



APPROVED

**MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
July 25, 2017
CITY HALL
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California**

Commissioners Present: Anne Cribbs, Jeff Greenfield, Jeff LaMere, Ryan McCauley, Don McDougall, David Moss, and Keith Reckdahl

Commissioners Absent:

Others Present:

Staff Present: Daren Anderson, Rob de Geus, Peter Jensen, Kristen O'Kane, Tanya Schornack

I. ROLL CALL CONDUCTED BY: Tanya Schornack

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS:

Chair Reckdahl: We'll move on to Agenda Changes, Requests, Deletions. Does anyone have any suggestions?

Kristen O'Kane: Chair, I actually have a suggestion mostly for future meetings. I thought at this meeting it might be helpful as well to move the Department Report on the agenda ahead of Oral Communications or after Oral Communications, either way. Just so that members of the public who are here can hear the Department Report, and staff who are reporting on the different things can do that at the beginning.

Chair Reckdahl: I'm happy with that. Does anyone have any ...

Male: Great idea.

Chair Reckdahl: Let's move that up today. Department Report, we'll move up right before Business, between Oral Communications and Business.



III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Chair Reckdahl: That bring us to—we do have Oral Communications. Jessica Brettle is going to speak.

Jessica Brettle: Thank you, Chair Reckdahl, Commissioners. Thank you for letting me be here this evening. My name is Jessica Brettle. I've met some of you. If not, I'm upstairs on the seventh floor in the Clerk's Office. I'm here today, as we normally do, to announce a recruitment that we have for a new committee. This committee is the Storm Water Management Oversight Committee. As you guys might recall, back in November, we held an election with property owners to increase our storm water management fee. This new committee will be in charge of overseeing the budget and the disbursement of those funds for the storm water management fee. We like to come to talk to all of you because we know that you're well connected, and you know folks in the community. We really encourage you to talk to them and encourage them to apply. The deadline to apply for this committee is August 1st, which is next week. They can apply online or they can give us a call in the Clerk's Office and apply via the internet or PDF. We make it easy on them. If they have any questions, they can call us as well. As a side note, this committee does not meet every month. It's probably once, twice a year. If you know someone who wants to start getting involved but maybe doesn't have a huge time slot to be involved, this is a good start for them to get involved in the community. I'm going to put some flyers in the back if you want to take them home with you, if you know of anybody. I appreciate your time this evening. Thank you.

Chair Reckdahl: Thank you.

IV. DEPARTMENT REPORT

Chair Reckdahl: Now we move on to the next, which is Department Report.

Ms. O'Kane: Good evening, Commissioners. Kristen O'Kane, Community Services Department. I have two things to report, and then I'm going to turn it over to Daren Anderson, who has some updates as well. The first is I just wanted to report back on our aquatics program. Palo Alto Swim and Sport will be officially taking over the aquatics program on August 14th with oversight by City staff. The contract with Rinconada Masters is still not finalized, but we are very close. We just have a few things to work out, but I do believe we are very close. We will get there soon. We are working with Palo Alto Swim and Sport to get the website updated and to just make sure everything is fine-tuned and ready to go on August 14th. The second thing I wanted to just report out on is just a follow-up on an article that was in the *Daily Post* related to the San Francisco Mime Troop. In May of this year, the San Francisco Mime Troop applied for a permit to perform at Mitchell Park. In addition to performing, the permit application stated that the Mime Troop would be soliciting donations at the event. The Council-adopted Park and

APPROVED

1 Open Space Rules and Regulations prohibit the solicitation of donations in parks. Staff
2 informed the Mime Troop that they could have their event at Mitchell Park; they just
3 could not solicit donations at the event. The Mime Troop subsequently removed the
4 performance at Mitchell Park from their 2017 summer schedule. Just to follow up on
5 that, we are talking with the Mime Troop. I spoke with them today actually to see how
6 we can possibly get them to come to Palo Alto this summer and perform at Mitchell Park,
7 something that works for them but also complies with our Municipal Code and our Parks
8 Rules and Regulations. We're still determining how that might work. We are hopeful
9 that they will come and perform this year in Palo Alto. They've been coming for a
10 number of years. We are happy to have them. Unfortunately, we need to enforce our
11 rules and regulations at the park. We can't have a lot of discussion on this tonight
12 because it wasn't an agenda item. If the Commission would like to agenda not
13 necessarily this issue but maybe the specific rule that's in question or that came to light
14 for a future meeting, we would be happy to do that.

15 Chair Reckdahl: We're planning already next month to talk about the commercial
16 activity in parks. I think we could roll this into that. Do you think that's good timing?

17 Ms. O'Kane: Sure. Yeah, that would be great.

18 Vice Chair Moss: Did we pay them to come to the park to perform?

19 Ms. O'Kane: No, we don't pay them. They apply for a permit to come and perform.
20 They would pay the fees that are outlined in the Municipal Fee Schedule. Now, I'll turn it
21 over to Daren for an update on the Foothill trails.

22 Daren Anderson: Good evening. Daren Anderson, Open Spaces, Parks, and Golf. I
23 wanted to share the latest with our problem trails up at Foothills Park. This is close to
24 Costanoan Trail and Los Trancos Trail. I've got a couple of photos. This is a map of the
25 preserve that shows the various closure spots. I apologize; it's rather small. To fit it in
26 and give it context, it had to be. It shows a number of slides and washouts along Los
27 Trancos. It's got a closure of a little under 3 miles. This is the back side of Los Trancos
28 that's closed. The Costanoan Trail, this segment here that's just under a mile was closed
29 in March. It's all the result of this very, very heavy rain we received in this winter. We
30 received 23.5 inches in January and February. That's about what we get in an average
31 year. It was a year's worth of rain in one month. The result was a lot of these typically
32 problematic areas that have minor washouts that are problematic and usually could be
33 maintained without having to reroute or do much. It's just manual work. Sometimes our
34 trail contractor brings in a small piece of—it's heavy equipment, but it's very narrow and
35 can fit on the trails and fix things. This is beyond that scope. I've got a few photos to
36 show. The trail is right up here and the absence of the trail. You can see some of the old
37 header board, that had been part of a probably 1980s installment to support that edge, had
38 completely washed out, all the way down to the creek. This is Los Trancos right along

APPROVED

the creek's edge. This is another section; I think the same washout, the same board. You can just see the soils are so loose there's just no way of cutting back into that without damaging and causing significant impacts to the creek. Some of these photos out of context it's hard to even see where the trail is anymore. This isn't just a bunch of refuse. This is uphill debris that slid down the trail far off screen now. This is the Costanoan section of the trail. This was a bigger landslide in terms of the amount of land that moved, but it's a little more localized. It wasn't on so many numerous spots. It's one significant spot. The trail just slid out. They're unsafe. We closed those trails because it was no longer safe for visitors to hike on them. This is another section. That is on top of what was once trail. The same Costanoan spot. The actions we took is we met with our trail consultant, walked the site with him, got his best opinion on what he thought we should do. His suggestion was "some of this I can repair. Your significant washouts, both the Costanoan and several sections of Los Trancos, your best technique would be rerouting that trail away from the creek onto more stable soils." We also hired a geologist to come out and hike the site with us and get his opinion too. He had the same opinion. In those two areas, unless you're prepared to spend a significant amount of money and very lengthy permitting processes, come out, excavate masses of some soil down to bedrock and rebuild it, you're going to have to reroute. The environmental impact of doing that would be so harmful I don't think we'd ever get permitted. It makes so much more sense to reroute. The next step was to consult with our partners at Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space District. They have 50,000 acres-plus of land that they manage. They're installing new trails and rerouting trails far more frequently than we have, which we haven't done in my tenure with the City. Ask them for their advice, "what do you think we're looking at in terms of permitting, review processes, etc." Their advice was if we're going to do the reroute, because there are sensitive species on Los Trancos—you've got the steelhead potential and on the Costanoan you've got the dusty-footed woodrat—we should hire a consultant and go through the CEQA analysis, which would be the Initial Study and the Mitigated Negative Declaration. That's the next steps for us, to find that consultant, work with our trail contractor to confirm this realignment. He eyeballed one in the field, but now it has to be hiked, measured out and, in consultation with the consultant, work through that CEQA process. That's the next steps. We're going to get bids very shortly and move forward with that one. We'll learn more about what kind of timeframes that consultant says on the permitting. Hopefully, it's not too difficult. That's where we are on that project.

Chair Reckdahl: It sounds like it's going to be many months.

Mr. Anderson: I think so, yeah.

Chair Reckdahl: That's unfortunate. Those are nice trails. Is that it for the Department Report?

Ms. O'Kane: Yes, that's it.

Chair Reckdahl: Sorry. I was waiting for you.

V. BUSINESS:

1. Approval of Draft Minutes from the June 27, 2017 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting.

Approval of the draft June 27, 2017 Minutes was moved by Commissioner LaMere and seconded by Commissioner Cribbs. Passed 4-0, Moss, McDougall, Greenfield abstaining

2. Parks, Trails, Natural Open Space and Recreation Master Plan and Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Chair Reckdahl: We'll move on to Parks, Trails, Open Space, and Recreation Master Plan. We do have one speaker card. Do you want to do a presentation first or the speaker card first? Do you have a presentation to give?

Ms. O'Kane: I'll do the presentation first.

Chair Reckdahl: Generally, we like the presentation first. Sometimes, if it's a skimpy presentation, we move straight to the comments. Kristen, you can take over.

Ms. O'Kane: Kristen O'Kane, Community Services. Tonight we have an action related to the Parks Master Plan. It is specifically a recommendation for the Parks and Rec Commission to recommend that Council approve the Master Plan and adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration, which is the CEQA document that was prepared for the Master Plan. To my right, I have Barbara Beard from MIG with me to provide some information on the public comments that we received during the public review period for the CEQA Initial Study. Before we get into that, I wanted to review one change to the Master Plan that is a result of the May 22nd Council meeting. At that meeting, Council made a motion to request staff to rework a specific policy in the Master Plan. I would like to review those changes, hear Commission feedback on those particular changes. Then, I'll turn it over to Barbara to go into the CEQA comments. At the May 22nd Council meeting, Council made a motion specifically to direct staff to strengthen the language of Programs 6.C.1, 6.C.2, and 6.C.3 to minimize private, exclusive use and, when such uses are allowed, charge significant fees and include specific outreach language. Staff attempted to revise that policy, and also I did receive some comments from the ad hoc that was put together not for the Master Plan but the field use policy ad hoc. I did receive some comments from them. We did some rewording in that policy. I wanted to specifically go over what was added to the programs in response to that Council motion. They're all related really to Program 6.C.1, the new 6.C.1. That is to limit the number of

APPROVED

1 days for private uses to a maximum of 5 consecutive days. That would include event
2 setup and breakdown. The reason that number was chosen was to avoid an event going
3 over a 2-weekend period. Five days would force the event to only be on one weekend or
4 the other or just during the week. The next addition was notice of the private event will
5 be made to the neighboring community and facility users 14 days in advance. We
6 originally had that all private events would have a public meeting associated with it, and
7 then we added "unless they were only 1 day." If it was a 1-day event, we wouldn't
8 require a public meeting. Anything over 1 day, we would include a public meeting in the
9 outreach efforts. We kept the statement that cost recovery including wear and tear on the
10 facility should be 100 percent. Those were the additions that were made to the programs
11 under Policy 6.C. If any Commissioners wanted to ask questions or provide feedback, I
12 could take those now.

13 Chair Reckdahl: Is this the change from what was in the packet?

14 Ms. O'Kane: This is a summary of the changes. The before and after is in the packet.

15 Chair Reckdahl: The current text is the same as in the packet? Do we have comments
16 and questions? Jeff.

17 Commissioner Greenfield: Thank you. I do have some comments. The new policy
18 update is definitely making progress in distinguishing between profit and nonprofit
19 events, closed versus public, and intensity of use. I think that's really what Council was
20 asking for. A primary role of ours as Commissioners is to help develop policies which
21 reflect the spirit of the law and make sure that's consistent with the letter of the law.
22 Actually, the SF Mime Troop is—the issue that came up is a good example of that. I
23 look forward to talking more about that next month. With that said, I think there are
24 some ambiguities remaining that I'd like to highlight. I will be making a motion for some
25 specific changes. First off, under 6.C, I'd like clarification if this policy is intended to
26 apply to the exclusive private use of part of a park or is it exclusive use of a park or an
27 athletic field. I think the answer is it depends on the scope. A larger part of a park
28 should be included as well. If that's the case, then the current verbiage is ambiguous on
29 that. Could staff provide an answer on the intent there?

30 Ms. O'Kane: I think it would apply especially for large parks, for example Rinconada or
31 Mitchell Park. If someone was reserving half of a park for—if they requested half of the
32 park for 2 weeks, this policy would come into play for that as well. We could include
33 that.

34 Commissioner Greenfield: That makes sense to me. What I would suggest then under
35 Policy 6.C, the first line, is a change of "booking an entire park site" to "booking a park
36 site." A "park site" could mean an entire park or a larger part of a park, depending on
37 interpretation. Again, I believe the intent of this policy is to apply to both parks and

APPROVED

1 athletic fields. Under 6.C.1, the first bullet—under the line of 6.C.1, it says "exclusive
2 use of parks or athletic fields," which is what we want. The first bullet says "no
3 exclusive use of parks by private parties." It doesn't include athletic fields. If we omitted
4 "of parks" and just say "exclusive use by private parties," then that would imply parks
5 and athletic fields as stated in the line above that. I do support limiting the private use to
6 5 days as stated in the second bullet point. I think that's a good number. Under the third
7 bullet, I have some concerns about the ambiguities regarding the community message and
8 meeting requirements and the 1-day threshold. Part of it you've clarified. You're asking
9 for noticing to be done for any private event, even if it's less than 1 day. I'm not sure that
10 would be necessary depending on the scope of it. Perhaps we want the same 1-day
11 threshold to apply to both the community messaging and to the community meeting.
12 Regarding the community meeting, clarification on the timing of that needs to be made.
13 The verbiage now doesn't seem to mandate that it be 14 days before the permit is issued.
14 I also think it's important to note that the public meeting should be before the permit is
15 granted. Finally, on that same bullet I'm not clear if the threshold for the private events
16 lasting longer than 1 day applies to events reserved for multiple calendar dates or for
17 more than 24 hours. If someone reserves it from 3:00 p.m. on Wednesday to noon on
18 Thursday, does this trigger this clause, which it should? In which case, maybe we should
19 call this—we can say that this refers to multiple days. Council has requested charging an
20 increased permit rate as noted for private events. Right now, the verbiage is cost
21 recovery should be 100 percent. My question is, is this the most we can charge. Is that
22 why that's stated? Is there some other wording that would apply? It seems to infer that a
23 new rate tier should be added probably for the private event permit as opposed to a field
24 permit. I don't know if that's implicit in the verbiage or we need to call that out. I'm
25 interested in staff's opinion on that.

26 Ms. O'Kane: Related to how much we can charge someone, that's outlined in the
27 Municipal Fee Schedule, which is approved by Council. That would be a separate action
28 by Council to revise the amount we can charge or to add another layer to a special event
29 permit fee, such as a commercial use or some other language like that.

30 Commissioner Greenfield: If I understand your answer correctly, we're probably fine
31 leaving it as it is, and Council can take it up and revise that further when the policy goes
32 to them as desired.

33 Ms. O'Kane: That's correct.

34 Commissioner Greenfield: As far as the need to call out a new rate tier for this, is that
35 implicit in the current verbiage or do we need to add something for that?

36 Ms. O'Kane: You're asking if this policy should include adding another rate category in
37 the Municipal Fee Schedule?

APPROVED

1 Commissioner Greenfield: In the recent event that occurred, one issue was there was no
2 appropriate rate tier for that event permit. That calls out the need to add a rate tier.

3 Ms. O'Kane: I think we could add it here. Whatever motion you make tonight, if you
4 could include that you recommend that there be an additional tier added.

5 Commissioner Greenfield: I do have an updated policy, which I typed out. I can forward
6 it if that's easier than reading this as part of a motion.

7 Chair Reckdahl: I think we have to read it just because it's an action item.

8 Ms. O'Kane: We do.

9 Chair Reckdahl: If this was a discussion item, then that might be better. Let's do a round
10 if other people have comments on top of your comments, then we'll come to a consensus
11 at the end. Any more comments on this?

12 Commissioner McDougall: Beginning with the policy statement, it says "events by
13 outside organizations." I'm not sure what outside organizations implies. Is that
14 organizations that are in Menlo Park or in San Francisco but not in Palo Alto? If
15 organizations are voters apparently, then an organization that's in Palo Alto is really not
16 an outside organization. Even just calling out private organizations would be better.
17 Outside is stigmatizing in a way I don't think we want to do. I agree with many of the
18 other comments that Jeff said. Private users will be limited to 5 consecutive days. Again
19 because of the kind of organization that we're dealing with, I think it would be useful to
20 clarify whether that includes weekends or not. Some of these organizations may say 5
21 consecutive days is Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Monday, Tuesday. It's business days
22 that they're implying. I think we should clarify that weekends are included. The cost
23 recovery item, I would at least want to say that the wear and tear on the facility should be
24 not less than 100 percent. In fact, it could be more than 100 percent under whatever
25 terms we put in. I'd also worry at what point do we define what the wear and tear is.
26 Somebody has a party; somebody spills something noxious. It's not obvious at the end of
27 the party, but 6 weeks later all of the surrounding oaks die. How do we recover that?
28 How do we define that? Is there some sort of mitigation? Is there some sort of deposit?
29 Is there some sort of hold-back on funds? I don't know how you would do that. The
30 whole cost recovery on wear and tear scared me in terms of what you would do. Thank
31 you. I don't know how you want to address any of that in your ...

32 Commissioner Greenfield: The change of outside to private is a good idea, and I would
33 add that and the first comment you made. Regarding the other comments, those could be
34 handled by staff in the policy phase. I'm not sure it's appropriate to include them in the
35 Master Plan policy. I'm interested in staff's opinion on that.

APPROVED

Chair Reckdahl: I had two comments here. One was the full park is not obvious to me. Right now if you look, it says "limit the exclusive use of Palo Alto parks." That to me sounds like an entire park. It should have the same clarification there. Any part of the park that's currently not reservable is considered a private event. The second, I wanted in the cost recovery to put in addition to cost recovery including wear and tear on the facility, we also should be charging a market rate for the opportunity cost. Now, your comments make me think we're not allowed to do that. If the market rate for renting a field in Palo Alto is X number of dollars, we're not allowed to charge that? We have a ceiling on what we can charge?

Ms. O'Kane: We do have a ceiling. In the Muni Fee Schedule, there's a range of what we can charge for a particular rental.

Chair Reckdahl: That's fixed in time or is that ...

Rob de Geus: No. Kristen's right. That's reviewed every year by the full Council. We can amend that. You could include a program here that we look at amending the Municipal Fee Schedule to add a higher rate for this type of activity. We wouldn't say it just like that, but so that we could charge a premium rate if there is an impact to residents.

Chair Reckdahl: We're not forcing you to be excessive. What we want is something representative, market rate. Something that's fair. We're not trying to squeeze people; we don't want to be giving away our assets.

Mr. de Geus: We can add that as a program here.

Chair Reckdahl: Would we put that in that cost recovery bullet or would we put it elsewhere? Should we say "amend the Municipal Fee Schedule to ...

Commissioner McCauley: While Keith thinks about that for just a moment—excuse me. I don't mean to interrupt you.

Chair Reckdahl: Please do.

Commissioner McCauley: Is there anything else that's driving the logic behind the current language on cost recovery? I know in the past there's been at least a suggestion that the City shouldn't be recovering or actually might be limited in recovering more than its costs. Is that what's driving this or is there some other logic behind the current language?

Mr. de Geus: We would have to check with the City Attorney's Office to make sure that we're within the legal bounds. There are circumstances where we can charge more than

APPROVED

1 the costs of a program. I believe this is one area where we can do that. We'll obviously
2 have to verify with the Legal Department before we take it to Council for review.

3 Commissioner McCauley: It's driven a lot of questions amongst this group. I'm not
4 opposed to including it, but I wonder if removing it might be a simpler way to go.
5 Obviously, the City's Fee Schedule is going to apply.

6 Chair Reckdahl: Yeah, that's true.

7 Mr. de Geus: It sounded to me like there was an interest, though, in staff exploring a way
8 to ensure there is a premium fee charged for a private group that uses a significant portion
9 of a park, that has an inconvenience to residents, which we don't have in the Municipal
10 Fee Schedule currently. I think the language could be to explore that and evaluate that
11 and bring it to Council for consideration as a program here. We would then work on that
12 when we go through the budget process and get the Municipal Fee Schedule approved
13 next fiscal year. They could approve that. That gives us the ability to charge that higher
14 fee should something like this come up.

15 Commissioner McCauley: I have no objection or reservation to putting a hook of that
16 sort into the Master Plan. I'm perfectly happy to see that there. I think it's slightly
17 different than the current bullet, which is the cost recovery one.

18 Chair Reckdahl: How about if we add another bullet after that cost recovery that says
19 "amend Municipal Fee Schedule to allow the City to charge market rental rates for park
20 facilities"? Is that ...

21 Commissioner Greenfield: That might be too specific.

22 Commissioner McCauley: I agree.

23 Commissioner Greenfield: Adding the language of charging a premium fee, which is at
24 minimum cost recovery, and then leaving it to Council to further add to that if they so
25 choose to.

26 Commissioner McDougall: I would only argue that it needs to say fee structure as
27 opposed to just fee. I would still be interested in something that says the fee is \$10,000
28 and you have to deposit an increment of \$10,000 that we might give back to you if you
29 don't destroy the park. I'm really worried about the concept of—the wear and tear
30 brought to mind what if they spill something that kills all the oaks. Now, we've got to try
31 and get money out of them as opposed to we already have the money. That bothers me.

32 Chair Reckdahl: How about "amend Municipal Fee Schedule to allow city to increase
33 maximum fee structure for park rentals"?

APPROVED

1 Commissioner Greenfield: I'm not sure that we should be directing Council to amend the
2 fee structure. It might make more sense to indicate what kind of fees we're looking for,
3 and then Council can make amendments as needed to address that.

4 Commissioner McDougall: Do we need to do more than leave this concept with staff?

5 Ms. O'Kane: My only concern is we were looking for a motion tonight that would allow
6 us to go to Council and request that Council adopt the Master Plan. It would be helpful if
7 the Commission could make a motion that included the specific changes and additions
8 that you wanted to this policy.

9 Chair Reckdahl: Normally, I would say that this is something that staff could take care of
10 in the implementation. The Council was pretty clear about what they wanted included in
11 the Master Plan. We have to address this, which you have done. Part of this also is
12 addressing the cost recovery aspect of that. Just because it's a Council directive we have
13 to at least specify our recommendation. We're not directing Council to do something;
14 we're recommending that the Council do something. Would recommended be more
15 palatable?

16 Commissioner Greenfield: I'm not clear how changing a fee structure for something is
17 applicable to be in our Master Plan. It seems like the fee structure is outside the Parks
18 and Rec Master Plan. That's why I'm hesitant to include it as part of this policy.

19 Ms. O'Kane: You could propose language similar to what Rob said, that the program
20 could start with explore. I know the Comprehensive Plan uses that, but it would be
21 explore updates to ...

22 Commissioner McDougall: The Comprehensive Plan is full of explore and consider and
23 whatnot. "Consider appropriate fee structure" as a program in here under the policy
24 would give you the wording that allows us to move ahead but not be so specific that it
25 sounds like we're dictating.

26 Commissioner Greenfield: I can support that.

27 Chair Reckdahl: Do you want both language? What did you say? Consider ...

28 Commissioner McDougall: I would say consider incremental or new or whatever cost
29 recovery fee structures that address the risk of wear and tear on the facility. Something
30 that ...

31 Chair Reckdahl: I don't think it's just wear and tear. I think it's opportunity cost too. If
32 the City can't use this park for a week, how much is that worth to us?

APPROVED

1 Commissioner McCauley: To tweak it slightly—Don, jump in here please—perhaps
2 consider fee structure adjustments that include but are not limited to cost recovery
3 (including wear and tear on facility).

4 Commissioner McDougall: I agree with something like that.

5 Commissioner Greenfield: Should this be part of the same cost recovery bullet or are we
6 first trying to indicate what kind of a rate tier we're looking for and then, separate from
7 that, if changes need to be made to allow for this rate, maybe that's a separate item.

8 Chair Reckdahl: In my mind, there's two bullets. One bullet is that we want to charge
9 the maximum we can or the maximum that's appropriate. The second is we should revise
10 or at least revisit the maximum that's set by the fee structure and see if that's appropriate.

11 Ms. O'Kane: Chair, did you want to include in that last new bullet reference to market
12 rates?

13 Chair Reckdahl: That's what my initial feeling was, but I don't think we should
14 necessarily dictate that. We could say premium charge or increase the fee structure. I
15 don't think it necessarily has to be market rate. That's what's driving it. If we're going to
16 rent out the facilities, we should be charging market rate, particularly if it's a for-profit
17 entity.

18 Ms. O'Kane: I just wanted to make sure that piece wasn't lost, but that sounds ...

19 Chair Reckdahl: I'm not wedded to market rate, but that's what's driving this desire. Go
20 ahead, David.

21 Vice Chair Moss: When I think of the Palantir event, they gave \$50,000 to the City, and
22 they gave \$10,000 to two different soccer clubs. They may have done that out of the
23 goodness of their heart, but in the future they may not. If they displace users, there has to
24 be a significant price. How do we make it so that what they pay is the least that they can
25 do? When you talk about market rate, I like the idea of a premium. I want you to have
26 the ability to charge a whole lot of money, and I don't know how to word it. If you just
27 leave this, Palantir can demand that we give them a public space for their use every year
28 for 5 days for very little money. I don't want that to happen. I don't know how we can
29 protect ourselves from—can they demand that we give them that public space?

30 Mr. de Geus: They can't demand that we give them public space. One thought I had here
31 is just an extra bullet that says "explore establishing premium deposits and fees for such
32 use," which relates to the language above. That gives us enough room to try and think
33 this through, about what kind of fee structure. Maybe it's a significant deposit if there is
34 risk to trees or other assets in the area. We can discuss that through the year with the

APPROVED

Commission and have it be a part of the budget process as we update the Municipal Fee Schedule. That would be fairly simply. "Explore establishing premium deposit and fees for such use" seems to capture it. It'd put it out there as something to consider.

Vice Chair Moss: Do we have to—if they say, "Sure, we'll give you the money," do we have to give it to them? Do we have to give them the public space? The reason you're notifying the neighborhood—do they have any say in this?

Mr. de Geus; Ultimately, it's the City that has to issue the permit. We're evaluating the impacts to residents and the community. If we think it's not in the best interest of residents, then we won't issue the permit.

Chair Reckdahl: What do you think of Rob's text? I'm happy with that if other people are.

Commissioner McDougall: I don't like premium as opposed to alternative or something that doesn't start off with an argument.

Chair Reckdahl: Premium is a loaded word. Can you think of a better one?

Commissioner McDougall: I would have used alternative.

Chair Reckdahl: Or increased?

Commissioner McCauley: I don't mean to be too lawyerly, but I agree with Don. If that actually is a concern, I'm not sure that it is really. If it is one, then I think you want to be more ambiguous.

Chair Reckdahl: I guess we're saying we want the ability to charge a different rate, and that's all we're saying.

Commissioner McDougall: If It's a private organization that's a nonprofit, there may be a—if it's the San Francisco Mimes.

Chair Reckdahl: This only applies to private rentals. This is ...

Commissioner Greenfield: Private, multiday rental.

Chair Reckdahl: We're saying explore, so I would say increased or larger. We're not saying that we must explore whether we want to charge more for private people. We certainly would not charge less for a private corporation compared to a nonprofit.

Commissioner McDougall: So let's use incremental.

APPROVED

1 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, incremental or alternative. It does work. Obviously, this is
2 something that Council would approve, so we wouldn't be going forward with something
3 that's less. I think it works, incremental or alternative.

4 Chair Reckdahl: What's the distinction between incremental and increased? Incremental
5 to me is taking steps as opposed to we just want to say it's larger. Do you have a problem
6 with increased or larger?

7 Commissioner Greenfield: I like incremental.

8 Chair Reckdahl: You like incremental?

9 Commissioner McCauley: That's certainly fine by me.

10 Chair Reckdahl: We'll go with incremental then.

11 Commissioner McDougall: Rob, did your wording—what was the rest of your wording?

12 Mr. de Geus: Explore establishing incremental fees for such use.

13 Chair Reckdahl: Deposits and fees.

14 Mr. de Geus: Deposits and fees. Sorry (inaudible).

15 Commissioner McDougall: That's what I wanted to make sure, the idea that there's fees
16 and deposits.

17 Chair Reckdahl: Let's roll this up. That's one extra bullet that we are adding after the
18 cost recovery bullet. Jeff, do you want to outline yours in terms of a motion?

19 Commissioner Greenfield: Sure. The one area that I'm not clear on is a comment that
20 you made regarding the parks or part of parks. My question is if our first line is saying
21 limit the exclusive use of Palo Alto parks (booking a park site or recreation facility for
22 events by private organizations that are closed to the general public), is that sufficient to
23 include parks and parts of parks?

24 Chair Reckdahl: I was saying "or part thereof" I would add.

25 Commissioner Greenfield: Where would you add that?

26 Chair Reckdahl: Where it says "booking an entire park site or recreation facility or part
27 thereof."

28 Commissioner McCauley: Let me ask for staff's opinion again. There is a distinction
29 between renting an entire park and renting a quarter of it or renting a picnic area within a

APPROVED

1 park for 3 days for perhaps a company meeting of 50 employees for a 3-day period or
2 something like that. The impact to the community is much lower, so then the question
3 would be do you think it's actually necessary to have the same requirements for that sort
4 of thing. Maybe there's a simple tweak which is just to say a significant portion of a park
5 or something like that.

6 Chair Reckdahl: I wouldn't mind that, "a significant portion."

7 Commissioner Greenfield: So booking a park site, recreation facility, or significant part
8 thereof?

9 Chair Reckdahl: How about in 6.C we just get rid of the word entire? When we go to
10 6.C.1, we specify.

11 Commissioner Greenfield: I already was getting rid of "an entire."

12 Chair Reckdahl: In 6.C?

13 Commissioner Greenfield: Right.

14 Chair Reckdahl: Read what you have, and I'll tell you if I'm happy or not.

15 Commissioner Greenfield: Limit the exclusive use of Palo Alto parks (booking a park
16 site, recreation facility, or significant portion thereof) or wordsmith that last bit if you
17 want.

18 Chair Reckdahl: I'm happy with that.

19 Commissioner Greenfield: For events by private organizations that are closed to the
20 general public.

21 Chair Reckdahl: 6.C.1 you wanted ...

22 Commissioner Greenfield: 6.C.1 does not change.

23 Chair Reckdahl: In this text that you have on the screen, you use the term private use,
24 which I like better than exclusive use. 6.C.1, do you want to start that with private use or
25 are we losing something by ...

26 Commissioner Greenfield: I guess it gets down to the question of does exclusive infer it
27 has to be all of a park or not. Since in 6.C we've stated that it can include a significant
28 portion of a park, I think we're covered. 6.C.1, exclusive use means exclusive use of
29 parks as we've defined it above.

Commissioner McCauley: I take it to mean essentially private events that are closed to the general public. That's my view as an exclusive use.

Chair Reckdahl: In 6.C.1, can that first line, the whole first line, be deleted and just replaced with "private events that are"? Do we lose anything by making that simplification?

Commissioner McCauley: Saying exclusive private events as opposed to—there might be many private events that don't actually exclude the community (crosstalk).

Chair Reckdahl: The next line says "closed to the general public."

Commissioner McCauley: Do you mean in 6.C.2?

Commissioner Greenfield: 6.C.1.

Chair Reckdahl: 6.C.1. The second line says "closed to the general public."

Commissioner Greenfield: I guess I'm interested in staff's opinion, but I think 6.C.1 works as written.

Ms. O'Kane: Including the bullets or ...

Commissioner Greenfield: Just 6.C.1 not including the bullets.

Chair Reckdahl: I think it's wordier than it has to be, but I don't object to it. 6.C.1 stays as is. Now, next bullet.

Commissioner Greenfield: First bullet, just crossing out "of parks," so it says "no exclusive use by private parties," etc. Do you want me to read the whole thing?

Chair Reckdahl: No. The first line we're just removing "of parks."

Commissioner Greenfield: That's right. No changes to bullet 2. Bullet 3 is replaced with "for any multiday private event including setup and breakdown, notice of the private event will be made to the neighboring community and facility users a minimum of 14 days in advance. In addition, at least one public meeting will be held a minimum of 14 days in advance and prior to a permit being issued." Comments?

Chair Reckdahl: Do you have a comment on that or is that ...

Ms. O'Kane: No. We just didn't get all of that. Could you repeat it?

Commissioner Greenfield: I would be happy to repeat it.

1 Ms. O'Kane: Thank you.

2 Commissioner Greenfield: Maybe I can even get it all out in one effort too. For any
3 multiday, private event including setup and breakdown, notice of the private event will be
4 made to the neighboring community ...

5 Chair Reckdahl: Made to the neighboring community you said?

6 Commissioner Greenfield: "Will be made to the neighboring community and facility
7 users a minimum of 14 days in advance."

8 Chair Reckdahl: Wasn't there something about a permit?

9 Commissioner Greenfield: "In addition, at least one public meeting ...

10 Ms. O'Kane: Could you repeat that last part please?

11 Commissioner Greenfield: Sure. The second sentence: "In addition, at least one public
12 meeting will be held a minimum of 14 days in advance and prior to the permit being
13 issued."

14 Commissioner McDougall: While you're on that point, I don't mean to be picky, but
15 don't you run the risk of sending out a notice and holding the meeting on the same night
16 because they're both 14 days?

17 Commissioner Greenfield: I'm open to suggestions from staff.

18 Commissioner McCauley: May I ask in terms of—so long as the permit is issued after
19 the public has an opportunity to provide feedback, does the 14-day timing for the meeting
20 really matter? My interest is just to provide the most flexibility to staff. I realize that
21 some of these things might at times be on slightly shorter notice. Fourteen days to me
22 seems sufficient giving the neighbors notice. If there's an opportunity to have neighbors
23 give that feedback to the City before the permit is actually issued, I think that
24 accomplishes the ...

25 Commissioner Greenfield: I'm open to any tweaking of the numbers. I was just trying to
26 remain consistent with the policy as written by staff. Any change in numbers that people
27 would like to suggest I could be quite amenable to.

28 Ms. O'Kane: Typically I think just as practices when you notice something for public
29 review or public notice, you then wait a period before you have your public meeting so
30 people can digest whatever the topic is and also be made aware instead of doing it on the
31 same day.

1 Chair Reckdahl: (inaudible) the numbers should not be equal. I'll either say make one 21
2 and 14 or 14 and 7 or something.

3 Commissioner Greenfield: Do we need a notice to call the meeting and then another
4 notice if the permit is issued?

5 Chair Reckdahl: I think that's excessive. What's staff's thought on the timing? Is 21
6 days advance notice excessive?

7 Mr. de Geus: I don't know if it's excessive. I think it's unlikely we're going to ever have
8 a private event in our park. I can tell you that. I wonder whether that's—there are
9 unintended consequences.

10 Commissioner McCauley: I agree that this is putting quite a few hurdles in the process.
11 That is appropriate at some level, but at some level it might be appropriate to allow some
12 private events in parks. Actually as we saw from the Palantir example, that generated a
13 large amount of money for the City and some charitable donations to the effected user
14 groups who, I think at the end of the day based on what you reported, were actually
15 happy with the way things had worked out. I think there can be win-win situations, but I
16 agree we shouldn't in these aspirational statements that go into the Master Plan make it so
17 difficult as to discourage any private use.

18 Chair Reckdahl: How about if we move the public meeting a minimal 7 days in advance?
19 Most of these things are planned months in advance.

20 Commissioner McDougall: How about we put the wording in "allow for public input"?
21 It really doesn't have to be a public meeting. It could be an online survey or something.
22 That might be a lot easier and that there be flexibility as to whether there's a meeting.

23 Mr. de Geus: Personally, I think that's better.

24 Commissioner Greenfield: Suggestions for an amendment here?

25 Commissioner McDougall: I would put "notice be made to the neighboring community
26 and facility users 14 days in advance. In addition, vehicles for public input should be
27 considered" or something like that. In fact, why not just say "facility users, a minimum
28 of 14 days in advance allowing for public input"?

29 Commissioner Greenfield: Prior to a permit being issued?

30 Commissioner McDougall: Yeah. That's by definition. That's fine.

31 Commissioner Greenfield: Let me read the bullet as I understand it. "For any multiday,
32 private event including setup and breakdown, notice of the private event will be made to

1 the neighboring community and facility users a minimum of 14 days in advance, allowing
2 for public input prior to a permit being issued."

3 Chair Reckdahl: That works for me.

4 Commissioner Greenfield: I'm not clear exactly where you want to go on the cost
5 recovery bullet and the additional bullet. If you want to propose something, I'm happy
6 with that.

7 Chair Reckdahl: My only concern is the 100 percent. 100 percent of what? It's not
8 obvious. Can we say "100 percent of the maximum"?

9 Commissioner McDougall: I'm asking staff is there any reason why we can't say wear
10 and tear on the facilities should be no less than 100 percent?

11 Ms. O'Kane: I think that would be fine.

12 Commissioner McDougall: That statement would be okay with the "no less than." The
13 cleverly articulated Rob de Geus statement would be the final one.

14 Commissioner Greenfield: Do we need to include wear and tear on the facility when
15 we're talking about cost recovery? Can we just say "cost recovery should be 100
16 percent"? It seems that by including wear and tear on facility we're highlighting that and
17 emphasizing that in contrast to many other factors that constitute cost recovery.

18 Commissioner McDougall: To me those are the signal words that allow us and people in
19 the future reading this to worry about wear and tear. As opposed to simply saying the
20 rate table says \$1 an hour, so they paid \$1 an hour, but they destroyed the place. This
21 allows us to recover the wear and tear. I think it's important to have it there.

22 Commissioner Greenfield: Does that emphasize it over the opportunity cost that was
23 suggested?

24 Commissioner McDougall: We were adding another statement.

25 Mr. de Geus: Which I had as "explore establishing incremental deposits and fees."

26 Chair Reckdahl: For such use.

27 Mr. de Geus: I had for such use. I don't know if it's necessary because the other bullets
28 don't have that. We could add that.

29 Commissioner McDougall: For a Master Plan, I think that's a good statement that gives
30 us the policy, the program that we should be incrementally recovering costs.

APPROVED

Commissioner Greenfield: Should we include that as a single bullet then? "Cost recovery including wear and tear on the facility should be no less than 100 percent." Then, a separate bullet. The next sentence, explore establishing incremental fees and deposits or deposits and fees.

Chair Reckdahl: Kristen, do you have a handle on all the changes?

Ms. O'Kane: We do.

Chair Reckdahl: Is there anything more on that? You want to make a motion?

MOTION

Commissioner Greenfield: I'd like to make a motion to revise Policy 6.C in the final draft Master Plan as we've just outlined.

Commissioner McDougall: I would second that.

Chair Reckdahl: Any discussion or ...

Commissioner McDougall: Do we need to make it clear that we're amending Policy 6.C including the—are the bullets in this programs or are they just bullets?

Ms. O'Kane: 6.C is the policy, and then C.1, C.2, and C.3 are programs. Any bullet that's under like C.2 is included in that program.

Commissioner McDougall: We would need to say Policy 6.C and Program 6.C.1 to be clear, wouldn't we? Isn't that what we just did?

Ms. O'Kane: Correct. You could say "policy and its programs."

Commissioner Greenfield: So moved.

Commissioner McDougall: So second.

Chair Reckdahl: All in favor. It passes unanimously. That was quite the sideline. Back to the presentation. Do you have more?

The Motion carried unanimously.

Female: (inaudible)

Mr. de Geus: Yeah, I think we might have missed a step there. We didn't fully finish the presentation. After the presentation, you were going to go to the public. It would be appropriate to do that.

1 Chair Reckdahl: We will have that motion on hold, finish the presentation, public input,
2 and then we'll revisit that motion.

3 Ms. O'Kane: Thank you for that clarification. Now, I'm going to turn it over to Barbara
4 Beard, who has been waiting patiently for her turn to discuss the public comments that
5 were received during the CEQA public review period.

6 Barbara Beard: Good evening, Commissioners. As you know, the Initial Study and
7 Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Parks and Rec Master Plan was circulated for
8 public review from May 8th to June 6th. The Commission held a public hearing on May
9 23rd to receive public comment. There was no public comment received at the hearing,
10 but the City did receive five comment letters. Those comment letters were provided in
11 your packet tonight. There was a letter from Caltrans, three letters from Santa Clara
12 County Departments, and one letter from the Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society. Each
13 comment letter is numbered, and the comments within each letter is also numbered so
14 that we can track the responses and provide documentation as to how each comment was
15 responded to. We worked with City staff to come up with the responses for each
16 comment and prepared written documentation that's going to be part of the CEQA
17 administrative record that Planning Department will have. This also includes text edits to
18 the Initial Study that are in response to the comments received. Per the City Planning
19 Department's normal procedure for Initial Studies, we prepared a final Initial Study and
20 Mitigated Negative Declaration that shows text changes in red with strikeout and
21 underline. This document will be posted on the City's webpage for the project and will
22 be presented at the City Council hearing. The text changes, I can summarize them very
23 briefly. In response to the Caltrans letter, there was text added to the traffic section that
24 was going to talk about the City's need to prepare a traffic control plan if construction of
25 a park project were going to affect traffic or circulation on a Caltrans facility. In
26 response to Santa Clara County Parks Department's comment, the legend for figure 4 in
27 the Initial Study, which also is a figure in the Master Plan, was changed to indicate
28 designated Countywide trails. That was the comment the County Parks people were
29 hoping would be made. The County Environmental Health Department raised concerns
30 about historic soil contamination and the potential exposure of workers in the public to
31 future park projects that may disturb subsurface soil. Do you have a question?

32 Commissioner McDougall: Excuse me. Can I just ask a question?

33 Ms. Beard: Yes.

34 Commissioner McDougall: In the package, you did a very nice job of providing us with
35 the letters. As you pointed out, the letter, for example, from the County was divided into
36 B1, B2 and B3. In the package, you only talk about B2 and E1 and E2, I guess, or
37 whatever. Now, you're talking about some of the others. Is that right?

1 Ms. O'Kane: The difference is what Barbara is referring to is changes made in the Initial
2 Study document. The changes that are called out in the staff report are changes that were
3 made to the Master Plan document itself. That's the difference.

4 Commissioner McDougall: For example, if I'm looking at A6 or whatever, sea level rise,
5 that's in the document from the Department of Transport. You acknowledge their
6 interest, but you didn't change anything in the document. That's why it's not called out
7 here.

8 Ms. Beard: Correct.

9 Commissioner McDougall: Every one of these organizations would have received a
10 letter back saying, "Thank you for your input. Here's what we did about A1, A2, A3."

11 Ms. Beard: The way the Planning Department responds to public comment for Initial
12 Studies is they come up with the City's responses. The CEQA Guidelines do not require
13 notification to the commenter of what those responses are. The text changes will be
14 available to the public via the webpage. When the City Council has the document in their
15 packet, it will be part of the public record. The Planning Department also has our written
16 responses for each specific comment, and they're going to keep that as part of the
17 administrative record. If you wanted to find out how the City was responding to the sea
18 level rise question from Caltrans, the document that the Planning Department has would
19 indicate that its comment is noted and that should a park project be located in an area
20 where there is going to be projected sea level rise, the planning of that project would
21 incorporate the current guidelines for sea level rise projections. There's no necessary
22 changes to the Initial Study text based on that comment, using that as an example. Many
23 of the Caltrans comments didn't require text changes to the Initial Study. They were "you
24 have to contact us if you work in our State right-of-way. You need your easements. You
25 need to prepare traffic control plans. You would have to conduct whatever studies are
26 necessary for hazardous materials." Very routine kinds of comments. None of them
27 requiring text changes. Is that a sufficient answer to your question?

28 Commissioner McDougall: Yes, I understand what you said. I'm not sure that in all
29 cases not responding to the submitter of the letter, "Thank you for your letter. Here's our
30 response." By not responding, I'm not sure how polite that was I guess is my ... "Thank
31 you for your input. We're not going to do anything about it," would have been a useful
32 response.

33 Ms. Beard: Our approach to this has been guided by input from the Planning Department
34 and also the requirements of the CEQA Guidelines. CEQA Guidelines don't require
35 written responses to commenters for an Initial Study. Planning Department's normal
36 procedures are not to respond directly to them.

1 Commissioner McDougall: Thank you.

2 Vice Chair Moss: I want to make a comment. We are providing input to staff, but it's
3 staff's responsibility to respond when necessary. We don't have to respond to everything
4 that is in that CEQA note unless you find something that doesn't agree with our Plan. We
5 have to trust staff to provide the input to the different departments as necessary. We
6 shouldn't have to respond to all of this.

7 Commissioner McDougall: I'm not expecting that we would respond. That wasn't my
8 point at all. Thank you.

9 Ms. Beard: Sure.

10 Chair Reckdahl: Let's move on.

11 Ms. Beard: We were picking up where we were talking about where the text edits from
12 the Initial Study are coming from, where they were made. We did respond to all the
13 County Department comments by adding text to the Initial Study. We revised the legend
14 to reflect Countywide trails. We added text to reflect the County Department of
15 Environmental Health's concerns about historic contamination of subsurface soils. Their
16 primary concern was historic ag uses. This would be long ago because the City has
17 obviously owned and operated its current parkland for quite a long time. We responded
18 by inserting text that discusses the City's normal procedures for following existing
19 regulations when you undertake a new project where there is going to be soil disturbance.
20 You follow a certain set of procedures to identify whether you need to do a Phase I
21 report, environmental assessment report, or any other subsequent soil analysis prior to the
22 soil disturbance. If you're going to do a CEQA process for that project, that would fall
23 under the CEQA process for a specific project. We added text describing the City's
24 normal procedures to address the comments of the County Environmental Health
25 Department. The letter from the Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society, we made text
26 changes to mitigation measure bio 2, which discusses preconstruction surveys for nesting
27 birds. We added text to indicate that surveys should be done—excuse me. I'm backing
28 up a little bit. To clarify the definition of an active nest, which includes a nest where
29 fledglings are still using it or where they're being fed in the nest or its immediate vicinity.
30 That would come into play if a park project was beginning—prior to its construction, a
31 nesting bird survey is required by California Department of Fish and Wildlife regulations.
32 This definition of an active nest would tell the field biologist when it would be safe to
33 allow construction if the nest was present. We also added language to Master Plan Policy
34 4.A in response to the comments regarding impacts to park resources from increased
35 access and from potentially allowing dogs on any new trails and open space preserve.
36 This sentence that was added to Master Plan Policy 4.A indicates that the protection of
37 biological resources should be the priority in open space preserves. That might have
38 been part of Kristen's presentation and text in your packet. That sentence was added both

APPROVED

1 in the Initial Study and in the Master Plan. Finally, City Planning staff made edits to the
2 draft Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Plan that was Appendix A of the Initial
3 Study. Those edits focused on clarifying the responsibility for implementation and
4 oversight of the mitigation measures themselves. The changes would be indicated in the
5 final Initial Study with red strikeout and underline, but you have the Mitigation
6 Monitoring and Reporting Plan in your packet tonight, which is the final language. The
7 changes are not indicated in strikeout or underline text. That was the sum total of the
8 City's responses to the public comment and is the final step in preparing for the action
9 that the City would like to take on the CEQA document.

10 Ms. O'Kane: I would like to point out two other changes that were made to the Master
11 Plan in response to public comments on the CEQA document. Those were in your packet
12 and are also projected on the screen. One was the reference to the Countywide trails
13 plan. Another one was a reference to the City Charter, Article VIII, which defines parks
14 and their limitations. The one that Barbara mentioned regarding protecting open space
15 preserves from visitor impacts. I'm just going to quickly go over next steps. Tonight, the
16 recommendation to the Commission is for the Commission to recommend that Council
17 adopt the Master Plan and also the Mitigated Negative Declaration. We are planning on
18 going to Council on September 5th with that, and your recommendation will be included
19 in our staff report to Council. We will be asking Council to adopt the Master Plan and
20 the CEQA document on that date. Just from a procedural standpoint, the final Notice of
21 Determination for CEQA needs to be filed within 5 days from the date that Council
22 adopts the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

23 Chair Reckdahl: Tight schedule. Let's go to public comments, and then we will have
24 Commission comments, and then we'll go to the vote. Shani Kleinhaus.

25 Shani Kleinhaus: Thank you. Shani Kleinhaus with Santa Clara Valley Audubon
26 Society. I'm also a resident of Palo Alto. One thing about process, CEQA does not
27 require that staff respond to comment letters, but many municipalities do. San Jose, for
28 example, any letter that we send them for any—whether it's a Negative Declaration,
29 Mitigated Negative Declaration, we'll get to see the changes that they make. It's only
30 right to do that because it's very difficult for me to try and trace all of this when I don't
31 have it well in advance. Especially today, all of that should be available already for the
32 public to review. When you say all of that will be before the City Council, it has to be
33 now. That's what we're responding to. I think this is a big misstep here from my
34 perspective. Some of the other projects that we comment on do engage us. I was on the
35 stakeholder group too, so I'm very familiar with the Plan. If I have comments on this, I
36 expect the respect of responding. I appreciate changing the mitigation bio 2 on nesting. I
37 do want to say that the theme of we care about nature was so strong throughout the
38 process. At least half, if not more, of the people said, "We care about nature." This was
39 translated in the MND to five categories, relax and enjoy the outdoors. That was not

APPROVED

what people said. They said the words nature, wildlife, I want to see frogs, I care about those animals whether I see them or not. People want to know that our nature is protected even if they don't have access. They do want access, but this is why I suggested another bullet on that, which was another need, conservation, restoration, enhancement of nature and wildlife habitat and providing access to nature. It's not in the MND. We have five other things. The only one that kind of hints at nature is this relax and enjoy the outdoors. I don't think it's the same thing. It's not to me, and it wasn't to a lot of the people who participated in public meetings, comments online, several surveys, intercept events, etc. I expect to see something about nature here. You can consolidate the two, but it needs to be there. The riparian corridor, I don't know why Palo Alto looks only at top of the bank and not at the edge of the canopy. All the other cities look at whichever is greater. It's either at the driplines, which means if you have trees along the creek, we look at the dripline of the creek. We measure 100 feet from there. In Palo Alto for some reason, we're only looking at the top of the bank, which is where the bank flattens out. It's a lot narrower. I think we should look at other cities in that respect and go to dripline instead of the 100 feet from the top of the bank. Where you have active recreation, like a lot of lights in a sports field or something like that, go 200 feet like San Jose does. They did a lot of study on that. If we can get the same protections for Palo Alto creeks, a lot of them are concrete, and it won't help a lot but maybe some. One other thing. In the new mitigation on visitor use, that's great but I would talk about activity too, not just use, use and activity. I think use is a lot more general, but activity would be important to have there. It's hard for me because I don't have it in front of me. If I had the response, it would be easier to provide some language. Thank you for a long process. I hope one of you will make a motion to include the nature, the need of conservation, restoration, enhancement, etc., into the document. I think you should move it forward; although, I would have preferred to not be on the spot like this. Thank you.

Chair Reckdahl: One comment I have is we have a whole Goal 4 that talks about protect natural habitat, integrate nature, natural ecosystems and ecological principles throughout Palo Alto. Overall, this is a very big document. Overall, we've done a very good job. There's going to be some omissions that the wordsmithing isn't going to be perfect for everybody. Overall, I think we've addressed all the issues. Comments, does anyone have any comments before we move on to making the motion? Let's clean this up. Let's do the motion that Jeff had just before. Do you want to re-move to have your motion? You don't have to read the whole thing. Just say "as read before."

MOTION

Commissioner Greenfield: I'm looking for it. I'd like to move to modify Policy 6.C and Program 6.C.1 as previously specified with one minor change on the last line. I'd clean that up a little bit to "cost recovery including wear and tear on facilities should be no less than 100 percent. Explore establishing an incremental fee and deposit structure."

1 Chair Reckdahl: I'm happy with that. Do we have a second.

2 Commissioner McDougall: I'll second, but I thought we had those as two separate
3 statements.

4 Commissioner Greenfield: My understanding is at the end we combined them into a
5 single bullet.

6 Commissioner McDougall: Does staff have an opinion? If everybody's in agreement, I'll
7 second the motion.

8 Chair Reckdahl: In my mind, it's two separate issues.

9 Commissioner Greenfield: I don't have strong feelings about it.

10 Commissioner McDougall: I thought it was two separate issues. It was cost recovery
11 and then incremental.

12 Mr. de Geus: That's correct. It was two separate bullets.

13 Commissioner McDougall: I thought it was two separate items.

14 Commissioner Greenfield: My misunderstanding. Let's make it two separate bullets.

15 Chair Reckdahl: Two separate bullets then.

16 Commissioner McDougall: I'll second the motion as amended.

17 Chair Reckdahl: Any discussion? All in favor. Opposed. Now, Master Plan comments,
18 questions. Anne, do you have anything?

19 **The motion carried unanimously.**

20 Commissioner Cribbs: Just a question. What do you expect when you go to Council on
21 the 5th? It is the day after Labor Day.

22 Ms. O'Kane: That's correct; it is on a Tuesday. I expect—Rob, maybe you can chime in
23 after me—there will be discussion on Policy 6.C as amended. One of the other
24 comments that we heard from the Mayor was he would like in the staff report some detail
25 as to how we developed the list of high priority projects and programs. We're crafting
26 that language, and I expect there to be some discussion on that as well. I'm hopeful that
27 they will adopt the Master Plan. Whether they do that without a motion to tweak some
28 language, I'm not sure. I'm hopeful that the Master Plan would be adopted at that time.

APPROVED

Commissioner Cribbs: Will we have any opportunity to review the staff report before it goes to the Council? Maybe it's not appropriate; maybe it's not necessary. It just feels like we've been all working on this for such a long time. I know you're anxious to get it done. We're all anxious to get it done.

Mr. de Geus: We wouldn't typically have the Commission review a staff report necessarily to Council. There is another meeting in August, but we're working on that staff report.

Chair Reckdahl: Isn't the deadline for submission before the ...

Mr. de Geus: It gets made public 10 days before the meeting. To answer this question specifically, we wouldn't bring a staff report that staff is writing for Council for the full Commission to review.

Commissioner Cribbs: I understand that. The tone of it or –I don't know. Maybe it's not appropriate. I just would like to know in advance maybe something about what you're thinking.

Mr. de Geus: We certainly can report on that and give you an outline of what we're planning. Sometimes actually it's helpful, with the presentation in particular, to do a dry run with the Commission. It's good feedback for us.

Chair Reckdahl: David, did you have any comments? Don, did you have comments?

MOTION

Commissioner McDougall: My experience in the Comprehensive Plan is it was, number one, wordy of course. Number two, the repeating things in various places was sometimes important. I'd like to support and actually make a motion that we add in 2.9.4 the statement that Shani has recommended in what is labeled as E2, which is conservation, restoration, and enhancement of nature and wildlife habitat and providing access to nature. That would be the first part of the motion. The second part of the motion or we can make it two motions—I do happen to believe that as a minimum we should at least expand the riparian corridor to 100 feet from the dripline as opposed to the bank and even 200 feet per active recreation area. Basically, in the mitigation measure add that, from the dripline as opposed to from the bank.

Commissioner Greenfield: I would second the motion.

Chair Reckdahl: You're modifying the Master Plan or are you modifying the ...

Commissioner McDougall: I'm suggesting modification to the Master Plan. I'm suggesting modifications to the modifications that we've been presented with here. I'm

1 not going back to the original. What they've shown us tonight is a response to the input.
2 I'm asking that we further consider that input in the way I've suggested.

3 Chair Reckdahl: Can you repeat what you said?

4 Commissioner McDougall: Staff has a comment, I think.

5 Ms. Beard: I'm ready to respond in a very general sense just for your consideration. The
6 Initial Study exactly summarized what the needs and desired activities were as presented
7 in the Master Plan. The language of the project description in the Initial Study exactly
8 matches the language in the Master Plan. Any potential changes to the Initial Study text
9 related to a need would have to be made in the Master Plan. It's not just in the Initial
10 Study. The project description of the Initial Study is presenting Master Plan language. If
11 that makes sense. The whole needs section of the Master Plan is a very focused section.
12 If you read that carefully, the language that's suggested in Comment E2 might need to be
13 tweaked a little bit. We had a staff conference call about this particular comment and
14 whether to add it or not. At the time, there was thoughts that some of the language was
15 not necessarily reflecting a need but also touching upon management because its calling
16 for restoration and enhancement. Those are also management activities. The concept of
17 the comment may be worth pursuing, but the language might need to be considered
18 carefully so it fits that section well.

19 Commissioner McDougall: So it fits the needs section?

20 Ms. Beard: Yes.

21 Commissioner McDougall: Do you have a suggestion?

22 Ms. Beard: Not at the moment. Since I'm focusing on the Initial Study and the whole
23 Master Plan team has been working on this for years, I would defer to the Master
24 Planning team. My comment also regarding the riparian corridor definition, the Initial
25 Study uses the definition coming out of the Comprehensive Plan process. The draft EIR
26 for the Comprehensive Plan provided us a lot of language that we could use in this
27 document. This document uses the definition of riparian corridor, etc., that's in the
28 Comprehensive Plan.

29 Commissioner McDougall: Can I ask which Comprehensive Plan you're referring to?

30 Ms. Beard: The update, the Draft EIR.

31 Commissioner McDougall: The newest draft?

32 Ms. Beard: That's not yet adopted.

APPROVED

Commissioner McDougall: There was a great deal of conversation in that. I think, in fact, within the Comprehensive Plan Committee, the momentum was in the direction of much, much larger offsets relative to riparian corridors. I think this is going back to the wording that was in the 1986 Comprehensive Plan, aren't we?

Ms. Beard: The language that's used in the biology section to define riparian corridor—you're correct—is from the current Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner McDougall: It's not from what I think is in the draft or was certainly intended to be in the draft. I think in the draft it's much more aggressive.

Ms. Beard: The reasoning for that came from the Planning Department, which said that current CEQA documents aren't allowed to use the draft language as adopted policy yet, until the new Comprehensive Plan becomes adopted.

Commissioner McDougall: We could put in the Master Plan that the riparian corridor should be as defined in the Palo Alto current Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Beard: We could.

Commissioner McDougall: Assuming the current Comprehensive Plan addresses what I'm talking about. If it doesn't, too bad I lose. If it does, we get what's appropriate as opposed to the old one.

Ms. Beard: We could make that change, yes.

Commissioner McDougall: That would be my recommendation. Relative to the first one, the need, it says conservation and restoration and enhancement. If we change that too conserve, restore, and enhance natural wildlife habitat, is that not rewording it as a need?

Ms. Beard: I'm trying to find the needs section in the Master Plan.

Mr. de Geus: Commissioner, did you have a page number that you were looking at on the Master Plan?

Commissioner McDougall: I don't. I would ask if Ms. Kleinhaus has a page number that she would refer us to. I don't.

Vice Chair Moss: Page 11.

Chair Reckdahl: My page 11 doesn't have it.

Commissioner McCauley: That's not it.

1 Ms. Beard: I believe it's page 30 of the Master Plan, starting with relax and enjoy
2 outdoors play for children, throw a ball, exercise and fitness, and gathering. Those are
3 the needs identified in the Master Plan that were brought into the Initial Study.

4 Commissioner McDougall: Why can't we just simply say access to nature is a need?

5 Ms. Beard: I defer to staff.

6 Commissioner McDougall: That wasn't in your list, was it? Why can't we add access to
7 nature as an additional need? I agree certainly all our experience with the
8 Comprehensive Plan and everything else was nature was a big deal. I think it's a big deal
9 that it's been much more sensitive today than it was 15 years ago.

10 Ms. O'Kane: There is language on page 34 of the Master Plan that says additional
11 geographic analysis evaluated access to experiences. These include the experience and
12 preservation of nature.

13 Vice Chair Moss: That was going to be my comment. The comment that Shani made is
14 many, many places in the Master Plan, and many programs and many policies. I don't
15 think you have to make the change here because it's many other places. I'm worried that
16 we are changing the Master Plan that we have spent months hashing and rehashing at this
17 very last minute. I would rather see us adopt the Master Plan the way it is right this
18 minute after months and months and months of hashing and rehashing than to nitpick
19 individual pieces at this very late date.

20 Commissioner McDougall: I'll accept that argument relative to the need, but relative to
21 the riparian corridor, I'd sure like it to have wording that was relative to the current
22 Comprehensive Plan where the effort went into that, which was also years of effort.

23 Ms. Beard: That is a change that would just primarily occur in the Initial Study. It
24 wouldn't necessarily affect Master Plan text that I'm aware of right now. That is a change
25 that we could make before this goes to Council.

26 Commissioner McDougall: Thank you.

27 Chair Reckdahl: There was no motion associated with that. She's going to (inaudible).

28 Commissioner McDougall: Do you need a motion relative to that or can you accept that?
29 Can staff accept that as something that they will do for us?

30 Ms. Beard: I would approach it by developing a more robust response to the comment
31 letter itself, which would be—what comment letter is it? Comment E3. Working that
32 into the text changes of the final Initial Study.

Commissioner McDougall: Thank you. That would be ... I'm done.

Chair Reckdahl: Ryan.

Commissioner McCauley: Forgive me for not being sensitive to this previously when it was first inserted into the Initial Study and the Master Plan early in May. I'm looking at Program 4.A.1.

Chair Reckdahl: What page is this?

Commissioner McCauley: This is at page 65 of the Master Plan, the added sentence. I certainly agree with Goal 4 generally. I certainly agree with Program 4.A.1 generally. I'm a little bit concerned by saying that the production of biological resources from visitor use is the priority in the open space preserves. I think it would be better to say "a priority" or "a significant priority." I'm worried about tying the City's hands in that manner particularly when there are other considerations that have to be brought into effect in every instance. I would propose that we amend that to be, rather than "the priority," "a significant priority in open space preserves."

Chair Reckdahl: I agree with that. What's the impact if we make that change? Is that just simply a vote and you can go and edit it or is there more ripples to that?

Ms. O'Kane: With respect to the Master Plan document, you can make a motion to change that. I don't know if it has an impact on the CEQA. I'll defer to Barbara for that.

Ms. Beard: The same change would be made in the Initial Study that would reflect the changes in the Master Plan. It wouldn't affect the analysis per se. Just be aware that throughout the Initial Study the Initial Study document says that each open space preserve will have its own Master Planning process. In that Master Planning process, you would develop the goals and priorities for that particular open space preserve. However, the Parks and Recreation Master Plan should be considered the big umbrella that all open space preserves are managed and developed under. Any guiding policies in this document should filter down into the individual open space preserve master plans as they are developed.

MOTION

Commissioner McCauley: Thanks. I'll move to amend it in that manner.

Chair Reckdahl: Do we have a second?

Commissioner McDougall: Second.

Chair Reckdahl: Any discussion? All in favor, say aye.

1 Ms. O'Kane: Can you state the revised language you would like?

2 Commissioner McCauley: It's just to change "the priority" in that added sentence to
3 "shall be a significant priority."

4 Ms. O'Kane: Thank you.

5 Vice Chair Moss: I oppose.

6 Chair Reckdahl: Let's go back. All in favor. Opposed.

7 Vice Chair Moss: I oppose.

8 Chair Reckdahl: It passes 6-1.

9 **The motion carried 6-1.**

10 Chair Reckdahl: Do you want to explain?

11 Vice Chair Moss: I don't want any more changes to it.

12 Chair Reckdahl: For me, the threshold for the programs is lower. The threshold for the
13 front matter, I think, is quite high. We should not be touching that unless there's
14 something egregious.

15 Vice Chair Moss: I believe that this is going to be a living document, and we should be
16 able to adjust the programs and actions over time without disturbing the overall
17 document.

18 Chair Reckdahl: Any more comments?

19 Commissioner McCauley: No further comments.

20 **MOTION**

21 Chair Reckdahl: Jeff? I have no other comments. That moves us to making a motion to
22 ... I move that the Commission recommends that the Council adopt the Master Plan and
23 the CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration.

24 Commissioner McDougall: Can I ask a question before you do that?

25 Chair Reckdahl: Okay.

26 Commissioner McDougall: We've now had a motion to make one change. Tell me again
27 why we shouldn't change the riparian corridor in here. Go back through your ...

1 Chair Reckdahl: Is that defined in ...

2 Commissioner McCauley: It's not actually in the Master Plan.

3 Commissioner McDougall: It's not in the Master Plan is your point.

4 Ms. Beard: Right.

5 Commissioner McDougall: Thank you.

6 Chair Reckdahl: It probably should be defined in the Master Plan. At some point, you
7 just have to call it a day. Any discussion?

8 Commissioner McDougall: I'll second your motion.

9 Chair Reckdahl: All in favor. Opposed. Passes 7-0. Do you have any more or should
10 we move on to the next item?

11 **The motion passes unanimously.**

12 Ms. O'Kane: We're ready to move on.

13 Chair Reckdahl: We're an hour-plus behind. That was an action item. That was
14 important to do right because it was an action. We still have a couple of hours' worth of
15 work here. Let's try and trim down, really keep the questions to a minimum. These are
16 all discussion items coming forward, so we will get another shot at these. Only major
17 questions if possible.

18 **3. Highway 101 Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge Preliminary Design Update.**

19 Chair Reckdahl: We move on to the Highway 101 pedestrian bike bridge update design.

20 Commissioner McCauley: Keith, forgive me. Would it be possible to determine any
21 community members if they're planning to speak on these discussion items, that we could
22 take them in the order that people are present here.

23 Chair Reckdahl: We have two people for this item.

24 Commissioner McCauley: We do, great. Thank you.

25 Chair Reckdahl: We will have the presentation. After the presentation, we have two
26 speaker cards, and then we'll move on to Commission questions.

27 Megha Bansai: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Megha Bansai. I'm Project
28 Engineer with Public Works. Tonight, we are providing you with an update on Highway

APPROVED

101 pedestrian and bicycle overpass project. From our team, we have Elizabeth Ames, Senior Project Manager, sitting in the audience. To my right, our consultant Roy Schnabel from Biggs Cardosa Associates. Before we get into the details of design, a little background. Back in November 2016, Council selected certain elements of the project including the bridge structure type, pathway width, and alignment for the project to meet the total project budget. Subsequently, we presented the design to the Commission back in March 2017 and to Architectural Review Board and Planning and Transportation Commission. We have advanced the design further based on input received in those meetings that we will be presenting to you tonight. We would really like to focus on our discussion and get your input on certain elements including overlook, refinements, trailheads, landscaping, and habitat restoration, lighting, location of amenities, and location and type of signage. With that, I turn it over to Roy Schnabel.

Roy Schnabel: Good evening, Commissioners. This first slide is basically a project map that shows the areas for the individual elements that Megha introduced and shows basically the areas they involve. We'll start with a brief update on the overall project. We're looking at placing a steel structure over the roadways, East and West Bayshore and the freeway, with 8-foot safety fencing. The following access ramps will be concrete structures with a 4-foot safety railing. Over the confluence of Barron and Adobe Creek, we have a steel truss similar to the existing one on the other side that basically leaves this path to one of the initial connections at the Adobe Creek Trail connection at West Bayshore. One of the project elements that was included by Council was an overlook, but they wanted something fairly minimal. We looked at providing a seating area with an ADA-accessible area in front. This is basically a minimal approach to the overlook. We had a couple of design charrettes and some input from the various Commissions and Commissioners. We looked at some of the enhancements that could be made to make this area more functional. One of that was to expand the area to include a bicycle storage area so that it wouldn't clutter the space and make it less ADA accessible and the incorporation of art elements in architectural features like the benches and the railing at this location. We have three main trail connections. The first one is at West Bayshore, located at the confluence of the sidewalks and the existing Adobe Creek Trail, which is currently closed to the public. The Water District is amenable to opening this up to improve safer access to this area. They also are amenable to expanding the confluence area, the area that all of the traffic meets at, into their right-of-way. We've reviewed an expanded area. Some of their conditions from what we originally had shown. They didn't like the amenities at this location because they were fearful that their maintenance operations would run into the amenities, and they would be responsible for having to replace those or update them. They also wanted a wider entrance to accommodate their vehicles. They also requested the addition of at the end of that area a 20-foot lockable fence so that, when they were performing their maintenance operations, they could lock their maintenance vehicles inside the trail during those operations. The other end of the trail is at Meadow Drive. We have coordinated with the Transportation Division in the

City, who is also doing a bike boulevard project in and around the area. They've asked us to provide a raised crosswalk and some chicanes, which are similar to what they're providing in their project. We've accommodated that at the East Meadow trailhead. At the nexus of the Bay Trail and this project, we have the connection at the Bay Trail circa to East Bayshore Road. One of the comments that we had originally received from this Commission was the original alignment had a T-intersection. You had asked us to take a look at a possible revision to that to provide something that would improve safety, especially with the mixing of the pedestrians and the bicyclists. We developed this roundabout idea, which is becoming popular especially in areas where we have bicycle and mixed use. We worked with PABAC and Transportation to develop this configuration. We're still resolving some circulation issues and some circulation questions. This is the current approach for this connection that we're looking at currently. With regards to the landscaping, we're affecting 28 trees all on the West Bayshore side. We are not able to replace all of the trees on that side, so we're looking to mitigate some of the tree impacts on the East Bayshore side within the Baylands. We're also looking at restoring some of the nonnative habitat areas that we're impacting with native grasses and native plant species. On the other side, we worked with the Urban Forester and the City Landscape Architect to identify some tree revisions to the other side to replace some of the species of trees that we're impacting with some more native plant species. With regards to lighting, the goal for the lighting is to minimize the amount of spillage onto the natural environments and still provide safe, lighted walking paths. Most of the lighting is very low level. We have some areas with pole-mounted lights. Those are limited to the West Bayshore side and only on 12-foot tall poles. We've revised the pole standard based on some comments from the other Commissions and are looking at more capped-style lights that reach over the pathway for the pole-mounted lights to improve their efficiency and their look. Most of the lights are mounted on the rails and railings, so they're fairly low-level. Here's an image of what they potentially will look like during the day and night. With regards to the amenities, we've resolved to minimize the number of amenities and the locations of these amenities. We're only looking at fairly limited amenities, a hydration station, a bike rack, a bike repair stand, and some trash receptacles. We also have some benches. They're located at two locations. One is the overlook, where we'll locate the benches and the bike racks. There will also be some interpretive signs at the overlook, that basically—we haven't identified what the information is that's going to be there. On the Bay Trail adjacent to the traffic roundabout, we're going to have trash and recycle receptacles, the bike repair station, and then the hydration station. These are the two locations where we have all of the designated amenities. With regards to signage, the sign on the top left is the standard that transportation is using for the bike boulevard project and what they've recommended that we utilize for our wayfinding. One of the comments that came from the other Commission was that it was very bike-centric and include some information with regards to or some inclusion of the pedestrians. In lieu of putting all that information, what they recommended that we put on the signs is basically direction, destination, and distance, and not necessarily the

APPROVED

duration it's going to take to get there because it's different for a bicyclist than a pedestrian, and it was getting fairly busy. The other thing is they asked us to look at custom trail options instead of just the bike standard, included both the bicycle and pedestrian symbology. With regards to wayfinding, we've worked with Transportation to get an understanding of what informational and etiquette signage. We're going to probably use a combination of signs and pavement markings. These are some of the examples that were delivered to us by Transportation in coordination with PABAC. They're trying to develop some standards for the City that are for these shared-path situations. These are some of the standard etiquette and pavement markings that we potentially foresee on this project. With that, questions, comments?

Ms. Bansai: We are planning to come back to the Commission with a Park Improvement Ordinance in September. I just wanted to point that out.

Mr. Schnabel: The first slide basically shows the project elements. These are the locations of ...

Ms. Bansai: Locations of signage. We wanted to highlight and wanted to get your input.

Mr. Schnabel: Currently, we're looking at placing the signage at locations of decision-making, so basically at all the trail connections and at the "Y." We're going to be limiting it to those areas so we don't overpopulate the bridge structure with signage. With regards to pavement markings, similarly we're envisioning pavement markings which are informational to slow down the bicyclists in those areas where they potentially will meet with pedestrians.

Vice Chair Moss: Everything looks great. I only have one questions, and that's the circle. Somebody's coming down from the bridge at full speed at night, is there some way for them to see the circle? Is the circle flat or is it raised?

Mr. Schnabel: There is a little bit of a raise, but it's mountable. It's basically ...

Vice Chair Moss: They could come right off the bridge and go right on top of that and not crash.

Mr. Schnabel: You could come right over it. You might crash into the fence that's on the other side of it. We had originally a more substantial curb, and Transportation gave us this curb detail, which is basically a mountable curb, that they're using on some of the other traffic circles in the City.

Vice Chair Moss: That's all I have.

Chair Reckdahl: Can you explain that more? This is the curb around the inner circle.

1 Mr. Schnabel: There's a detail for it so we can actually see what it looks like. You can
2 see the image on the left. It's basically an inch high where it meets the pavement.

3 Chair Reckdahl: This is the tan portion, or beige?

4 Mr. Schnabel: Yeah, the beige portion covers that detail that's on the left. You can see
5 the curb. I don't know if it's clear.

6 Chair Reckdahl: Do we want any curb at all there?

7 Mr. Schnabel: We're discussing that with Transportation. If you don't put a curb there,
8 people will just go across it. The question is how do we make it functional and not force
9 people to cheat. That's one of the things that we had discussed, the circulation issues.
10 That's one of the circulation issues because they feel like some people will try to cross on
11 the other side, and that will decrease safety instead of improve it.

12 Chair Reckdahl: If you could just make it rough, so it's not pleasant. A curb, I think,
13 seems like a safety issue. There's experts in the field that can have more (crosstalk).

14 Ms. Bansai: We will also have some trail etiquette signs there, at the circle.

15 Mr. Schnabel: On all three corners we'll have trail etiquette signage to remind people to
16 be safe. Thankfully, you guys have a very informed bicycle community, and a lot of
17 those guys self-police. It's pretty good.

18 Chair Reckdahl: Is that it? Are you done with the presentation?

19 Ms. Bansai: Yeah.

20 Chair Reckdahl: We have some public comment. We have Shani Kleinhaus, and then
21 followed by Jeff Saunders.

22 Shani Kleinhaus: Good evening. Shani Kleinhaus again. I wanted to thank staff for a
23 very, very extensive outreach to the community, getting a lot of comments, sharing the
24 process with us. That was a very, very good process. That's all. Thank you.

25 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. Jeff Saunders.

26 Jeff Saunders: I like the way that this is evolving. I think it's great. Keep moving
27 forward. I want to continue to raise awareness to people that after this is done we should
28 look ahead to extending this to Sterling Canal to take the bicycle and pedestrian traffic
29 off of West Bayshore up to Greer Park. Also, looking at this design, I had one question
30 about the trail intersection at Meadow. If bicyclists are going along Meadow, there's
31 nothing really south of there. The trail would go along behind (inaudible) and Kehillah

1 High School, and then it kind of dead ends. I'm not sure where that would go with that
2 raised sidewalk going across. Bicyclists shooting out onto Meadow might encounter
3 traffic. It might be a good idea to put a barricade there, so that bicyclists can't go directly
4 out into traffic. Thank you.

5 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. We're done with public comments. Commissioners. Jeff.

6 Commissioner LaMere: I think it's a really great plan. Just a quick question. The one
7 concern that I do have is I think it's going to be heavily used. It's in a great location. It's
8 a great idea, the usage and the mixing of bicyclists and pedestrians, obviously, the
9 importance of signage of etiquette and whatever we're painting on the pavement. A quick
10 question. Is it wide enough that you could have designated bike lanes and designated
11 pedestrian lanes? It probably is not, but I'm curious about that.

12 Mr. Schnabel: When we first looked at this, one of the options was to look at dedicated
13 bike and pedestrian lanes, but that required a fairly wide structure and was fairly costly,
14 had more environmental impacts. Council selected the option to provide as much width
15 as they could but not dedicated lanes. Basically, the bicyclists, when they would have to
16 pass, would probably have to go to the open lane or slow down before they could pass.

17 Commissioner LaMere: My other comment would just be I'm not sure if the bike racks
18 that you showed here are the ones that you guys intend to use. To me they look
19 aesthetically very pleasing. They don't look super functional to lock up different types of
20 bicycles. That'd be my only comment.

21 Mr. Schnabel: We're still working out the kinks with regards to the bike rack. We did
22 include—that was the one that the architect selected as it evoked some of the same things
23 that they wanted to evoke at that location. I think we still need to work with
24 Transportation because they have some very, very good ideas with regards to what's
25 functional in the City with regards to bicycle racks all over the City.

26 Commissioner Greenfield: Thank you for a very comprehensive plan. As I've said
27 before, there's lots to like about it. I like the addition of the roundabout, and the
28 bike/pedestrian dual signage is a good step as well. My primary question and comments
29 center around access to the western approach to the bridge. In looking at the plan, it's
30 very difficult to figure out what the intended paths are for bicycles and pedestrians from
31 the various access points. Within the presentation, the trailhead slides help that a lot, but
32 they weren't included in the packet. I think it would be very helpful to have a table set up
33 that talks about the various ingress/egress points to the western approach. On West
34 Bayshore we have the northbound and southbound approaches, and we also have the East
35 Meadow access to the Adobe Creek Reach Trail. A question which I asked previously,
36 which I don't have a clear answer to is what happens when there's a maintenance closure
37 from Santa Clara Valley Water District. What is closed, and then what are the new

APPROVED

recommended paths from each of these three points? Really, it applies to two of the points. Included in the table should just be a clear explanation. If a pedestrian just wants to walk along Bayshore without accessing the bridge, make it clear where they're going in and out. A question I have is, which I think I understand it, on West Bayshore when you are southbound, pedestrians would access from one point on the ramp, but bikes are not intended to go on that ramp. Bikes are intended to continue on the bike path to the second intersection point. There's really two intersection points on the west side.

Mr. Schnabel: Yeah, that's correct. The access ramp, the pedestrian ramp, at the "Y" was basically—there was a desire to put a staircase, a secondary access point, there for providing easier access or closer access for pedestrians and also for fire response. We looked at the staircase, and the ramp option had so many advantages to it in continuing the sidewalk and some of the other things that putting the bike lane back into sole use on the street from a safety perspective that we went towards the ramp option. We're not going to exclude bicycles from using it. Bicycles have to dismount, though. There will be dismount signs. Bicyclists who do want to use that path as a secondary path access can do it. We made the path wider than a standard sidewalk to accommodate them.

Commissioner Greenfield: If a table could just be set up that explains all these details, that would be a lot clearer when someone's looking at the plan, trying to understand it.

Mr. Schnabel: With regards to maintenance, we're still working with the Water District as to the requirements. Currently, what they want is when they do their maintenance every 3-5 years for several weeks, their plan is to close the trail and to lock their equipment inside the trail during those periods. They typically don't utilize this area as often as the area on the other side. We don't think it's going to be used as often as they think it is. It's probably going to close the trail for that duration. That area in front where pedestrians will be continues to remain open. That wider area where bicyclists can turn around will still be open.

Commissioner Greenfield: When the trail is closed, then northbound traffic, which is basically on the sidewalk on West Bayshore, would continue up and would be able to access ...

Mr. Schnabel: They'd have to take a left into that area and then to that trailhead and go up that, which they can do now. Transportation has asked us to put bicycle markers similar to what's on the other side to indicate even currently when we finish the project that bicyclists will be allowed. We just feel that more bicyclists will utilize the Adobe Creek Trail because it's safer.

Commissioner Greenfield: At the 15 percent presentation, there was a question about whether that access point would even be open for bicycles and pedestrians with the potential that they'd have to continue down to the ramp.

APPROVED

1 Mr. Schnabel: As we meet with the Water District, we're continuing to get more and
2 more definition on the limitations of what they want. At some point, we're going to need
3 to start negotiating maintenance agreement-type and cooperation agreement-type
4 information. That'll get more solidified as we get closer to those conversations.

5 Commissioner Greenfield: That seems pretty critical to sort out.

6 Mr. Schnabel: It's all in their right-of-way. We're trying to get as much as we can.
7 We're also trying to negotiate early access to the trail as one of the Commissions wanted
8 to access that earlier.

9 Commissioner Greenfield: Between the new Adobe Creek bridge and the trailhead,
10 where the Adobe Creek Reach trailhead meets West Bayshore, is that just a single path?
11 There's no sidewalk besides—that access path is the only way to move along.

12 Mr. Schnabel: No, there's sidewalks. Our project will widen that sidewalk, which is
13 nonexistent right now, and basically put it into that trailhead. There's an existing
14 sidewalk on the other side. There will be a continuous sidewalk on both sides of their
15 opening.

16 Commissioner Greenfield: This is south of the bridge. There would be a sidewalk.

17 Mr. Schnabel: There is an existing sidewalk there that basically ends at the current
18 Benjamin Lefkovits underpass connection.

19 Commissioner Greenfield: There will be both a sidewalk and the path, which is
20 connecting to the bridge.

21 Mr. Schnabel: Yes, and it'll widen there for the combination of pedestrians and bicyclists
22 on the (crosstalk).

23 Commissioner Greenfield: That's real hard to see in the current drawings.

24 Mr. Schnabel: It is.

25 Commissioner Greenfield: Last question and then move on. The 20-foot lockable area,
26 is that intended to be on the Reach Trail?

27 Mr. Schnabel: Yes, yes.

28 Commissioner Greenfield: That's why the Reach Trail is closed.

1 Mr. Schnabel: We located it further back so we could get that space as wide as we can
2 and as big as we can based on what they're looking for. They want to have the ability on
3 both sides to lock the trail up, prevent access during those maintenance operation periods.

4 Commissioner Greenfield: Thank you.

5 Commissioner McDougall: Just a few comments. The last time there was a presentation
6 here my question was had there been any attempt to create a use case. The document
7 says a facility may be used for both commuting and recreational. Do we have any idea at
8 all of is it 50/50, is it intended to be 80/20? How will we know we've been successful in
9 the end if we don't have some sort of estimate?

10 Mr. Schnabel: We tried to approach that right after the last meeting. I think we're still
11 trying to get our arms around how to do that with regards to evaluating. We've asked
12 Transportation to give us some information with regards to how to understand the overall
13 use.

14 Commissioner McDougall: You want to even have maybe three cases, 50/50, 80/20,
15 20/80 or something because a lot of the questions that are being asked about access and
16 what not, the answer almost depends on are you talking about commuters in spandex or
17 whatever or are you talking about a biker with a trailer behind with kids in it. The answer
18 almost depends on it. Even the question of the outlook. I think you have to force
19 yourself at some point to be able to say, "We're estimating this use case." You don't have
20 to be right in the end, but we really have to consider that.

21 Mr. Schnabel: I think we've considered it because we've heard from a number of those
22 users. We've heard from the commuters; we've heard from the recreational users; and
23 we've heard from the moms who are carting around their trailers. Hopefully we've
24 accommodated all of those users and usages in this plan. I thought your—forgive me for
25 not understanding. I thought what you had originally asked for was in regards to the
26 signage.

27 Commissioner McDougall: Signage is part of it. I think that's what instigated the
28 thought. My thought is throughout the whole project, access, signage, outlook, even the
29 roundabout, we should have some understanding of what is it we're expecting. Even if
30 you look at what you've got now and say, "What we ended up with is not necessarily
31 good for everybody." I like what you've said, that you've asked everybody and you've
32 tried to get all the points, but I kind of doubt it. I won't push that further. I appreciate
33 that you remembered, and I appreciate you continuing to think about it. The one picture
34 that shows on the east side at Bayshore where there's all that vegetation, habitat, I think
35 that's very important that it be habitat. I like habitat restoration. Somewhere else it says
36 landscaping. Considering its proximity to the Baylands, habitat restoration is more
37 important than landscaping. The other thing I would worry about here is, if we're going

APPROVED

1 to put native plants in there, what we run the risk of is nearby are all sorts of invasive
2 species that have the opportunity of immediately getting into this restored habitat area. I
3 hope that's taken into account, that it's not just the immediate area but maybe there's some
4 proximity that we have to worry about in order to preserve our restoration.

5 Ms. Bansai: To respond to that, we are working with stakeholders and with our biologist
6 and landscape architect and arborist. We will come up with a plant list that will be
7 suitable for that area.

8 Commissioner McDougall: All of the planting. I hope that all the stakeholders consider
9 what used to be Acterra is now ...

10 Ms. Bansai: Grassroots Ecology.

11 Commissioner McDougall: I hope they're included. I hope the Audubon people are
12 included. Maybe Environmental Volunteers, which are new. I hope they all get
13 included. My other comment would be about the lighting. It just seems like there's an
14 awful lot of lighting. I'm not sure what's too much and what's not enough. One of my
15 questions would be is the lighting—would the lighting be on all night or would it be a
16 triggered lighting?

17 Mr. Schnabel: The plan is to have control systems. There will be occupancy sensors.
18 When there are no occupants utilizing the pathway, the lights will dim down. As it
19 senses occupants, it will raise. We're still working out for how long and what duration
20 those are. The plan is to include control systems for the lights.

21 Commissioner McDougall: Thank you. My last comment would be as we move
22 forward—we're all obviously enthusiastic about moving this forward as quickly as
23 possible. I would sure like to see something like complete 35 percent design, which now
24 says fall of 2017. As we get closer, I'd like to see that become a month. Can we say
25 October? Can we say November or whatever? Fall could be any time between
26 September and March of next year. The only problem with having a fiscal or annual
27 quarter as a measurement device, when you slip 3 months, you've really only slipped one
28 quarter, so it's not a big deal. You get my point. I'd just like to see us get more
29 (crosstalk).

30 Mr. Schnabel: Project delivery is very important. We've heard it from every
31 Commission and a number of the community. We are dedicated, both staff and project
32 team, to trying to expedite delivery. Some of those things are outside our control; that's
33 why it's sort of a seasonal thing. We still have to wait for CEQA clearance and
34 environmental clearances to occur. That date hasn't been completely solidified yet.

1 Commissioner McDougall: If I wouldn't slow you down by asking a bunch of questions,
2 you'd get there faster. Thank you very much for what you're doing.

3 Chair Reckdahl: David. Anne. I just have a couple of questions. First, West Bayshore
4 is just a mess. It's not your design; it's just that's a bad situation.

5 Mr. Schnabel: It's not ideal. There's just not a lot of space to fit anything that is better.

6 Chair Reckdahl: Can we have a dedicated crosswalk or marked areas?

7 Mr. Schnabel: I've discussed some of the—we put a lot of thought into it because we
8 struggle with the same issues, us and Transportation. We sort of worked out what would
9 be best in that. We talked about potentially raised crosswalks here too. They felt leaving
10 it as minimal as possible was going to be the best solution.

11 Chair Reckdahl: Right at that corner, it's just such a bad situation. Could we slide it
12 down and have the crossing—the people who have to cross West Bayshore, have that
13 further north where the ramp comes down and have the crossing there and make that a
14 bike path coming up the ramp as opposed to pedestrians?

15 Mr. Schnabel: I'm not sure how to make that safe. The southbound bicycles have to
16 make a fairly large U-turn. Trying to do a sharp turn like that closer to the ramps might
17 not be ideal. The northbounds have to make a left turn. The street is pretty tight with
18 regards to the traffic, and the traffic is going pretty quick in that area. That's why ...

19 Chair Reckdahl: I don't want to belabor it. I agree with Jeff that we have to really look at
20 how people are going to get to that west crossing. There are kids; kids are going to be
21 crossing, using this bridge to go down to Baylands or going over at Twister's Gym.
22 There's going to be kids here, and I really feel uncomfortable with that corner right there.
23 It's just a bad situation. You know that, and we need to work on that. Bike racks on the
24 overlook I don't understand. I don't see anyone locking their bike on the overlook. I can
25 see them maybe stopping for a minute or two.

26 Mr. Schnabel: What we had originally planned was the bikes would just be leaned on the
27 rails. As we looked at the spaces with the architect, they tended to clutter the areas that
28 were available for the ADA ramps and access points. If they put it up near the bench,
29 they would—we only had 4 feet between the bench and the railing, so that's basically the
30 ADA minimum. If somebody put a bike there, we would basically be non-ADA-
31 compliant. The thought was to identify an area to store bikes, whether that's a bike rack
32 or just something that's sticking up where bikes can be leaned upon. We just wanted to
33 identify an area that was more functional to keep it away from access points and in front
34 of the benches.

APPROVED

Chair Reckdahl: I just think it'll be used more often for strollers and things like that. Having bike racks in there will make it hard, make it less usable. I like the benches on the overlook. The seniors and other people need that break. If we can get another bench over on the West Bayshore side somewhere, it doesn't have to be right at the stop. Somewhere in that general area near the Reach Trail a bench just so people can rest. For someone who's elderly, that's a long hike. You're going up elevation and over. We don't view the elderly world through our eyes. We ignore that. We need benches for the elderly. That's good enough. There's no staircase on the east side? That's been deleted?

Mr. Schnabel: That's been replaced by the access ramp.

Chair Reckdahl: On the east side?

Mr. Schnabel: On the east side, no.

Chair Reckdahl: It'd be nice to have but not required. Thank you. Thank you. I appreciate your work. We're a little rushed to catch up here. It's good work. I'm looking forward to having it built. You said you plan to come back in September for the PIO?

Mr. Schnabel: Yes.

Ms. Bansai: Yes.

Chair Reckdahl: Thank you.

Mr. Schnabel: Thank you very much for all your comments.

Ms. Bansai: Thank you very much.

Chair Reckdahl: Let's move on. We are still behind schedule.

4. Proposed Dog Park Design at Peers Park.

Chair Reckdahl: Dog park, Peter Jensen is going to talk that. Again, this is just a discussion item. We'll come back for a PIO later. Try to get the highlights for your questions.

Mr. Anderson: Good evening. I'm Daren Anderson with Open Space, Parks and Golf. I'm with my colleague from Public Works, Peter Jensen, Landscape Architect. We're here tonight to discuss with you the draft design for the Peers Park dog park. I'll briefly discuss the background regarding how we got to where we are at this point. Then, I'll ask Peter to walk you through the key elements of this draft design. The background is that in December 2016 we hosted two community meetings to discuss the option and collect feedback from the public about the idea of putting a dog park in either Pardee or Peers

APPROVED

1 Park. The outcome of the first meeting, which was Pardee, was a number of concerns
2 and a lot of opposition to the concept for a number of reasons. One of the predominant
3 ones was the location we were forced to use was so close to the residents' house lines.
4 There were concerns about impacts to those homes and privacy and noise. A week later,
5 we had the public meeting for Peers. There was a much more positive reception to the
6 idea. There was very little opposition. After we analyzed it a little bit, some of the—in
7 addition to the feedback, once we started looking at design, there was enough space at
8 that site to have a 0.72-acre dog park. Very large and considerably larger than the
9 options at Pardee. In addition to that, you have the ability to place it right along the train
10 track side, so the noise issue gets mitigated to a great degree because you already have
11 trains. At the March 2017 Commission meeting, the Commission expressed support for
12 the concept and for proceeding with adding a dog park at Peers. Staff has done so.
13 We've created this draft design using feedback both from the Commission, from the ad
14 hoc committee, from our public meetings, and prior public meetings going back several
15 years where we have notes about things people wanted. For example, separating big dog
16 and small dog. I'd add to that that we've also learned from staff experience of the three
17 existing dog parks we have what's working and what's not, and what elements we should
18 add. With that, I'm going to turn it over to Peter to walk you through the elements of this
19 draft design.

20 Peter Jensen: Good evening, Commissioners. Peter Jensen, Landscape Architect for the
21 City of Palo Alto. Like Daren was saying, the park is advantageous to having a dog park.
22 I think one of the difficulties with locating a dog park in our current park system is
23 actually dedicating that large of a space to a specific use as a dog park. It turns out,
24 though, that Peers Park does have an optimal place for it. As Daren was saying, there is
25 an unused buffer that's in the rear of the park, that's up against the Caltrain tracks, that
26 supplies a good space that is sort of a pseudo dog park right now, that's just basically not
27 fenced off well. The graphic that you're seeing up there, the red outline is the proposed
28 location of the dog park. This graphic is more of a construction document. What it starts
29 to do is define the spaces between the large dog park and the small dog park. This line is
30 dividing the smaller location. The longer, linear part of it is the small dog park. The
31 location behind the tennis court that has a little bit more of a larger open space for larger
32 dogs is the larger dog park. A few other amenities. The main point of the project is
33 fencing and defining that area. The idea would be to start to use a black, vinyl-clad,
34 chain-link fence in that area to mitigate the chain link as much as possible. It is 5 feet
35 tall. One of the feedback we heard along the way is the double entry gate to each zone.
36 The small dog and the large dog would have the setup where you would have two gates.
37 There would be space between that would allow dog owners to collar their dogs before
38 they leave the dog park. Water bowls for the dogs as well or dog drinking fountains,
39 picnic tables that are dispersed loosely through the dog park, that allow some flexibility
40 and movement of seating out there, and then maintaining the surface area out there. Most
41 of it is grass, but there are areas of mulch as well. Having that diversity of surface

APPROVED

1 material works out very well for the dog park itself. There is flexibility in the plan.
2 There is a sliding 12-foot gate between the two dog parks. If it's seen one day that maybe
3 it's just better to have the whole space as one dog park, we do have the opportunity to do
4 that as well and give us some flexibility of using that space. There will be new concrete
5 walks specifically adjacent to the tennis courts that connect the existing concrete
6 walkway to the main entries of the dog park. There's easy access from those locations.
7 In a nutshell, that's pretty much it. There's not too much complex about a dog park.
8 We're basically just defining an area. I think we'll move on and take questions. I think
9 our goal is –going back, this is the setup in the seasons again as far as schedule goes.
10 Most of it is definitely concentrated right now, so we would like to get feedback from the
11 Commission, of course, but we would like to start to put a construction document
12 together, bid it out, and actually get a dog park installed. The dog park goes back way
13 before even my work here, maybe a decade or more of trying to get a dog park in Palo
14 Alto. We're very close now. Let's just get to the finish line, and it'll be great. I know the
15 dog owners are very eager to have a dog park, a new facility that we don't have yet,
16 especially in the north of Palo Alto, which does not have a dog park currently.

17 Mr. Anderson: The only thing I'd add to that is if the ad hoc who's been so generous with
18 their time and support has anything to add, now is maybe a good time.

19 Chair Reckdahl: (inaudible) anything to add?

20 Commissioner Cribbs: Yes, I do. First of all, I'm excited to see this. I think it's great.
21 I'm glad we have the money for it now as part of the CIP. I'm disappointed and dismayed
22 at 2018 in the winter time. It just seems like a really long time from now. It would be
23 great if we could accelerate that somehow. I know there are processes and all of that, but
24 I think we'd really like—it's been 10 years. It'd be great if it could go faster than that.
25 Specifically about this particular dog park, it's a great location. There's a lot of good
26 work done on it. There was some questions about the budget and if there were
27 opportunities in the budget for the dog owners who offered at a number of community
28 meetings to support the budget. Maybe we could identify some of those places, and have
29 a vehicle to raise the money and all of that. Can you think about that and maybe the ad
30 hoc can think about that as well? Two other questions independent of that. In the last
31 report, there was that discussion of the public art in one of the parks. There were
32 restrictions on the public art, so we couldn't have a dog park in a place that you thought it
33 might be good. Can we find out specifically about what that kind of restriction is?
34 Secondly, the whole issue of the trees, the dog urine underneath the trees, and that kind
35 of tension because it's limiting the places that we can put a dog park. The last thing is
36 what's the next dog park on the list. Thanks very much. It's exciting.

APPROVED

1 Commissioner McCauley: I'll be very brief. Thanks to Daren and Peter for pushing this
2 forward. I agree that it'd be great to have it constructed as soon as possible. I know
3 you'll work towards that. Please continue to push. Thanks.

4 Commissioner McDougall: I'm sorry. I'd like to make a couple of quick comments. I
5 recently spent a bunch of time in New York and went around to all the dog parks in New
6 York. One of the things they didn't do is they said there was a mixed dog space and then
7 a small dog space. It wasn't big dogs and little dogs. People could say, "It's my option to
8 take my little dog into this space." I think that might help us going forward. We talk
9 about dog water bowls. They were much more aggressive in terms of fountain space and
10 whatnot. I don't know if we can approve that, if we have the budget for that or not. I
11 would encourage that we be more aggressive than just water bowls. It also says picnic
12 tables for seating. Are those picnic tables inside the dog area or are those the existing?

13 Mr. Jensen: They're inside.

14 Commissioner McDougall: Why would it be picnic tables as opposed to benches?

15 Mr. Jensen: The picnic tables, they can sit loose without being tethered. A bench would
16 need some type of pad to be attached to. We felt just for the space itself and having the
17 flexibility and because of the terrain out there right now of the grass and the mulch that
18 picnic tables would work well, but we can look at benches.

19 Commissioner McDougall: My other comment is concrete paving. In so many of our
20 projects we immediately say concrete paving. I was over there today, and I'm not so sure
21 that you couldn't put some ADA kind of path in that was just simple hardscape of some
22 kind, that wasn't concrete. I'm not sure if more concrete in our parks is necessary. I
23 would discourage that.

24 Chair Reckdahl: At El Camino Park, they have that concrete that at least the water ...

25 Mr. Jensen: The permeable.

26 Commissioner McDougall: I think that's important. In terms of the schedule, I would
27 wonder if there's some way to phase it. It's not a big project. I was over there today.
28 Phase I is—the tennis court is the current dog park. I'm sure you're aware. I was there;
29 six dogs were inside the tennis court having a good time. It seemed to me that it wouldn't
30 take much to put up a fence quicker and get even one part of it so that it was available,
31 and we started to have some experience with it. I agree with Commissioner Cribbs that
32 the winter of '18 seems like a long way away to put up some 5-foot fence. I realize we're
33 minimizing all of the other issues. I think that's important. I was worried when it said
34 picnic tables, that that meant the picnic tables that are already there. Any access that we

1 can provide that doesn't encroach on the current picnic tables is probably a good idea to
2 keep them safe.

3 Commissioner Greenfield: I support all of the comments to reduce the timeline. Good
4 stuff otherwise.

5 Chair Reckdahl: I understand when you have construction put out for bids and stuff, but
6 the planning. What exactly is Planning doing? Checking ADA compliance and other
7 things like that?

8 Mr. Anderson: They'll end up doing an environmental review as well. There may be an
9 Initial Study that's required; we'll see as we go through the process. Originally, we were
10 looking at a longer process even. It can be onerous. You see on this revised staff report
11 it says up to 4 months, and that was some negotiation and convincing on Peter's part as
12 we negotiated with the staff and the Planning Department to see if we can't expedite as
13 our ad hoc and Commission has advised in the past. We're going to do our best to drive it
14 forward.

15 Chair Reckdahl: It looks good. I think it's a great place for a park. I think it's nice and
16 long. They'll be able to get the speed up. I think it's really good. Thank you for your
17 work.

18 Mr. Jensen: Thank you.

19 **5. Update on Cubberley Community Center Master Planning.**
20 **a. Draft Scope of Work for Consultant to Assist with Master Planning**
21 **Effort.**

22 Chair Reckdahl: Let's move on to the next item, update to Cubberley Community Center
23 Master Planning.

24 Ms. O'Kane: Kristen O'Kane, Community Services. We added this to the agenda in
25 response to a request to have the draft scope of work be sent to the Commissioners. We
26 decided to just put it on the agenda. There's no action tonight; it's just an update on what
27 we are doing with the Cubberley Master Plan process. Just a brief background. As you
28 probably know, the City owns 8 acres of the Cubberley site, and the School District owns
29 27 acres, which the City then leases. The Community Services Department operates the
30 entire facility including the athletic fields as the Cubberley Community Center. The
31 current lease will expire in December 2019. Included in the lease agreement is a
32 provision that the City and School District will jointly develop a Master Plan for the
33 entire site by the end of the lease term. In March of 2016, both City Manager Jim Keene
34 and Palo Alto Unified School District Superintendent Max McGee signed a Cubberley
35 Futures Compact to demonstrate the two entities' commitment to collaboratively plan for

APPROVED

the future of the 35-acre Cubberley site. Since then, both staff from the City and the School District have been working together to develop a scope of work. The scope of work was developed jointly by City and School District staff and has been reviewed by Superintendent Max McGee and his staff as well. The intent of releasing this Request for Proposals is to enter into a professional services agreement with a consultant who is experienced in creative and effective public engagement and design thinking, who can assist the City and School District staff in an efficient Master Planning process. Staff presented the scope of work to the Policy and Services Committee on June 13th. The Policy and Services Committee approved the recommendation, which was for Council to direct the Community Services Department to release a Request for Proposals for a consulting firm to assist the City and School District with Master Planning of the Cubberley Community Center. They added additional language, which was "including a negotiated cost-sharing agreement, and that the negotiation will not cause a delay to the RFP." Following our presentation to Policy and Services, the School District staff presented it to the School District Board of Education. They also expressed their support for embarking on this RFP process. The scope of work that we presented to Policy and Services was slightly revised between that meeting and the Board of Education meeting. Those changes are identified in the at-places memo that was provided today. A majority of those changes were with respect to the School District's position on their 27 acres of the Cubberley Community Center. The next step is we are planning on going to Council on September 5th and requesting that they direct staff to release a Request for Proposals for a consultant. This would be a joint effort between the School District and the City to start a Master Planning effort for the combined site.

Chair Reckdahl: That's it?

Ms. O'Kane: That's it.

Chair Reckdahl: Do you have any questions? Jeff.

Commissioner Greenfield: Is the joint effort to be joint funded?

Ms. O'Kane: The intent is for us to put together a cost-sharing agreement that would be funded by both the City and the School District.

Chair Reckdahl: Is that going to be 50/50 or is that still up for negotiation?

Ms. O'Kane: It's still up for negotiation. The initial discussions have been that it will likely be 50/50. It's not for certain yet. We need a completed agreement, but that's, I believe, where it would be going.

Chair Reckdahl: I could see some of the tradeoffs in wanting more recreation, if we wanted a swimming pool, things like that. The School District may not want that. The

1 bells and whistles may end up being on the City's dime just because they are City needs.
2 I'll wait for my turn. Was that it? Don, do you ...

3 Commissioner Cribbs: Is there an option B if it's not going to be a joint project? Is the
4 study going to be about a joint project? If all of a sudden the demographics change or the
5 landscape changes or the School District wants something different, are we back at
6 square one in 5 years? Is there something that we're thinking about that could be option
7 B where the City just develops the land that's available to us?

8 Ms. O'Kane: Our goal with the Master Planning process is the School District will still
9 retain their 27 acres, and we'll retain our 8 acres. The intent of the Master Plan is the
10 School District have their property representing their needs, and ours representing our
11 needs, but those would intermingle and would be possibly joint uses. They would
12 complement one another. If the School District—you made a good point. When we get
13 done with the Master Planning effort, we may be in different places as far as building that
14 property out. We would still need to find funding for that. There could be various
15 options, so it could be that the City and the School District try to obtain funding jointly or
16 it could be that we obtain funding separately. I think that's going to be something we're
17 going to need to look at, at the end of the Master Planning process depending on what the
18 outcome of the process is. I don't think the City has necessarily a plan B. There could be
19 an opportunity for the City to find funding on our own if the School District's not ready
20 or vice versa or we could find funding together as two organizations. Does that answer
21 your question?

22 Commissioner Cribbs: It's complicated.

23 Ms. O'Kane: It's very complicated.

24 Commissioner Cribbs: I'm wondering if it wouldn't be an exercise that would be at a
25 pretty high level. You already probably know this from what the recreational needs are
26 for the City. What would it look like to just have the land that's available to us to develop
27 and how much would it cost? Not to say we're going to go it alone or anything, but just
28 to say should we look at this as a community with that as an option.

29 Mr. de Geus: I think that's likely something we'll look at as part of the Master Planning
30 process. There will be different conceptual plans that are going to be developed. I do
31 think it's likely that the City's interests and needs around a multigenerational community
32 center with a variety of things is going to be more defined likely than what the School
33 District is going to be able to do. I think that's going to be one of the options that will be
34 part of the package.

35 Commissioner Cribbs: It's just a thought. How does it fit into the property that could be
36 developed for recreation over by the golf course? That's all I have.

APPROVED

1 Chair Reckdahl: When you go to Council, they will be directing you to hire the
2 consultant to outline the process? We have a Phase I and Phase II, but this is Phase 0 that
3 they're directing, right?

4 Ms. O'Kane: This is just directing staff to release an RFP. It's similar to what we did
5 when we released the RFP for the aquatics program. We went to Council to—one, it's to
6 raise the process that we're going through, particularly because we're doing this combined
7 with the School District. We really want to raise their awareness that this is the direction
8 that we're heading, and we would like their support and approval to do that.

9 Chair Reckdahl: This is an RFP. It's not for Phase I; it's for the planning.

10 Ms. O'Kane: This is an RFP to get the consultant onboard.

11 Chair Reckdahl: Different consultants will say what they can do and their expertise, and
12 we'll choose from that. That consultant will ...

13 Ms. O'Kane: Into Phase I.

14 Chair Reckdahl: We do have a speaker card, Penny Ellson.

15 Penny Ellson: Good evening. Thank you. I just have a couple of questions. I'm a
16 former member of the Cubberley Community Advisory Committee. I just want to make
17 the point that teacher housing, which is included in this report, was never vetted in any of
18 our discussions. As a representative of my neighborhood, I never brought that question
19 to our neighborhood. I have no idea what their opinion is on it. I'm guessing that would
20 bring it to a level of density that might cause some consternation. If we're talking about
21 doing a school and a community center and housing, it's a lot at a location that is pretty
22 intensively used and would be. I noticed in here that you refer to the community asset
23 evaluation, which we referred to in the committee as a community needs assessment,
24 which is a rather different thing. If you're looking at the existing community assets, that's
25 one thing. What we talked about was a survey or a way of studying what the community
26 needs or deficits might be. What do we not have that perhaps we need, not just what do
27 we have that we need more of. I just want to make sure that—maybe that work was done
28 as part of the community Master Planning. I don't know. That's what was in our minds.
29 We felt there was a big gap in our knowledge, and we didn't know what it was that the
30 community needed. Finally as always, Safe Routes to School is big in my mind. As this
31 process moves forward, I hope that the people who are working on it will give careful
32 thought to how much traffic this site and all the approach streets can handle at certain
33 times of day and how it's going to manage bicycles because it's going to be an afterschool
34 destination, I imagine. It might be a school destination. To the School District, one of
35 the things I'm going to say—I'll say it publicly now—is we need to think very carefully
36 about whether or not that should be a choice school or a neighborhood school because

1 that's an area that is already impacted by traffic from a nearby private school that draws
2 about 500 kids a day from outside of the community, all driven to school. Hoover
3 Elementary School, a choice school, very high volume of car trips. Greendell, of course,
4 draws a mixture. It's got kids from all over the community, and many of them are driven
5 but also many bicycle. There are a lot of nearby schools. It's a very sensitive area with a
6 lot of congestion in the morning. Traffic's going to be a key concern. Thanks.

7 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you, Penny. Do you have any last comments? We're moving on.

8 **6. Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates.**

9 Chair Reckdahl: The next is Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates. Does anyone
10 have any updates? I guess we have the grid this month. Does anyone want to talk about
11 their updates? We have a status update for all the ad hocs. If anyone thinks a verbal
12 explanation would be better; otherwise, the grid will do.

13 Commissioner Cribbs: I like this process. It was really helpful to me to see where other
14 ad hoc committees are and what we needed to do. I think it was helpful to the
15 committees that I'm on to be able to request from the staff the things that we felt we
16 needed to get our work done or more information. I'm excited that we've tried this.
17 Thank you for putting it all together. I think we should let it run for a couple more
18 months and see how we all feel about it.

19 Chair Reckdahl: I agree. There's some added benefit.

20 Vice Chair Moss: I like this process very much. The good and the bad of it is that I've
21 got lots of things I want to do right now. We need staff to do them right now. It focuses
22 us like a laser. You've got ten different committees all wanting to focus like a laser.
23 What do you suggest for getting staff time for these items? Do we make a 30-minute
24 appointment with you? What would you suggest?

25 Ms. O'Kane: In all of those, there is a staff liaison assigned. I would reach out to the
26 staff liaison, which I think is pretty much me and Daren. Whoever is assigned, you can
27 reach out. We can just have a conversation about timing. There may be something that
28 staff knows would be more appropriate to include the ad hoc in a few months or maybe
29 there's a reason to include the ad hoc sooner. Don't hesitate to contact us and just ask us.
30 We could talk through it and see what the best role for the ad hoc is at that time.

31 Chair Reckdahl: Don, do you have anything? We move on. The Department Report is
32 done.

VI. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Reckdahl: Comments and Announcements. Do you have any comments or announcements? Does anyone?

Commissioner Cribbs: I do. I'm sorry; go ahead.

Vice Chair Moss: The Friends of the Palo Alto Parks have invited us to their next meeting, which is in September. Don and I are going to represent the Commission.

Chair Reckdahl: Is there anything specific or they just want contact with us?

Vice Chair Moss: That was the thing. One of the things they were very interested in was the AT&T property, but Daren has said that that's a very slow process. I wish there were a way to speed that up. We have 2 months before we have to go before that committee. If there was any way we could get something before then, that would be great. That's one of the things.

Commissioner McDougall: I think their outreach was just a general "we'd like an update, come and talk to us."

Chair Reckdahl: Interaction with them is always very good. We need to stay tightly connected. The AT&T property, they have not redrawn the lines yet? It's a no go until they do that. Have you heard anything new?

Ms. O'Kane: I believe that AT&T and the City are still working on the lot line adjustments.

Chair Reckdahl: Are we talking directly with AT&T or are we talking through the lot line people? What's the route that the parks people are talking to AT&T?

Ms. O'Kane: Our Real Estate Department is mostly working with the company that AT&T has hired to do the lot line adjustment. We're also directly communicating with AT&T as well.

Chair Reckdahl: If it goes up for sale, we will know quickly?

Ms. O'Kane: We would.

Vice Chair Moss: One more question. When I reviewed the transcript of the May 22nd meeting with the City Council about the Master Plan, they had many, many comments. Foothills Park, opening it up, and bicycles and many, many items. Do you feel that we're going to get some pushback from the City Council for the—the reason I wanted to push for this version to go is I'm worried that there's going to be some last minute changes or

1 issues, and we'll never get this approved. What's your take on getting this approved by
2 the Council in September?

3 Mr. de Geus: I think we're on track to get it approved. It's not uncommon for the
4 Council—it's their prerogative to make final adjustments and revisions. That's okay. I'm
5 confident we've done a good job here, the Commission, the staff, and the many members
6 of the public. Helpful to have the Commission there and speak in support. I think it'll get
7 approved.

8 Chair Reckdahl: The last Council meeting, I thought they'd have 20 or 30 comments.
9 They only really had one where we had to go back and change. I think that's good news.

10 Commissioner Cribbs: I had another comment about the chili cookoff, which I thought
11 was great fun. Thank you for getting me in to be a judge. I think Jeff and I both felt like
12 it was great fun and great fun for the community. We'd love to see more chili teams next
13 year. We'd like to have the Commission challenge ourselves to find some chili teams,
14 either to have our own or do some outreach. If we each brought in one or two chili
15 teams, we'd get back up to the 25. It could be really good. I didn't want to lose sight of
16 that, so I have this. If we could address that in the agenda maybe in November or
17 something, we could start to do that.

18 Ms. O'Kane: That'd be great. Thank you for ...

19 Chair Reckdahl: Did Pat Markovich have her team?

20 Commissioner Cribbs: She was there, but she didn't win this time. She wanted to win,
21 but she didn't.

22 Ms. O'Kane: Thank you for being a judge. It is a fun event for staff and for everyone
23 who attends. Thank you for being there.

24 Commissioner Cribbs: It was great fun. It was great fun for the community. People of
25 all ages were enjoying the music and the dancing and the Bowl and everything. It's was a
26 great 4th of July in Palo Alto. We just needed more teams.

27 Commissioner Greenfield: I think we also wanted to encourage the other Commissions
28 to reach out to try and get participation.

29 Vice Chair Moss: One other thing is the Midtown—what is it called?

30 Commissioner Cribbs: The ice cream social.

31 Vice Chair Moss: I encourage everybody to participate.

Commissioner Cribbs: I have one more question. Rob, could you talk to us about your tenure and what's going on and when you're moving to the Manager's Office and all of that?

Mr. de Geus: I thought about whether to bring it up. We can talk about it next month as well. We have begun the recruitment for my replacement. We're working with a company, Terry Black. They'll do a national search. We're almost finished with the brochure, so that will be out hopefully next week. It'll be open for a month. I have already moved to the City Manager's Office, so I'm up there now, and have been doing both jobs for this month. I fly to Australia on the weekend to see my family for 2 weeks. That also marks a transition for Kristen to step in as interim while we go through the process. The City Manager, Jim Keene, will make an announcement formally about that change. That's the plan. It'll take 2-3 months to get through the process of recruiting. In fact, I invite some of the Commissioners to participate on the interview panels that we'll have for hiring the new director. If you're interested in that, let me know.

Chair Reckdahl: Ed helped out last time. He has expertise in that area. If you can get Ed, I think ... Go ahead.

Commissioner LaMere: Just one quick question. We've talked about the AT&T property. The ITT property, is that on anyone's radar still about some of the direction of that? Daren took me out there maybe 3 months ago. Someone else came out from the City and made it seem like there's some simple things that could be done to kick start it. There doesn't need to be any response now, but just something to keep on our minds or maybe some agenda item in the next month or two just to get an update on that. Thank you.

Chair Reckdahl: There's so much work that we could do out there. If we had a big budget, we could do something really good. We, unfortunately, don't, so I think it's just going to sit for a long time.

VII. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR AUGUST 22, 2017 MEETING

Chair Reckdahl: Let's move on to next month. We have four things. We have JMZ is going to come back with a PIO. That's going to be an action item. We'll have three discussion items, one of them being park dedication, what activities are prohibited and park activities. I want to talk about this whole mime issue and what can you do and can't you do in a park. The next is Rinconada, the long-term plan. The final is the Buckeye Creek hydrology study update. Is there anything else?

Ms. O'Kane: There's not unless we discuss the Master Plan that's coming to Council as Commissioner Cribbs recommended. I will say these four items could possibly be very lengthy items. We may want to consider even moving one of these out.

APPROVED

1 Chair Reckdahl: If it hadn't been for this mime issue, I would have said push out park
2 dedication. That was for information only. Rinconada long-range plan. Is there
3 anything new on that or is that just an update? That's with the JMZ, isn't it? They
4 dovetail together. Let's either bump out park dedication or Buckeye Creek. Let's figure
5 out with Daren if there's news.

6 Commissioner McDougall: I would be willing to let the Chairman work with staff to
7 determine the agenda.

8 Commissioner Greenfield: Just one question. Regarding Buckeye Creek, is there a
9 schedule to share that with Council that would be impacted by pushing that?

10 Ms. O'Kane: It was supposed to go tonight, and we moved it to August. As Rob said, I
11 think it's fall, but I'd have to check with Daren on that. Probably October is the
12 timeframe.

13 Chair Reckdahl: Let's pencil in and confirm in a couple of weeks. Let's pencil moving
14 the park dedication 1 month back to September. We'll see how we feel in 2 weeks.

15 **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

16 Meeting adjourned on motion by Commissioner McDougall and second by Vice Chair
17 Moss at 10:07 p.m.