapters mentioned an interest in looking into an additional pool, but we don't have a project that covers that. Cubberley is a possible location. I think we mentioned a possible connection between gyms and Cubberley somewhere, but I don't think pools were as explicitly called out for that. That's an opportunity. I guess it is an outstanding question whether we should have a project to find a place for a pool.

Commissioner Cribbs: I would like it. In the discussion about Cubberley, is there a reason to add bringing forth the old Cubberley plan that the community worked so hard on a couple of years ago, just to make sure that we know it's in there?

Ms. O'Kane: We can add that.

Commissioner Cribbs: The last question was just about in the fundraising area, if we are being able to fundraise for facilities, is there is an idea to put in an endowment to take care of those facilities after they're built or a fund? On page 91. Actually that's not the page; it was just a note that I had. It doesn't go there at all.

Commissioner Hetterly: I think that's a great idea, to think about an endowment fund for maintaining facilities. We do identify the funding gap for maintenance and operations in particular, but we don't really identify any way to fill it. I think that would be a great suggestion.

Commissioner Cribbs: I didn't know if that conflicted with the capital fund or anything. Sometimes when major donors are interested in giving a lot of money for a big project, they're also concerned with how the building is going to be taken care of. If we could build that in, that might be something useful. I'm done.

Commissioner Moss: There was one more comment about the community meeting. I had an opportunity to talk to not one but three members of the Friends of Palo Alto Foundation or whatever. Just like Council Member Filseth said last time, just ask because there's money out there. We just need to ask.

Chair Lauing: Anything else on Chapter 5 down here?

Commissioner Reckdahl: Yeah, I've got a couple. Go ahead.

Commissioner Hetterly: I just had a few. On page 86, enhance existing sports fields. This is not necessarily 86. General comment. I like the way you did the funding options. That was new since we last talked. I think it worked really well. I wonder if there are any of these big ticket items in this front group that are well suited to special districts or to tie in with other infrastructure projects. I don't know if that would require a lot of effort to figure that out. If there are some that staff thinks are suitable, that would be great. Pretty much the only extraordinary funding measure we have in here is a bond cited for some of them. It may well be that some of the other funding options identified in the summary could apply to some of these big items. I'd love to have you take a look at that. The Rinconada pool facility improvements on page 90, we should mention somewhere in there the recent Rinconada Master Plan. Somewhere in that description that should be tied in, because there is a plan for those renovations in place.

Mr. de Geus: Yeah, yet to be approved.

Commissioner Hetterly: It has not been approved?

Mr. de Geus: It's still a draft. We're really trying to align the approval of that with the Junior Museum and Zoo and their final plan.

Commissioner Hetterly: I see. I thought that had already been approved.

Mr. de Geus: Not yet.

Commissioner Hetterly: Maybe you don't need to include it here. Thirdly, page 92 was talking about acquiring new parkland. It just reminded me that we had talked previously about adding a program about legacies and bequests or long-term leases. I don't think we've done that. I'd like to see that added in. Not on that page, but that's the page that made me think of it. Sorry. Lastly, the progress reporting. I see you took out all the indicators. Previously you had planned to add a table with some considerations for tracking—this is page 112—progress. I kind of liked the indicators. I can see some rationale for not including specific indicators, but I think this section without them is pretty light. It needs to be beefed up in some way to offer some greater credibility and accountability for the plan. I have several editorial comments, typos, words and stuff throughout. I wonder if we couldn't maybe just hand you our notes at some point for that. Surely the rest of you will be looking through for that too. That's the end. Thanks.

Chair Lauing: Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Just a couple here. Page 90, the Rinconada pool facility. I think the third sentence that says "to meet growing demand, a subsequent program policy to open the pool for a long season is being explored." I think that's irrelevant. What the other sentences say is sufficient. It's old; it's not in good condition; we need to redo it. Whether or not we're going to have a long season really doesn't change the fact that it's not in good condition. I would just delete that whole sentence. I don't see the value added to that. I would start a new paragraph where it says two-thirds of the way down "overall pool facility improvements include." I would start a new paragraph there, because the first part before that is all background. Now, you're starting to get into specifics. I would break that up and just make it clearer instead of one big paragraph. That's stylistic, I guess. The same thing also on 93 for the golf course improvements. We have a couple of sentences that talk about background, and then we start talking about improvements. I would have the background be one paragraph and have the improvements be another. Again, that's stylistic. That's all I had on Chapter 5. I had some typos too, but I'll email you those. They're just piddly things.

Chair Lauing: Apart from Chapter 5 then.

Commissioner Reckdahl: On A1, Appendix A, in that chart where we list all the parks and then all their attributes, you list El Camino Park as owned by City of Palo Alto, which it's not. It's owned by Stanford. I don't know if you want to say ownership leased from Stanford. That may be a cleaner way of doing that. We do have a long-term lease. Maybe even say when the lease expires. When does the lease expire, do you know?

Mr. de Geus: It was extended.

Chair Lauing: I think we got 15 more years, didn't we?

Mr. Jensen: It's 2045 I think.

Commissioner Reckdahl: 2045. Under the ownership say leased from Stanford until 2045. Also the same with the Palo Alto playing fields. It might be nice to say leased from Stanford University, lease ending this date. If that disappears, we are in trouble for playing fields. The expiration date of that lease is important. The second thing is on A3. Down at the very bottom, there's an asterisk. It says "high school fields not available for City or community use." They are available, but not through the City channels. If you want to rent the Gunn baseball field, you call Gunn and rent that out. I'm not sure how to phrase that. That sounds a little misleading, because it is available but you can't just drop in. You have to arrange it ahead of time. I don't know how to phrase that to say that's not available for—down at the very bottom—not open for use. I don't know how to qualify this.

Mr. de Geus: We can work on something. The use is not managed by the City during non-school hours as opposed to the middle and elementary schools. We can do something with that.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That was it. Thank you.

Commissioner Hetterly: I think you have to be careful about how you word that high school fields thing. It's not managed, but it's also not necessarily available to be managed by the City. I think you should—that's a tricky one.

Chair Lauing: It's not controlled by the City specifically.

Commissioner Hetterly: I just had a couple of other comments in other sections. In the executive summary, page 7, it talks about expanding the system and underserved areas

map, park search areas map. In the paragraph up above, you talk about areas with the greatest need, for example those with the highest density and/or the largest population.

Commissioner Reckdahl: (inaudible)

Commissioner Hetterly: It's page 7 of the executive summary, vii. I know we talked about that long ago, about trying to build into the walkshed map some density considerations that would then lead to park search areas, so the search area didn't reflect just geographic location outside of a certain radius but reflected a greater need in certain areas that have denser population. Is that reflected in the park search areas or is that not? I apologize for not raising this question long, long ago.

Mr. Jensen: I think we had a slide that we originally showed, that called out … I guess it's "E" or "D" that had the most population and the least amount of parkland. It started to reference which ones were ranked per that. I don't think that got translated into any of these actual maps.

Commissioner Hetterly: I think that's hugely useful information. If we have it, I would like to see it included. If we can't include it, then we should not say that we've considered it as it does in the text. I would love to see it. Further on in that same paragraph, the last clause is talking about school grounds and says "that can be used in park search areas, that will be maintained and expanded to better support neighborhood park uses and enhance their open space value." Has the School District been involved in any discussions about this plan? It seems a little bold to say they will be maintained and expanded to enhance open space if we've not had those conversations with the School District. I think you can handle that either by taking it out or by talking to them or by changing the wording to say "we will seek to" or "hope to" or "there's potential for future partnership to" blah, blah, blah. The next page on connecting the systems, I would love to see somewhere in that paragraph some mention of the Safe Routes to School. They do have connections that are built into this map, that are important. They are increasing their efforts to expand their advocacy to include safe routes to parks. We ought to reciprocate that by going together on that one.

Commissioner Moss: Are you saying that it should dovetail with their plan? Our job is not to provide safe routes to school, but you're saying that they have a plan to do that. We have a plan to do our connecting, and it would be nice to dovetail. Is that what you're saying?

Commissioner Hetterly: Yes, I think we do largely dovetail. Those connections are all reflected in the Bike and Pedestrian Transportation Plan. That Safe Routes to School effort should be recognized in this paragraph as we took that into consideration in

figuring out what are the best routes to parks. That's it. All the rest of my comments are editorial.

Vice Chair Knopper: You have some comments? No. I just had one quick one. There's a couple of typos in the executive summary or some grammatical things. I don't know if you want to go through that right now. The one thing I would say is on page 12. That's xii, Keith. Under high priority projects and programs, the last sentence says "they are not ranked nor are they presented in priority order." I just would bold and underline or just really make that sentence prominent, because you immediately go into the projects. If they're just glancing, they're just going to miss that and think we have bullet points and all of a sudden this is our order. It's just a style thing, but I know how people glance. Did you want some of the typos or no? I can just give you my …

Mr. de Geus: Send them in.

Chair Lauing: It's a wrap. We have our dates for the next set of line-ups.

Ms. O'Kane: Can I just add? I'd like to thank again the ad hoc for their insight, wisdom and work on this, especially Chapter 5. It's been very helpful.

Chair Lauing: We aren't going to say it was nothing, because it was something. Thanks for hanging in there. We should be getting this zooming off to Council soon. Thank you.

4. Recommendation to Council to Explore the Potential Sale by AT&T and Purchase by City of Palo Alto of a Portion of a Parcel at 3350 Birch Street, Palo Alto, Adjacent to Boulware Park, for Parkland Use.

Chair Lauing: We have some speaker cards on the next item, which is recommendation to Council from the Commission to explore the potential sale by AT&T and purchase by City of Palo Alto of a portion of a parcel at 3350 Birch, Palo Alto, adjacent to Boulware Park for parkland use. We have three speakers, and then we have a draft to circulate that we can potentially vote on. The first speaker is Angela de la Parta. I hope I said that correctly. Approximately 2 minutes. Thank you.

Angela de la Porta: My name's Angela de la Porta [phonetic]. I live in the Ventura neighborhood. I'd just like to voice my support for the acquisition of the AT&T land that is just right across the street from Boulware Park. It's been this lovely space that's been very attractive for many years, but it's all overgrown and not used except by sometimes vagrants as a toilet, which is not very pleasant. It would be great if we could actually acquire that land and make it into a pleasant, welcoming place for people. Boulware Park is, I think, maybe the smallest park in Palo Alto or one of the smallest. Just that little bit of extra land would be lovely to have. That's all.

Chair Lauing: Thanks very much. Next is Jonathan Brown.

Jonathan Brown: Thank you to the Commission for giving me the opportunity to speak tonight. Thank you to the staff who have worked hard on this. The Ventura neighborhood has historically been an underserved part of the City. Boulware Park, with the exception of the Ventura Community Center, is the only park in our very large populous and diverse neighborhood. I wholeheartedly support the acquisition of as much of the parcel at 3350 Birch Street as possible to expand this precious resource and elevate our neighborhood's park space closer to those of other neighborhoods and closer to what our community expects and deserves. The Ventura parks committee feels likewise—I'm the chair of that committee—as do many of the community leaders and others to whom I've spoken about this idea. Importantly, the time to act is now. AT&T is willing to sell, and this opportunity must be seized now or it will be forever lost. I commend the Commission for prioritizing this issue and putting it on tonight's agenda for action. The community stands ready to help in any way necessary including with time, negotiations and funding. In order to maximize our chances of successfully capitalizing on this opportunity, we need to bring to bear all of our resources including not only those of our City staff, who are already working on this, but also our community members and public-private partners who have shown the ability to step up to meet community needs when government finds itself constrained in various ways as noted in several examples set forth in the draft Parks Master Plan on pages 106 to 108. Please recommend pursuit of this acquisition and please keep those in the community who stand willing to help involved throughout the process. I live on Fernando Avenue, right across the street from Boulware Park. I'd be happy to answer any questions from the Commission to the best of my ability. I look forward to progress on this. Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Thanks. The third speaker is Becky Sanders.

Becky Sanders: Good evening, Commissioners. I want to just thank all of you all for opening my eyes to how wonderfully smooth a Commission can run. It wasn't until I got involved in this Ventura Park expansion program that I actually came to Parks and Rec. I do seem to think—I'm not trying to butter you up, but you do seem to be one of the more efficiently run. Everybody's firing on the—all the cylinders are working. It's been really inspiring for me. I just want you to know that we had as many people here as the swim club did; not really. We did have three more people; we had three more people here. Here's the deal. With the acquisition of the Mike's Bikes property, that's going to be expanding deep into Ventura along Pepper Avenue, and with the coming online of 441 Page Mill, that's a ginormous Godzilla project, that's increasing the housing stock big time, as they say. How about increasing the parkland? Just a little bit would be great. Of course, we'll be back for the Fry's. I don't know what's going on with Fry's. When that comes online, we'll be back. It doesn't make any sense to keep piling people into the

Ventura neighborhood already, I think, the densest neighborhood in Palo Alto without adding parkland. If it's beaucoup moolah that AT&T is looking for, let's see what we can do. There is a tradition of investors buying on spec, hoping that they can get Council or somebody to flip the public facility. We've seen that at VTA. There's a little nod there. If they can make below market rate happen there or something, they'll flip that zoning. I'm anxious that the PF zoning will be flipped to something that will be like RM-30 or something. I just want to send developers a clear signal that zoning is not for sale in Palo Alto, and it's not for sale in Ventura. I feel very passionately. I make jokes and everything, but I feel deeply passionate about keeping the public facility. We pave it over if there's no money, but let's not lose this opportunity to make a beautiful addition to our open space in beautiful Palo Alto. Thank you for your service and great job on the Master Plan, parks people. Really good job. Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Thank you. You can come every month if you like. Lovely comments. I did some, and you did some. Kristen did some. Mine are the non-green, two-page varieties in case you want to write on things. Just a draft of what we should talk about. It doesn't have to be this wording.

Commissioner Moss: Can you remind me what the process is?

Vice Chair Knopper: Is this the same thing?

Chair Lauing: Sorry. I didn't know you passed it out. Sorry.

Commissioner Moss: You will remind me what the process is.

Chair Lauing: This is a recommendation from us to Council specifically to do what it says in the—staff and ultimately Council to do an investigation to kind of bring all the issues to light and see if there's a way that we can sort of wrestle this to the ground. That's an informal way of answering your question, Commissioner Moss, but that's what we're asking for here. You want to add to that, Rob?

Mr. de Geus: I'm not sure I understand the question. The Parks and Recreation Commission is a Commission that advises Council on matters related to parks and recreation. This is the Commission contemplating making a recommendation to the City Council that we look to acquire, if possible, this piece of land. That's the process we're in. If the Commission agrees to do that as a Commission, then staff will facilitate making sure the Council gets that advice from their Commission.

Chair Lauing: With appropriate investigation of options and costs and risks and all that kind of thing. Just to clarify, it doesn't mean that if we make this, then we're done and it

just goes straight to Council. It still needs to have a lot of work done around the issues, but it's an activation process that we're going for here and a very high visibility process.

Commissioner Cribbs: What's the timeline then?

Chair Lauing: Of next steps?

Commissioner Cribbs: Yeah, of next steps.

Mr. de Geus: If the Commission votes to send this along to Council, recognizing there is some sensitivity and urgency around this, we would want to get it to the Council as soon as possible. I'd have to talk to the City Manager about how exactly he would like to do that. There's different ways that can be communicated. We'll look into that right away, and then I can let the Commission know.

Vice Chair Knopper: What are we supposed …

Chair Lauing: We need to look at this and see if this states exactly what we want to say or if we want to change the draft of this in any way. This is just a draft for the Commission to evaluate. Obviously it shows how it's tied to the draft Master Plan and Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Do we know how many acres this parcel is?

Commissioner Hetterly: The parcel, I don't know. Do you know?

Commissioner Reckdahl: The park is 1 1/2.

Daren Anderson: We recently had the real estate attorney look into this. What we found is it's not the entire parcel outside those buildings. It's actually 0.63 acres that they're able to sell, 0.63 acres.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That lot is part for sale and part not for sale?

Mr. Anderson: Yes.

Commissioner Reckdahl: It might be good to specify that. In the second paragraph, where we say the subject property is currently zoned, maybe in that sentence somehow we can mention that it is 0.63 acres.

Ms. O'Kane: I'd like to add a couple of things on that. The first is just to clarify that the property isn't for sale yet. They do need to do a lot line adjustment to identify that 0.63

acres. I don't think that's set in stone at this point, that it's 0.63 acres, because they have to go through that process and then actually put the property up for sale.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Maybe we can just say approximately 0.6 acres. I just wanted to give …

Commissioner Hetterly: I would leave it out.

Commissioner Reckdahl: You'd leave it out?

Commissioner Hetterly: Yeah, just because we don't know what it's going to be and it's negotiable presumably how it will turn out. I think the Council knows the property that we're talking about. I don't think we need to provide that kind of detail that we can't be certain of.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The reason it's important to me is that it's a significant lot, it's a significant size. Compared to the park itself, it's almost like half the size of the park. It'd be different if this was a tiny little lot and if we miss it, we miss it. This is really important because this would really make an impact to the park. Maybe we don't have to give numbers, but I would want to say it would significantly improve the park or make a strong statement that this is really important for the park. It's just not a small lot that just happens to be on the edge.

Chair Lauing: You just want to put significant expansion in there?

Commissioner Hetterly: We could say something like "the generously sized property is currently zoned public facility" or something to that effect. Is that what you—does that work?

Commissioner Reckdahl: Yep, I'd be happy with that. I just wanted to make sure that they understand this is significant, and it's not just a small lot.

Commissioner Moss: It's important because they could conceivably carve out a piece of that for two homes and give us the rest. That would diminish the utility for us. I want to make sure it's the whole thing and not half the thing. I don't know how to say that.

Chair Lauing: Commissioner Hetterly, what are you suggesting for the add there?

Commissioner Hetterly: How about we say "the sizable subject property is currently zoned public facility"?

Chair Lauing: That works. Any others? Commissioner Hetterly, would you like to make a motion to adopt this?

MOTION:

Commissioner Hetterly: Yes. I move that we approve this memo and forward it to Council.

Chair Lauing: Second, Commissioner Cribbs. Further discussion, staff?

Mr. de Geus: It's a really interesting and unique opportunity. I think exploring it makes a lot of sense given what we heard from the public and just looking at it. We just went over the Master Plan, and we have all of those things that we want to accomplish, the top 33 and more. You just take any number, take the 10 1/2 acres out at the golf course with no funding for how we might improve that site. We have the 7.7 acres up at Foothills Park that we're soon to learn what we might be able to do there. There's no funding for that either. We talked about pools and gyms and other things. If we were to do something like this, it could potentially draw on funds that could be used for some of those other things. I think that's important, and maybe that could be part of the full exploration. I don't know that that comes across as clearly here. It may be a unique opportunity, but on balance is it the one that we should spend the limited resources and funding on? Maybe it is, but I think it's important that there's some caution. At least that staff will do that when we share it with Council. I'd be interested to hear from the Commission if you agree.

Vice Chair Knopper: Because geographically speaking, Palo Alto has significant limitations that any opportunity that you can purchase—totally hear what you're saying. Obviously everybody at this table would renovate everything and make everything state of the art tomorrow if we had the financial resources. The opportunity to actually purchase land here is so difficult. It doesn't come up that often. Any chance that we might be able, that has an adjacency to a park, it would be crazy not to explore it. It may be financially not viable. AT&T might decide to do something completely different. I think it's necessary based on everything that we've talked about, trying to expand our parkland. I do understand your reservation. I do understand that.

Chair Lauing: Others? As one of the speakers pointed out, that we know, that's a particularly unserved place for parkland. That, I think, adds to the urgency of this particular plot.

Commissioner Cribbs: I would agree with that about Ventura being underserved. I also think that this is a great opportunity to paint the picture of we can do this, we can create a vision, and there can be money out there to support it. It can go along with the list of the

great things that we want to do as long as we ask and get it out there. I have a lot of faith that saying we're going to do this or we recommend this is going to really help draw some of the funding that we need.

Commissioner Hetterly: I agree with that. I think it will draw funding not just from City resources but it gives something for people to rally around, as we heard from the community. They're ready to step up and do what they can in terms of funding support within the community and with other partners. I think putting a flag in the ground, saying we really believe in taking advantage of unique opportunities like this for the long-term good of our community is an important message to send.

Mr. de Geus: Do you think there is any advantage in including something about creative funding opportunities to do this? The way it reads is just the City should purchase it, if we can. That doesn't inspire fundraising. The City doesn't have money to purchase it. It just seems like a gap in the message to me.

Chair Lauing: Do you think that should be here, though, or is that in part of the investigation? Plus, we've heard here, which is obviously recorded in the minutes, that there are local resources that are willing to step up and look at helping fund it.

Mr. de Geus: I would feel more comfortable if it was included in there, that there was some recognition that the City does not have a fund that can just buy land, and a recognition of that balance with the many needs that the City has in the park system and recreation program and facilities. That's not to say we shouldn't do it. I'm not saying that. I actually think it's really a unique opportunity that I would support.

Commissioner Hetterly: How about if we add a sentence at the end of that first clause that says "including identification of creative funding opportunities to realize this unique opportunity"? Does that work?

Mr. de Geus: I think that's better.

Chair Lauing: Creative funding, I think, is fine. We don't want to commit the community to any dollar amount tonight. It's not unprecedented. This has happened before in the City. Any other comments?

Commissioner Cribbs: Yes, it could be the (inaudible) our first for our program legacy thing that we talked about in the Master Plan. This could be something that we can try and everybody can jump aboard.

Chair Lauing: Any other comments or are we ready to vote on the revised memo? Let's just review the revisions.

Commissioner Hetterly: I do have one other question following up on Anne's point. We do have a policy about that, should that policy be added to the Master Plan policies that are relevant.

Commissioner Cribbs: That's a good idea.

Commissioner Hetterly: The changes I have are at the end of the first sentence insert a comma and add "including identification of creative funding opportunities to realize this unique opportunity."

Chair Lauing: I don't think we want "opportunity" twice there?

Commissioner Hetterly: What do you want to say?

Chair Lauing: "To enhance the ability to make the purchase."

Commissioner Moss: Maybe a public-private partnership.

Male: Funding strategy.

Commissioner Reckdahl: (crosstalk) strategy.

Commissioner Hetterly: Creative funding strategies to realize this unique opportunity. Does that work?

Vice Chair Knopper: Sure.

Chair Lauing: Sure.

Commissioner Hetterly: At the beginning of the second paragraph, we're going to insert "sizable." It says "the sizeable subject property is currently zoned public facility," and then it continues on. We're going to figure out whichever program it is that talks about look for funding partnerships, etc., and add that to the programs or policy, whichever it is, that's listed in the Master Plan.

Chair Lauing: All in favor of the motion as amended on the floor. It's unanimous. Thank you. Thanks to the speakers as well.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED

5. Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates.

Chair Lauing: The next item on the agenda is other ad hoc committee and liaison updates. Do you have any items on that, Daren?

Mr. Anderson: Just a brief update on the IT&T property. We were able to do tours for most of the Commission. If there were any Commissioners who didn't get to come and would like to do it, I'd be glad to set up another tour. You can just send me an email, and we'll find a time. For those that joined me, thanks so much. I enjoyed that. One of the follow-up items was to look into the hydrology of that area a little bit. I'm sorry I don't have the display for you. The next time I come back, I can. Commissioner Moss joined me. We walked around and looked at it for about an hour. This was at a king tide. The intent was to see exactly how much of it receives any tidal influence. As we suspected, it's one 18-inch pipe that carries tidal water from the other side of Byxbee, closer to the marsh front trail in the Baylands, across into this 150-acre wetland area. It's extremely muted because there's (inaudible) coming in. This is in a 9-plus king tide. There was just very little change into what we had seen the day we had come out, which I think was an average tide height. We know it's muted, but there is water that comes into the area inside the fence of the 35.5 acres, the antenna field. There is tidal action in there for what it's worth. We could easily put together a little display that kind of shows you where that's at. I think that's all I had on that item.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Were we going to, in the Baylands Master Plan, address that? We had talked about that on the tour.

Mr. Anderson: It's a challenge. It was a great question. How in depth would it get? I think unfortunately it is unlikely to go into great detail. What mostly likely would happen is there'd be a recommendation upon further analysis and study to say you can enhance the habitat by increasing the tidal flow. Exactly how you do that is very complex. You don't just reshape a marsh by going in with shovels. It's a very engineered solution, and it would take a lot of study, almost its own hydrology study. What I would anticipate is it would be looked at a high level with the Baylands Comprehensive Plan and probably be a recommendation on ways to improve the habitat in that area.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I think that's a good idea. It's not that we need to solve this problem, but I want it on people's radar screen. If we include it in the Conservation Plan, then it will be eventually addressed hopefully.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you.

Chair Lauing: Other ad hoc committee or liaison updates from Commissioners or staff?

V. DEPARTMENT REPORT

Chair Lauing: The next item on the agenda is Number V, now VI department report. Rob, Kristen?

Mr. de Geus: I just have a couple of updates. I sent the Commission a report for a study session on the Junior Museum and Zoo that's going to happen this coming Monday. I'm not sure if you've had a chance to read that. The study session with Council will look at a few things. We'll give them an update on where we are in the process with the Friends. We'll look at the current design of the new facility, which is smaller as I've mentioned at previous meetings. It's still being worked on even as we speak. We just included some fairly simple floor plans in the actual staff report. The big changes are going from a two-story building to a one-story, more modest building. We will share that. The Zoo footprint is the same as the last time you saw it. I thought it had actually come off even further, but it's the same as the last time. I think the Commission was comfortable at that point with that. There was also a phasing of the project. There's a second phase of the construction project, because the funding is just not available to do what they had hoped for. It's unfortunate but in some ways a smaller, more modest program might be in the end the better thing to go forward with for the local community and some of the challenges we already have with that site and how packed it is and parking and other issues. We'll also talk about an interim location for the Junior Museum and Zoo when we do close and rebuild. We're looking at Cubberley as a possibility for that, at least that's the current thinking as a site. The auditorium at Cubberley not to have a zoo but certainly the program and exhibit space so it can remain relevant. We'll give them an update on the fundraising, which is going very well from the Friends. They committed to raising $25 million; they've raised 24 and have $1 million to go. This additional Phase 2, which staff thinks is really important to try and get done, is about $3 million more. We'll see if funding will find its way to that. We'll talk about timeline, which is still all tentative. They haven't submitted a project for permitting yet. It'll be an interesting study session to tune into. It's taped, so you can watch it later as well. We can also add it to the December agenda if the Commission wants to get a full update from the project team.

Vice Chair Knopper: May I ask one quick question?

Mr. de Geus: Yeah.

Vice Chair Knopper: They're shrinking the size. Will it still be large enough for them to get that accreditation they needed for the animals?

Mr. de Geus: It will.

Vice Chair Knopper: It will not?

Mr. de Geus: It will. It will still be accredited.

Commissioner Cribbs: What time is the study session?

Mr. de Geus: 6:00. Are there any other questions?

Commissioner Reckdahl: Can you discuss shortly about the Rinconada Master Plan? You mentioned in that discussion that we were waiting for the Junior Zoo. What's the timetable or what's the order of tasks that are going to happen?

Mr. de Geus: I hope that'll come forward in the spring of next year, once the final plans for the Junior Museum is done and the environmental work for the Rinconada long-range plan is completed.

Commissioner Reckdahl: (crosstalk) under way right now?

Mr. de Geus: They're related. Yeah, most of it actually is done. We're waiting on a few reports to be finalized.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That will come back to us in the spring?

Mr. de Geus: The Rinconada long-range plan will come back to the Commission right before we go to Council. We'll need to be reminded of everything that's in there, because it's been some time.

Commissioner Reckdahl: (inaudible) or is it just that it's a courtesy, coming back to us?

Mr. de Geus: I think we would ask the Commission to recommend approval for that. Just quickly, we had an interesting trip over to Emeryville. Emeryville decided to build a community center and school together. They very much needed to do that and had big funding issues and other things. With Dr. Max McGee and Bob Golton from the School District, Kristen and I visited and got a tour and heard about that whole experience as related to our interest in Cubberley. It was fascinating. They share everything, the whole space, classrooms, the whole thing. We learned some things from that. I don't think we need to have that level of sharing here in Palo Alto, but it can be done. It's clear that it is being done there. They're 3 months in or something like that, less than 6 months open at this point. There are some growing pains that they're going through. It was interesting to be there, and it was great to have Max and Bob join us, showing their interest in moving this along. That's all I have to report.

Mr. Anderson: I do have one more report. Staff has started work on the CIPs, our capital budget. Just started today, first kickoff meeting. Unfortunately and as usual, the turnaround time is quick. We're to return to Council by December 15th. Sorry, not Council, to our OMB staff, budget staff, with our department's recommendations for CIPs. As our custom has been, there's an ad hoc with the Commission that meets with staff and kind of vets this through. The turnaround time is kind of quick, but that would be really helpful. I don't know if it's the same ad hoc committee we've worked with or if there's a new one. It'd be helpful to meet fairly quickly with them and talk through some of the options.

Chair Lauing: I think the current one is just Keith, as I recall.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Unless there is other takers.

Chair Lauing: In addition to or instead of?

Commissioner Reckdahl: In addition. If one of the new people have some interest, they're welcome to join me. Otherwise, I'm happy to do it myself.

Female: (inaudible)

Mr. Anderson: I'm sorry I did a bad job of kicking that off. This is the capital improvement projects.

Chair Lauing: Looks like you've got it, Keith. You and Daren can coordinate on it.

VI. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Lauing: Overall comments and announcements as distinct from the department report. Always looking for the hydrological update from the 7.7.

Mr. Anderson: Yeah, the Buckeye Creek hydrology study. By the end of this month, we should have some concepts, which is great. They've done some preliminary analysis on their survey work. We're one step closer. We'll look over those concepts and probably have a public meeting, bring it to the Commission not too far after that.

Commissioner Moss: The Baylands Conservation, is that going out to bid?

Mr. Anderson: Yes. We're still working with purchasing to get that one out to bid for the Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan.

Chair Lauing: Go ahead.

Commissioner Hetterly: I just wanted to let everybody know that the Comp Plan Update Committee is wrapping things up around the Natural Environment Element for the Comp Plan. I wanted to thank Daren for coming to the subcommittee meeting and putting in a lot of time. We hashed through a lot of details. We met about it last night. The current draft was very well received along with some additions that were nearly unanimous if not unanimous. I think there will be some additive. I expect next month, December 13th, the full Committee will vote to move that Element forward to the City Council.

Ms. O'Kane: I have one announcement. I wanted to recognize that Chair Lauing and Commissioners Knopper and Hetterly were recognized at Monday's Council meeting. There were resolutions read for each of them in appreciation for their work here on the Commission for many years. Of course, that was voted unanimously to accept those resolutions. Again, on behalf of all of us here, thank you for all your service and work on the Commission.

Chair Lauing: On top of all her other work, Kristen came to that too. Thank you.

Vice Chair Knopper: Did you replace us?

Mr. de Geus: The interviews, I think, are the 30th of November.

Chair Lauing: Not much time.

VII. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR DECEMBER 14, 2016 MEETING

Chair Lauing: Tentative agenda items for December 14th special meeting.

Commissioner Cribbs: Is that still the 14th?

Chair Lauing: Yeah. Special meeting because it's been moved. That's why it's called special, the 14th. Just before that on the calendar, we see still the Council meeting on the Master Plan on the 12th. That's done, out.

Commissioner Moss: Peter mentioned three dates. He mentioned December 5th, December 9th and December 14th. What is 5th, which is a Monday? What is December 9th, which is a Friday?

Mr. Jensen: December 5th is when staff, the project team, would like further comments that you have for the draft Master Plan report to come back to us, so we can incorporate those into the final draft that'll be coming to you on the third date, the 14th. The meeting

on the 14th is the next PRC meeting. The 5th is when we'd like comments back from you. The 9th is when we'd like to close the community survey. Those are the three dates.

Chair Lauing: Let's get back to the tentative agenda. Is anything on aquatics coming back next month?

Mr. de Geus: We're going to be actively working on that over the next couple of months. If there is substantive updates, that could certainly be. We have this survey that's out right now, that we have several hundred responses to. I don't think that's enough. If we have more than that or more alignment of what we might be thinking to have a further conversation. At this time, though, I'm just not sure. We'll have to stay in touch.

Chair Lauing: Clearly the Master Plan is coming back again.

Commissioner Hetterly: Are we going to vote on it in December?

Chair Lauing: What?

Commissioner Hetterly: The Master Plan.

Chair Lauing: Yeah, I would hope so. Action item.

Vice Chair Knopper: How exciting. I genuinely mean that.

Commissioner Cribbs: I have a conflict that night, so I most likely will not be there (inaudible) out of town.

Chair Lauing: The Zoo, if they're willing to come back and meet us again.

Mr. de Geus: If the Commission wants to do that.

Chair Lauing: I would like to, but I'm just raising it for Commission input. Go ahead.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm not sure what we would say. Certainly if they want to give us an update of what the status is, I could listen. I don’t have any strong feelings either way.

Mr. de Geus: I don't think they have a strong interest to come back, not for any other reason. Their park issues haven't changed considerably since the last time they were here. They will come back for a Park Improvement Ordinance at some point when it's closer to a real project and happening.

Commissioner Reckdahl: One of the questions we had last time was can they shrink it back at all. Did they shrink it back at all?

Mr. de Geus: They did twice. The third time was as far as they felt like they could go. They haven't gone further back. What they have done, which is interesting, is the building is smaller. That's allowed for the Zoo to get a little bit more space. That wasn't on parkland.

Commissioner Reckdahl: It still went out like 90 feet into that grassy area.

Chair Lauing: That's why we should see it again.

Commissioner Reckdahl: If they're going to come back and say it is what it is, we're going to bring it to Council, then that'll be a little awkward.

Commissioner Hetterly: It's going to Council before our next meeting. Isn't that right?

Mr. de Geus: It's going to Council next Monday.

Commissioner Hetterly: My inclination would be not to bring it back to us unless there's—I would like an update following the Council session to hear how that went. I think we can certainly watch it on the webcast and get the same presentation, unless they want to come. Of course, I would welcome them to come, but I would hate to ask them to put in the hours of prep time in order to present to us something that they've just presented to Council and we have access to.

Chair Lauing: Any other comments? No. Doesn't seem like we need that to come back then. It's just Master Plan and possibly aquatics.

Mr. de Geus: Maybe.

Chair Lauing: Maybe, why? It's an action item. Any other comments?

Mr. de Geus: I'm not saying we should do this. We have three Commissioners. The Human Relations Commission for their December meeting has a short meeting, and they all go out to dinner together. Isn't that nice? I'm just saying.

Chair Lauing: We would have to start our meeting at about 4:00 p.m. to have a short meeting so we could still go out to dinner.

Vice Chair Knopper: We're just approving it. It's going to be perfect.

Commissioner Moss: When do we get …

Chair Lauing: There's that. Any other items? A motion to adjourn?

Commissioner Moss: Hold on.

Chair Lauing: Sorry.

Commissioner Moss: When do we get your replacements?

Chair Lauing: They just said that they were going to interview on the 30th. It's for the January meeting. Motion to adjourn?

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned on motion by Vice Chair Knopper and second by Commissioner Hetterly at 10:25 p.m.