



APPROVED

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

**MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
August 22, 2017
CITY HALL
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California**

13 **Commissioners Present:** Anne Cribbs, Jeff Greenfield, Jeff LaMere, Don McDougall, David
14 Moss, and Keith Reckdahl

15 **Commissioners Absent:** Ryan McCauley

16 **Others Present:**

17 **Staff Present:** Daren Anderson, Peter Jensen, Kristen O'Kane, Tanya Schornack

18 **I. ROLL CALL CONDUCTED BY:** Tanya Schornack

19 **II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS:**

20 Chair Reckdahl: Next is Agenda Changes, Requests, Deletions. Does anyone have any
21 changes they want to make? We'll move on to Oral Communications.

22 **III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

23 Chair Reckdahl: We're now going to talk about anything that is not on the agenda
24 tonight. We have one speaker, David Carnahan.

25 David Carnahan: Good evening, Chair Reckdahl and Commissioners. My name is
26 David Carnahan in the City Clerk's Office. You can all guess why I'm here. I'm here to
27 share with you some exciting opportunities available on the City's Boards and
28 Commissions. As you know, these are fantastic ways for members of the community to
29 both give back to Palo Alto and to help shape the future of our fantastic community.
30 We're currently recruiting for the Architectural Review Board, the Historic Resources
31 Board, and the Planning and Transportation Commission. There are two openings on the
32 Architectural Review Board, four on the Historic Resources Board, and two on the
33 Planning and Transportation Commission. Our ask of you is we hope that each one of
34 you is willing to reach out to at least two community members that you think would be a



1 good fit for one of these roles since you have a fantastic reach and are, as we would say,
2 embedded in the community. The application deadline is September 19th at 4:30 p.m.
3 Applications are available on the City Clerk's webpage, cityofpaloalto.org/clerk. I will
4 leave some flyers for each of you to take as a reminder of your homework to reach out to
5 some community members. I will leave some flyers in the back for anyone who is here
6 in the audience interested in either participating yourselves or if you know someone in
7 the community that might be a good fit. Thank you.

8 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you, David. Please, if you have anyone you know that is good,
9 the best Commissioners usually are recommended by other Commissioners. Please, if
10 you have anyone that's sharp, please recommend that they apply for something.

11 [The Commission moved to approval of the minutes.]

12 **IV. DEPARTMENT REPORT**

13 Ms. O'Kane: Thank you. Good evening. Kristen O'Kane, Community Services
14 Department. I have a few things to report. I also wanted to introduce Jazmin LeBlanc, to
15 my right, who I believe you've all met before. Jazmin is Community Services' Strategy
16 and Operations Senior Manager. She's here today just to learn the Commission process
17 and to help me out here as staff. She wants to get to know the different Commissions and
18 the different work that we do a little bit better. She's just going to join me up here today.
19 I have a few things, and then I'll turn it over to Jazmin. I wanted to give a short
20 presentation on our summer camps just to provide a recap of what we've done over the
21 summer. Just looking at camps by the numbers, we've categorized them by different
22 themes. Our total number of camps is nearly 300 that we offered this past summer, for a
23 total of 3,583 total campers. That produced a total revenue of over \$1 million for the
24 City. One of the other benefits of our camps is that we do provide a lot of summer jobs
25 for local teens. We have 38 recreation camp staff onboard with us in the summer. We
26 also provide opportunities for junior camp staff and also a Counselor in Training program
27 to teach some of the younger kids, who will eventually become camp counselors with us,
28 the ropes and get a head start on that. One thing that we're doing is we're really trying to
29 refine our in-service training. The first week of camps is actually just for us to train the
30 counselors. We're adding new things every year. This year we did a lot of diversity and
31 inclusion training. We also review the developmental assets with them, customer service,
32 how to handle conflicts and sticky situations in addition to all the legal requirements
33 we're supposed to do. It really is a great leadership opportunity for them, and they do
34 learn a lot. Recreation camps. Our most popular camps still are our Foothills camps.
35 Some of the traditions that have been going on in those camps for 40 years are still going
36 on. Our overnights at the campground, sing-alongs, hikes, canoeing, all those things are
37 still just part of the Palo Alto community, which is great. We also are in our second
38 year—just finished our second year of doing a teen week out where a small group of



1 teens go to a different location every day for a week and get to experience different
2 things. In addition to our recreation camps, our Art Center as well as our Junior Museum
3 and Zoo also provide a lot of—and our Children's Theatre—exciting opportunities for
4 kids. Some new camps this year in the Art Center were very popular—there were quite a
5 few waiting lists—including one that travels around to different Bay Area museums and
6 artist studios. At the Children's Theatre, the next time you're at Mitchell Park
7 Community Center, you need to check out the teen mural project that was done over the
8 summer. There were also some new camps related to actually producing a musical.
9 They produced the musical *13*. It's just a great opportunity for kids who are interested in
10 the arts to get really hands on and involved in the process. The Junior Museum and Zoo
11 had a great summer, offered some camps that are focused on science-related topics. Just
12 the feedback we got back from them is that this is one of the best summers ever for their
13 camps and got a lot of great feedback from their campers and parents. Finally, I just
14 wanted to do a little summary of what happened over the summer with our swim lessons
15 and swim camps. Spring and summer, we served with Palo Alto Swim and Sports, our
16 third-party operator—over 700 students learned to swim. They report what are called
17 splashes. A splash is every time a student gets in the water. We had over, 7,000
18 splashes. We also had a new camp this summer which is a summer aquatics camp that
19 includes—it's a day camp that includes a swim lesson, time in the water but then also
20 land activities as well to give parents the opportunity to have their kids do a swim lesson
21 but be occupied for the entire day. We had 125 campers, so it wasn't completely full. It
22 is a new camp, and I think we'll continue it next summer hopefully and get the word out
23 that we offer this camp. That's all I had on that. Any questions?

24 Commissioner Cribbs: How many kids did we have to turn away? Do you know? For
25 the camps that were full or oversubscribed.

26 Ms. O'Kane: I don't have that number with me, but I can find out.

27 Commissioner Cribbs: It's probably not easy to get, but it would be interesting to know
28 how many were turned away and then the percentage of Palo Alto residents. I think there
29 are scholarships available for kids. Yes?

30 Ms. O'Kane: The fee reduction program, mm hmm.

31 Commissioner Cribbs: Thank you.

32 Ms. O'Kane: Sometimes when the kids are—if a camp is full, the parents will find
33 another camp for them to go into. That might be a more difficult number to track, but I'll
34 see if we can find that.

1 Commissioner Cribbs: The sports camps that we have, do people go to other sports
2 camps rather than coming to the City's? Do you think that's why there's a lesser
3 enrollment?

4 Ms. O'Kane: I think so. There are a lot more opportunities available for sports camps.
5 That is one that we're noticing a decline in participation over the years. I think it's just
6 because there are so many choices out there.

7 Commissioner Cribbs: It's a great tradition. I'm really glad that you brought this. It's
8 really great to see, and it's great to see the photos and everything. Once again, a good job
9 by rec staff.

10 Ms. O'Kane: Thank you.

11 Commissioner LaMere: Just a quick question. Do you know if the camps do surveys or
12 how do they receive the feedback from the parents? Is it through email or just purely a
13 parent going up to a counselor or someone and making a comment?

14 Ms. O'Kane: It's both. Definitely, we have open communication. If a parent wants to
15 provide a comment to the counselor or anyone, they're welcome to do that. We also do
16 surveys as well.

17 Commissioner McDougall: Kristen, I think congratulations to everyone. I think that's
18 spectacular. I think Tanya lied to me because a copy of that presentation is not in the
19 package. Could we make sure we get that?

20 Ms. O'Kane: Yes.

21 Commissioner McDougall: The reason I ask is any amount of reinforcement and
22 publicity that we could do personally by talking to people about how good the programs
23 are and how well it's done would be useful to everybody.

24 Ms. O'Kane: Absolutely.

25 Vice Chair Moss: I too wanted to know the percentage of Palo Alto residents. Also, the
26 714 students for the lessons, how does that compare with last year and the 7,200
27 splashes? Are we a double or a third or what, a third more?

28 Jazmin LeBlanc: This is Jazmin LeBlanc. I can't remember the exact number that we
29 had last year. I do think it was closer to 4,000 splashes.

30 Chair Reckdahl: That's just due to more offerings or is that due to more recruitment or
31 better publicity?

1 Ms. LeBlanc: I think the main reason is that it's a longer period, and we're offering it at
2 more times. We're really becoming more flexible.

3 Chair Reckdahl: The camps that were full, what was the limiting factor? Is it that we
4 couldn't get more counselors or that we didn't have the space? Or all the above? We
5 don't know how it breaks down.

6 Ms. O'Kane: It's mostly space. We do try to offer a diverse selection for people to
7 choose from, so they can focus on what their kids' interests are. Some camps tend to be
8 more popular than others. We can use that information to make some adjustments the
9 following year.

10 Chair Reckdahl: Like the metal working class that you said was very popular and had a
11 wait list, was that just a space constraint or why couldn't we have multiple versions of
12 that?

13 Ms. O'Kane: I don't exactly know the answer to that, but I'm assuming it's a space
14 constraint and probably instructor constraint.

15 Commissioner LaMere: What's the process of adding a new camp if, say, there's
16 someone in the area that does have an interest in offering a skill or offering something
17 that might be a good camp? What would be the process of referring them to Parks and
18 Rec or who would that be?

19 Ms. O'Kane: They could contact me directly, and I'll get that to the appropriate staff. We
20 get contacted frequently from people who are interested in having some camps in Palo
21 Alto. We look at all of them. Just send them over to me.

22 Commissioner Greenfield: Are we aiming to break even financially with these programs
23 and how did we do on that?

24 Ms. O'Kane: That is our goal for summer camps, to break even on those.

25 Commissioner Greenfield: Do we know if we break even?

26 Ms. O'Kane: We do.

27 Commissioner McDougall: I should have said this initially. I can speak to this
28 personally because both of my sons were camp leaders at one point. The double impact
29 of the impact on the young kids and the leverage for them and then the impact on the kids
30 that are leaders really needs to be reinforced. It's really, really positive.

1 Ms. O'Kane: Thank you. I agree. A lot of campers become the Counselors in Training,
2 and then they become the counselors. It's really neat to hear those stories of kids that
3 have started out and pretty much grown up in Palo Alto's camps.

4 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. We'll move back to business. Next is the Baylands
5 Boardwalk replacement.

6 Ms. O'Kane: Chair, we actually had a few more things on Department Report.

7 Chair Reckdahl: I'm sorry. I am shortchanging you tonight.

8 Ms. O'Kane: Jazmin reminded me. I was right along with you. Just a couple of other
9 quick things. I do want to report that the RFP for the golf course did go out. This is the
10 RFP for golf course operations, maintenance, and also the food and beverage space there
11 as well. That went out yesterday. We are having a pre-bid meeting on August 29th, and
12 then proposals are due September 29th. We're hoping that it will go to Council in
13 December for the final approval of our selection.

14 Chair Reckdahl: Are we sending it to select companies or are we just putting it on the
15 website and hoping that people come?

16 Ms. O'Kane: Both. It's gone out to some companies that we know have that interest, and
17 then we also do our normal advertising. Finally, the last I have is I wanted to let
18 everyone know that the YMCA and the City are partnering again this year on a
19 community health fair. It is September 23rd from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. In the past it's
20 been at Mitchell Park and Mitchell Community Center. This year it's going to be here at
21 City Hall, out on King Plaza. There will be more focused speakers and seminars within
22 City Hall. I can send out that information via email to all of you. I think it's going to be
23 a great event and probably bigger than it was last year.

24 Chair Reckdahl: When is it?

25 Ms. O'Kane: September 23rd. It's a Saturday. Jazmin just has a couple things.

26 Ms. LeBlanc: Yeah, two more things. Just wanted to quickly announce that we're going
27 to be offering a 3-week series of free dance fitness classes out on King Plaza in
28 September as well. Sort of a small-scale, special event called Get Fit. We'll be
29 advertising that later this week. That will be the three Sundays in September after Labor
30 Day weekend, 3:00. Free for anyone to join. It should be really fun. It's likely to be
31 Zumba, LA dancing, and hip hop dance.

32 Chair Reckdahl: Is this something that people register for or you have to drop by?

1 Ms. LeBlanc: Just drop in. It's at King Plaza. Anyone can join in. It's meant to be for
2 all ages. The other thing I wanted to update was quickly on the aquatics contract. Palo
3 Alto Swim and Sport began operations of the lap swim and open swim programs last
4 week. It seems to be coming around relatively smoothly. Still plenty of hiccups.
5 They've already got 137 monthly memberships and had over 450 people drop in for lap
6 and open swims. In terms of the Rinconada Masters contract, that is still an outstanding
7 contract, but Tim Sheeper, the owner and operator of Palo Alto Swim and Sport, and
8 Carol McPherson have had several conversations. They're getting very close to having
9 an agreement.

10 Chair Reckdahl: In the meantime, Masters is just keeping their current ...

11 Ms. LeBlanc: Yeah.

12 Chair Reckdahl: We don't have a contract for that. We're just doing that ...

13 Ms. LeBlanc: It's month to month. My understanding from the Attorney's Office is that
14 it can be ended at any time. We do fall back on that contract.

15 Chair Reckdahl: It'd be nice to get that done.

16 Ms. LeBlanc: Yes. We're all hoping for that quickly.

17 Chair Reckdahl: Otherwise, it seems to be going well? Sheeper's happy with the
18 facilities, and people are happy with the new offerings?

19 Ms. LeBlanc: In general. Obviously, there are people who are unhappy with changes,
20 but most of the comments have been more around just having to get adjusted to a new
21 point of sale system. Hopefully that's going to get a lot better as people do get onboard
22 with the membership program and things.

23 Chair Reckdahl: Refresh my memory. If you have a membership at Palo Alto, can you
24 use that in Menlo Park?

25 Ms. LeBlanc: No, not at the time. It's something that, I think, is worth exploring the
26 feasibility of in the future. Right now, they're totally separate.

27 Chair Reckdahl: At one time, that had been discussed, having reciprocity between the
28 two groups.

29 Ms. LeBlanc: It would make sense. We'd probably have to really work with the
30 Attorney's Office to structure it in a way that works legally for both cities.

31 Chair Reckdahl: Any questions? Anne, do you want ...

1 Commissioner Cribbs: I don't think so. I think we should all wait and see how
2 everything develops and see if it's good for the City and we can provide the kind of
3 service that we want to provide and we have enough lifeguards and we have enough
4 teachers and we have enough swimming lessons and people are using the pool to the
5 max. The fact that it's an 18-month contract I'm encouraged by because we'll all have a
6 chance to review it, I expect.

7 Chair Reckdahl: We should be able to make everyone happy. I don't see any
8 showstoppers. It's just people don't like change. Any other questions? Is that it? Okay.
9 Now we can move on to business.

10 [The Commission moved to Item Number 2.]

11 **IV. BUSINESS:**

12 **1. Approval of Draft Minutes from the July 25, 2017 Parks and Recreation**
13 **Commission meeting.**

14 Approval of the draft July 25, 2017 Minutes was moved by Commissioner McDougall
15 and seconded by Commissioner Cribbs. Passed 6-0 McCauley absent

16 Kristen O'Kane: Chair, could we do the Department Report at the beginning?

17 Chair Reckdahl: I'm sorry. I'm not used to that.

18 Ms. O'Kane: I know. It's a change to the agenda.

19 Chair Reckdahl: You can't teach an old dog new tricks. We were quick on that.
20 Department Report is next then.

21 [The Commission moved to the Department Report.]

22 **2. Baylands Boardwalk Replacement Preliminary Design Update**

23 Chair Reckdahl: We have the Baylands Boardwalk rehab.

24 Megha Bansal: Good evening. I'm Megha Bansal with Public Works Engineering. I
25 would like to introduce our team tonight. We have Elizabeth Ames with Public Works
26 Engineering and John Aikin with Community Services in the audience. Sitting next to
27 me is Anthony Notaro, our consultant with Biggs Cardosa Associates. Tonight, we are
28 here to provide you an update on the Baylands Boardwalk replacement project. Our
29 presentation includes a brief background of the project. We'll be discussing project
30 elements, and we would like your input specifically on certain items including overlooks,
31 railing and decking, benches and viewing panels. Then, we will talk a little bit about

1 schedule and next steps. A little background. As you all know, the Baylands Boardwalk
2 was closed in 2014 due to structural damage and safety concerns. We performed a
3 feasibility study in 2016 to assess the condition of the Boardwalk. That study
4 recommended replacement of the structure to have a longer life, reduce maintenance, an
5 ADA compliant structure, and to address sea level rise. Soon after, in 2015, we also
6 made minor structural repairs in the first 200-foot segment of the Boardwalk, which is
7 now open to the public. We also presented findings of the study to the Commission back
8 in March 2016, and Commission was in favor of replacement of the structure. A design
9 contract was approved by Council with Biggs Cardosa in September 2016, and we
10 developed initial design concepts and presented those in a community meeting in May
11 this year. The next slide shows an overview of the project. It includes all the project
12 elements, which is essentially replacement of the existing Boardwalk with a new
13 Boardwalk that follows the same alignment and that has same length. We will have some
14 other components including additional overlooks and an observation platform, new
15 railing and decking, pile supports, and some amenities. Tony is going to go over the
16 details of the design. With that, I give it to Tony.

17 Anthony Notaro: The first slide just talking about alignment, height, and width. We're
18 going to replace it, exact same alignment. The existing structure is 4 feet wide; we're
19 going to widen it to 5 feet to better provide ADA access and passing lanes. One change
20 since the previous presentation. The elevation of the deck has changed due to sea level
21 rise conditions and our coordination with the BCDC and the other regulatory agencies.
22 They are interpreting the higher end of the curve, so they've raised our upper bound of
23 where we can put the deck elevation. We're proposing to match basically the deck
24 elevation of the existing Nature Center at elevation 13.5.

25 Chair Reckdahl: How much of a change is that?

26 Mr. Notaro: That's about a 3-foot change, I think, from the existing 3, 3 1/2. It's about
27 elevation 10 now plus or minus.

28 Ms. Bansal: I think it is between 3.6 to 4.3 feet higher.

29 Mr. Notaro: The higher end is where the collapse of the existing Boardwalk is. The
30 original constructed height was about elevation 9.9 or 10, so it's about 3 1/2 feet.

31 Chair Reckdahl: The final overlook, the viewing platform?

32 Mr. Notaro: The final overlook at the end, we're just going to take it straight all the way
33 out.

34 Chair Reckdahl: That's unchanged?

1 Mr. Notaro: That would be unchanged, yeah. Instead of ramping down from the Nature
2 Center out and then ramping up at the observation platform, you'd basically go straight
3 out. Another item that had changed since we previously presented. The original concept
4 was to replace in kind, have two overlooks, and the observation platform out at the end.
5 Per discussions internally, with the public and with operations at the Nature Center for
6 seizing opportunities for more interactions with the Baylands site itself, we're proposing
7 four overlooks strategically located to highlight different elements out on the site. Those
8 can be seen on that one exhibit, where the two existing are and where the four are
9 proposed. The structure, we're proposing to use timber railing, a similar style to what
10 was done on the Interpretive Center. The railings will be customized for use on the
11 Boardwalk, since we have a very long, linear structure, a lot of repetition. We're going to
12 design the railings to be constructed in a panelized configuration, which will allow the
13 construction to proceed quicker, less construction work on the site, more work can be
14 done offsite and carried on. The railings will be a minimum of 3 1/2 feet high to meet
15 ADA criteria. One element that we'll look for input from the Commission on has to do
16 with observation panels at the overlooks and the observation platform to allow viewing
17 through the railing. On the Interpretive Center, there are glass panels there. For the
18 Boardwalk itself, in consultation with the biologist we've shrunk the size of those
19 openings to be a little bit smaller, less likely to cause a bird strike farther out where the
20 birds are more active. We have two alternatives to look at. One's a glass panel like on
21 the Interpretive Center. There's also been some discussions about using a wire mesh
22 panel to be the safer alternative for some of the birds. Another change since we spoke
23 last, that came out of our consultation with the biologist and in coordination with the
24 regulatory agencies, is their concern with the higher Boardwalk elevation of raptors
25 perching on the higher railing, giving them an opportunity to hunt the mouse out there.
26 It's been proposed to put what we're calling raptor deterrent rollers. They're basically a
27 roller system. If a bird lands on it, it rolls so they can't just sit and perch. There's a
28 similar system in place at Alviso Park. There's a photo up there of that system.
29 Basically, it's just a roller that sits along the top rail, that would discourage raptors from
30 perching there. Let's see. Another key feature is going to be the decking of the
31 Boardwalk. The existing Boardwalk has longitudinal planks where the key boards are
32 running parallel to the direction of travel. The project's proposed to use a transverse
33 decking system. That's very common on many of the pre-fab bridge structures along the
34 trails. The advantages of that are we get to use a smaller member because you've got a
35 shorter span. That helps us with costs; it helps with maintenance costs down the road
36 because you would be replacing smaller elements. All of the decking elements, we're
37 looking at using redwood similar to what was used for the Interpretive Center. The main
38 structural elements consist of very similar to the existing timber posts or pilings that go
39 down into the Bay muds of the marsh. They'll be capped with timber beams, and then
40 we'll provide timber cross-bracing to provide lateral stability to the system. There will be
41 longitudinal stringers that support the deck elements. All of these primary structural
42 elements, we're proposing to use Alaskan yellow cedar, which is a natural, durable

1 softwood. It mostly comes from Alaska and areas in Canada. That's an alternative to
2 pressure-treated Doug fir, which the regulatory agencies have been strongly discouraging
3 to avoid the chemicals getting into the wetlands. That was a material that's already been
4 used on other projects and approved by them. It was recommended by the Water Board
5 for this project.

6 Chair Reckdahl: One of the options before was the metal screws.

7 Mr. Notaro: The metal screws, when the structure got higher, the cost factor for the
8 metal screws went down. It was no longer cost effective because they're very flexible.
9 The higher we got, the more sway you're going to get out of your system, so we would
10 have to increase the number of elements in shorter spans. We moved away from that.

11 Chair Reckdahl: What type of lifetime do we think we're going to get from these posts?

12 Mr. Notaro: These, we're looking at 50-75 years as the target.

13 Chair Reckdahl: In the mud, we're talking?

14 Mr. Notaro: Yeah, in the mud. The Alaskan yellow cedar is a fairly durable material,
15 and in marine environments, salt water, it also is resistant to marine borers. It has good
16 natural properties. This graphic shows visually what the cross-section of the Boardwalk
17 would be. The elements in more of the yellow/brown are the Alaskan yellow cedar.
18 That's the primary structural elements below. Your walking surface, your decking and
19 your railing, we're going to use heart redwood similar to what was used on the
20 Interpretive Center. We would like to include benches at each of the overlooks and the
21 observation platform. The photos on the left side show what's existing. On the right are
22 just some initial concepts for the proposed benches. We would like to include armrests to
23 help facilitate getting up and down. It's a lot easier for folks. We would have one at each
24 overlook and back-to-back in the center of the observation platform, similar to existing.
25 In accordance with the Site Assessment and Design Guidelines for Palo Alto Baylands
26 Natura Preserve—a long title for your guidelines for out there—all the wood would be
27 stained with this natural gray product from Olympic. Any metal fasteners and
28 components would be painted sandy hook gray from Benjamin Moore, exactly what was
29 done at the Nature Center. We have the opportunity with the follow-on project that
30 there's going to be interpretive signage incorporated into the project at the overlooks and
31 the observation platform. Our design will accommodate some slanted railing that will
32 incorporate the signage in the future. We'll also design the elements to be able to
33 facilitate the attachment of different interpretive features that are being developed by the
34 City separately. The last thing for me, just a reminder of some of our key construction
35 constraints that we're dealing with. Environmentally, because of the Ridgway Rail out
36 there, we have a work window from September 1st to January 31st to stay out of their
37 breeding season. That's one of our key constraints. Hydrologically during that time

1 period, we can expect a high tide usually once or more a month. We're going to have to
2 accommodate some flooding during the course of the project and some loss of workdays.
3 The construction window is in the rainy season, so we've factored in some rain days for
4 our construction estimate. Subsurface conditions, we're in a marsh, very weak soils.
5 That's accommodated in the design of the supports as well as we don't really have a good
6 ability to work from the marsh deck level itself. We've proposed and designed the
7 elements to be small enough to be constructed with small equipment from the Boardwalk
8 itself. The contractor, we would expect, may have to do some localized strengthening to
9 support his operations of the existing before he removes a bit. The plan is to work from
10 the existing Boardwalk. The only caveat to that is access out to there. Instead of going
11 through the nice, newly renovated Nature Center, we need to come around the outside
12 with a series of marsh mats on the marsh level to get the access for the contractor on a
13 daily basis. With that, I think Megha will take over schedule and next steps.

14 Ms. Bansal: Regarding schedule, we have completed preliminary design of the project.
15 We are currently preparing CEQA document. We plan to come back to the Commission
16 for review and recommendation of Park Improvement Ordinance in September during
17 CEQA circulation. What you see on the schedule for agency permit and completion of
18 design by summer 2018 is a best case scenario. We can be in construction next summer
19 in September pending permits. Our more likely scenario is September of 2019 due to the
20 construction window that Tony just mentioned, about 5 months construction window, if
21 we don't get our permit. With that, I think you can ask questions.

22 Chair Reckdahl: Anne, do you have anything?

23 Commissioner Cribbs: I just was curious if the price continues to go up with the changes
24 and then with the delay of the construction. Does it continue to increase?

25 Mr. Notaro: So far we're still projecting to be within the budget constraints that the City
26 has set. Any time the project moves farther out in time, there will be associated potential
27 cost increases. One thing we have done in our design that I had failed to mention is the
28 existing Boardwalk has supports every 10 feet on center along the length. We've
29 increased that with the materials that we've proposed to a 12-foot spacing. We're actually
30 putting in fewer elements than originally estimated in our feasibility study. That has
31 helped to sway some of the additional costs associated with materials and things that have
32 changed.

33 Commissioner Cribbs: Thank you.

34 Ms. Bansal: Also, the panelized construction of railings will make it faster, so we are
35 hoping to complete construction in that one 5-month window. That will also help with
36 construction costs.

1 Commissioner Cribbs: Thank you.

2 Vice Chair Moss: I'm really hoping that you can start September 2018 since we've
3 waited so many years. Is there any way that you can start construction in that 2018
4 timeframe even if you don't have all of the permits yet? Is there some staging or some
5 stuff that you can do ahead of time?

6 Mr. Bansal: I think that is less likely due to our experience with permitting agencies.

7 Vice Chair Moss: Another thing is that a number of things changed because the height
8 level was higher. I was actually hoping that it could stay low enough that once in a while
9 it would flood because that's so dramatic. One of the highlights that people look forward
10 to when they come to the Baylands is to see the flooding that happens once or twice a
11 year. Is there no way—you said that certain agencies required that you be up that high.
12 Do we have to do that?

13 Mr. Notaro: In general, it's been primarily BCDC that's driving that criteria. Their
14 primary goal is they're looking at maintaining access. They want the structure to be high
15 enough to maintain the access. We've approached them about trying to avoid getting it as
16 high. We originally proposed kind of a happy medium between the existing and the
17 current proposed. So far, we haven't had any luck in getting that criteria adjusted.

18 Vice Chair Moss: One other thing, and that is you said that you couldn't use the metal
19 screws because you had to raise it. I also thought that you were going to use the existing
20 base so that you wouldn't have to drill more holes into the mud, that you would use the
21 same holes and that you would build out the Boardwalk from the safety of the existing
22 one, working out, out, out. Is that not going to happen?

23 Mr. Notaro: We're going to use the existing Boardwalk as a working platform to
24 construct the new. Actually the new piles are constructed outboard of the existing
25 Boardwalk so that they can be constructed while the existing Boardwalk's in place.
26 Another benefit of having them outboard is they're out of the shadow zone. The
27 vegetation grows more robustly out there, so there's less erosion. Currently, underneath
28 the existing Boardwalk, with it being low there's a heavy shadow, and nothing grows. A
29 channel has formed with the water coming in and out. That's been part of the problem
30 with why the structure had failed in the first place. It lost some of that support.

31 Vice Chair Moss: It's really going to be in the same spot; it's just going to be wider.

32 Mr. Notaro: Yes, same spot. In the very back of our presentation, there's the anticipated
33 construction staging. The first one is the existing Boardwalk. The contractor does
34 whatever minor repairs he needs to be able to move his equipment out on it. The second
35 one shows the piles being put in outboard of existing. When we no longer need the—

1 then, they'll work their way backwards, remove the existing as they're building the cross
2 frames so that stay out of the marsh to the greatest extent possible.

3 Vice Chair Moss: On the sidings, you said they could either use the bird deterrent glass,
4 which seemed like an oxymoron, or the wire mesh. I would hope that you would go with
5 the wire mesh because it seemed like you're making it much more difficult to see down in
6 there. There's more stuff between the kids and the marsh. If you have the mesh, you can
7 actually see straight through the mesh. If you have a glass thing, it's going to get
8 scratched, it's going to change its opacity over time. It'll just be that much more difficult
9 for people to look down in there, especially little kids. The last thing is the raptor roller.
10 You know that the raptors, the majority of them, are going to be on that Boardwalk that
11 PG&E uses or they fly over the marsh hawks, the harriers. They just fly over, and the
12 herons land in there. I'm dubious that that's going to work, but you say it's in action
13 already. What do you ...

14 Mr. Notaro: We've had numerous debates internally with the City and the design team
15 and the biologists on that very issue. It will come down to really the coordination with
16 the regulatory agencies and what they will allow. To some extent, because there is that
17 other project, there's a precedent which they rarely relax their requirements once they've
18 gotten it out of somebody before. We'll continue to work to reduce that. I did talk them
19 out of—everywhere I've got a horizontal piece of wood that sticks out, like at each of the
20 bents in the piles, they wanted bird deterrents out there. I talked them out of that. That's
21 sufficiently low that they won't perch there to hunt. We're making every effort to try and
22 glean back as much as we can.

23 Vice Chair Moss: That's all I had.

24 Commissioner LaMere: Just a quick question. You said that the expected life of the
25 project is 50-75 years. Is that correct?

26 Mr. Notary: Yes, that's the target life.

27 Commissioner LaMere: Some of that has to—is there a way—does that have to do with
28 the choice of the wood and how it goes into the mud? What's the maintenance on
29 something like that to keep it going?

30 Mr. Notary: In our mind, the key elements are going to be the timber post piles. From
31 our understanding, that's an area where the City had spent most of their budget in the
32 past. Although, there were, I think, some issues with the existing railing because you had
33 a lot of metal components in that. There was some problems with that and the detail of
34 how that got connected down at the base. There was a lot of splitting of those particular
35 boards. We've tried to be strategic in some of the details we're using to avoid the things

1 that had trouble in the past on the project and taking a lot of cues from what's out at the
2 Interpretive Center.

3 Commissioner LaMere: That's all I have.

4 Commissioner Greenfield: It's a very comprehensive plan and very well thought out. I
5 applaud you for that. I like the accounting for sea level rise—that's very important given
6 the projected lifetime of the project—also the environmental considerations during
7 construction. I like the traverse plank decking plan that you've suggested. A question on
8 the glass panels versus the wire mesh. I'm wondering is the Interpretive Center happy
9 with the glass panels that they put in. Said another way, if they had to do it over again,
10 would they put the glass panels in or would they put the wire mesh in? That would seem
11 to go a long ways towards answering what to recommend putting there.

12 John Aikin: Hi. John Aikin, City of Palo Alto. We are happy with them. The
13 instructors that give me feedback for the classes that they're taking out there say that the
14 kids gravitate to those glass panels to be able to see out because the pickets are a natural
15 barrier. They're a little bit more maintenance for us, especially when the swallows are
16 nesting and pooping on things, but we're happy with them. One of the issues with
17 continuing that design further out into the marsh, though, is you have more nocturnal
18 species in the marsh that can't see the glass that is designed to reflect UV light. The
19 agency has asked us to narrow that down and perhaps put other kinds of designs on there
20 so that nocturnal birds can see them. We're trying to improve visibility for humans but
21 take visibility away for birds so they don't strike it. One of the things about mesh is
22 horizontal lines human eyes have a harder time seeing through. If we end up going with
23 the mesh design, we may look at a hexagonal pattern or a vertical pattern or something
24 just to try and maximize visibility for people because that's really the goal.

25 Commissioner Greenfield: Thank you. I was definitely wondering how clean does the
26 glass stay and how much of a problem is that. It sounds like it's manageable.

27 Mr. Aikin: It stays relatively clean. It's actually sort of self-cleaning glass; it sheets stuff
28 off, but we have to go out and clean it off every once in a while too.

29 Commissioner Greenfield: Regarding the deterrent roller rails, it sure seems like a wood
30 railing would be preferable if we can swing that. It sounds like we're considering the
31 roller rails if we're basically tasked to do so. We wouldn't do that unless we had to; is
32 that a correct assessment?

33 Mr. Notaro: I would agree we'd like to avoid them if we can talk them out of it. We'll
34 keep putting that pressure and see where that takes us.

1 Commissioner Greenfield: Full speed ahead on that one. I like the armrests on the
2 benches. I just wanted to confirm that, given the examples that you have, the benches
3 will be looking out towards the view so the back of the bench will be closest to the main
4 part of the path.

5 Ms. Bansal: Yes.

6 Commissioner Greenfield: I think that's reflected in the drawings. It's just ...

7 Ms. Bansal: Yeah, it is reflected on the drawings.

8 Commissioner Greenfield: There was some mention of using the FSC wood for the
9 Alaskan yellow cedar. I'm wondering if that's something that the City has done before or
10 has considered doing or has elected not do because of cost considerations or if this is
11 something new that's available.

12 Mr. Notaro: I just want to make sure I understand. The plastic composite wood, is that
13 what you're talking about?

14 Commissioner Greenfield: No, the Forest Stewardship Council approved wood.

15 Mr. Notaro: Got you. I'm not aware if the City has done that before. They did have me
16 specifically talk to the mills or the suppliers. The ones that I've spoken to have indicated
17 when you use the FSC it basically drops you down to—about 15 percent of the mills will
18 certify. For the Alaskan yellow cedar in particular, it's a tree that's naturally in decline at
19 the moment because of environmental changes, temperature changes and things. The
20 material is good for up to 80 years after the tree dies, so they're currently harvesting
21 primarily a lot of these stands of the trees that have died. There is a general supply out
22 there. Also in talking with them on the FSC, there will be a—if you go that route, there is
23 a premium that you pay for that. That would be estimated about 10-15 percent price
24 point, and it takes about—because of the fewer mills, you need an extra month basically
25 in lead time for acquiring the material. That may have a factor as to when we can get the
26 design done and out to bid. We just need to factor that far enough in advance to account
27 for that extra time.

28 Commissioner Greenfield: Is time more of a consideration than cost at this point?

29 Mr. Notaro: I guess it depends on when we get everything finalized and can get it out to
30 bid.

31 Commissioner Greenfield: Last question. How confident are we that we can complete
32 the project within the 5-month window? What can we do to help ensure this can be
33 accomplished?

1 Mr. Notaro: I did take a close look at it. We've consulted with our hydrology consultant
2 to find out a reasonable number of rain delays and potential flood days. We've looked at
3 breaking it down into work crews and structure. One of our key components is
4 panelizing the railing system. Basically, each 12-foot length between the supports, we'd
5 bring out a panelized piece that's constructed offsite. We use the top rail to tie all of
6 those panels together, so we'd have a longer top rail. It's all attached to the side rim joist.
7 That's one of our key factors in shortening our work window. Based on the numbers we
8 have so far, we're optimistic that we can do that. I have a little bit of float in the
9 schedule. I do need to still, as the design develops, vet it with some more folks in our
10 office and things. Yeah, we definitely want to try and do everything we can to help hit
11 that window.

12 Commissioner Greenfield: If we had a rainy season like we had this past year, would that
13 make this fairly difficult to accomplish? The second part of the question is, if we get 80
14 percent completed and we run out of time, what happens. We just have an 80-percent
15 completed project sitting there for 7 months and then we can get back to it?

16 Mr. Notaro: That would be likely; however, the first 200 feet is open. They would be
17 utilizing that existing structure throughout their construction. We figure they'll be
18 working back from the platform in. There is the opportunity, if we can get it far enough
19 back so that you have to winterize it but we can get it far enough back to the existing
20 portion that was still structurally sound and can stay open, then we could facilitate a
21 transition from the old to the new, a temporary one, at the end of our construction
22 window.

23 Commissioner Greenfield: Thank you.

24 Commissioner McDougall: Or you might just have one 12-foot gap that you had to jump
25 over for 7 months or something.

26 Mr. Notaro: Spring board.

27 Commissioner McDougall: Your first question in the presentation was the number of
28 overlooks, and nobody's spoken to that. In the presentation, you talked about the
29 different interaction—you talked about interaction with the Baylands, and you talked
30 about the different kinds of elements. I don't mean to be cynical or whatever, but it's all
31 Baylands. I'm not sure that there are different elements as you go. You could create
32 different stories; I agree with that. We have no evidence of the cost of having four bulb-
33 outs or whatever you want to call them, overlooks, as opposed to just one. I would
34 personally vote for fewer. That would reduce the cost and would allow us to get it done
35 faster, if that ever became a question. My second is it wasn't in the presentation that you
36 did today, but it was in the material that we had ahead of time. We're providing PG&E

1 access to their platforms along the way. My question is has anybody asked PG&E what
2 their participation in paying for this is.

3 Ms. Bansal: We have not.

4 Commissioner McDougall: I don't know that anybody here could answer that, but I
5 would think that, if we're providing PG&E access, it would be kindly of them to help.

6 Ms. Bansal: We are planning to meet with PG&E to discuss about that interface, where
7 their catwalk crosses over our Boardwalk. We have not discussed about them paying for
8 ...

9 Commissioner McDougall: I don't know why we wouldn't ask. I would encourage us to
10 ask. Frankly, I'm going to ask you again later how much they're paying. I don't think we
11 should just give it to them without the question. In terms of the rollers that spin or
12 spinning rollers on the handrails, I'm both skeptical, as other people have suggested here,
13 about the importance of that. Although, eliminating raptors' opportunities, if we can—I
14 don't know what percentage we're eliminating. I think that's important. If you go to
15 Byxbee, where there are all the signage holders—there's no signs but signage holders—
16 they're all covered in guano or whatever you want to call it at this point. It's obvious that
17 that's where they will sit or birds will sit. If we cover all of the rails, but still in your
18 picture here it shows the signage platform, all you're going to do is make it so that we
19 know exactly where the birds are going to sit. They're going to sit on the signs. I'd like
20 to hear at some point a more complete explanation of, if we put rails on 90 percent of it,
21 does that solve the problem because the birds just sit on the other 10 percent. They're not
22 stupid. What we're trying to protect is—another comment is in the documents we had, it
23 said several endangered species. I don't know that there's really several as opposed to
24 two. Certainly, the CEQA for the Buckeye Creek was pretty definitive in terms of what it
25 was. I don't know at what point will we define how much we're trying to protect. My
26 lack of success in seeing Clapper Rails or Ridgway Rails as you call them today tells me
27 they're pretty rare and the same with the mouse. I'm all for protecting it; I'd just like to
28 see better definition. The conversation about whether we're using wire mesh or
29 plexiglass, one of the things that's incredibly successful in the Environmental Volunteers'
30 EcoCenter is the plexiglass in the floor, not just the plexiglass on the wall. I would like
31 to hear if we've explored that at the overlooks or at the far end, if there was an
32 opportunity to do that. I realize from what was previously mentioned that would
33 probably be a maintenance issue because people will step on it or whatever. You don't
34 have to put it on the pathway; you can put it to the side or whatever. Maybe you have to
35 replace it every 3 years. I don't know what it would be, but it's certainly an effective way
36 to allow people to really get a close look. My other comment is I would agree with the
37 comment that, if we—I think more than one comment's about if we didn't have to go to
38 13 1/2 feet, I'd sure like to not go to 13 1/2 feet. All of a sudden this feels like the New

1 York—what do you call it where you're on the old railway line, and you're 30 feet above
2 the ground? I'm a little worried that we're going to lose that contact, that interaction that
3 you talked about with the Baylands if we do that. My last comment would be about the
4 cedar. I think the issue is 50 years later we not only know a lot more about which woods
5 are good for this kind of thing, but care a lot more about which woods are good for this
6 kind of thing. I understand why it's cedar at this point, and I would applaud that. Thank
7 you. I think this is really good work, so I'm really excited about getting it done.

8 Chair Reckdahl: I have a couple of complaints. One complaint being just the height.
9 You'll lose that connection to the Baylands. Is there any way that we can lower that
10 down or at some of the overlooks have some steps that go down? Are there panels down
11 below that the kids could go down and see? When you're that far up, you can't see the
12 pickleweed at all. If you get down close, you get a much different view than if you're up
13 10 feet above. Even if we can't do the whole thing at the height, can we have portions
14 that go down to provide the close viewing of the pickleweed? Next is the schedule.
15 When I look at the schedule, it says agency permits—first of all, I'm surprised that Don
16 didn't catch this, fall 2017 to summer 2018. It would be nice to have a little bit of
17 resolution on that. It kind of scares me that we're doing the permitting and then starting
18 construction right after the permitting. We're really susceptible to permitting delays. Is
19 there anything that we can do to feed the preliminary designs to the permitting agencies
20 so they can get a first cut through and then, when we get the final designs, we can get it to
21 them? We know it's not going to change dramatically.

22 Ms. Bansal: At this point, we are hoping to—we cannot submit applications for
23 permitting before CEQA is circulated and approved. The reason you'll see these seasons
24 right now is it's a wide range. We will have some more, better understanding of the
25 months or definitive dates maybe in a couple of months. We are currently anticipating 7-
26 8 months of permitting, maybe by April if we do circulation in September or October.
27 Then, we can continue working on the design to progress it to 100-percent design, and
28 then we will have a couple of months for sending the project out to bid and award
29 construction contract. That's our best case. We are still hoping for that.

30 Chair Reckdahl: CEQA is scheduled to end in December.

31 Ms. Bansal: End of December, but that would be approval of CEQA document. It may
32 be November; it depends on when the CEQA is circulated. This is just giving you more
33 conservative schedule.

34 Chair Reckdahl: When we look at all these things, are there things we can do in parallel?
35 What can we do to push this to the left? If you had to push this to the left, what would
36 you attack?

1 Ms. Bansal: I think what we can do at this point in parallel is continue design, but we
2 cannot submit any application for review, any permitting application, before CEQA is
3 circulated and the comment period ends.

4 Chair Reckdahl: That CEQA has to have the final design on it?

5 Ms. Bansal: No, it doesn't have to have final design. The design we currently have
6 would be adequate for CEQA.

7 Chair Reckdahl: Can we start the CEQA right now?

8 Ms. Bansal: Yeah. We are working on the CEQA document right now.

9 Chair Reckdahl: When will that be released?

10 Ms. Bansal: We are hoping sometime in September or latest in October.

11 Chair Reckdahl: Can we pull that to the left at all?

12 Ms. Bansal: I'm sorry?

13 Chair Reckdahl: Can we make that start earlier?

14 Ms. Bansal: Probably not. Maybe mid-September is the best case I can think of.

15 Chair Reckdahl: The Baylands Boardwalk is probably the most common thing that
16 people complain to me about. They say, "It's been closed forever. What's taking so
17 long?" The public just doesn't appreciate this hoop jumping that we have to go through.
18 Still, can we do anything to make the hoop jumping go faster? This whole project, we've
19 been too happy just letting it slip. It'll get done when it gets done. Every year that goes
20 by is one more year that the kids don't get to see it. The kids grow up, and they don't
21 appreciate it anymore. You're missing a generation here.

22 Ms. Bansal: We will try to have some initial discussion with permitting agencies. We
23 will discuss with their environmental consultant and see if we can feed in some
24 information to them about the design. We can get back to you on that.

25 Chair Reckdahl: Anything that we can accelerate this. Anything we can start right now,
26 I think, we'd be well served to do that. I really want to make—I agree with David. I
27 really want to see the 2018 start.

28 Ms. Bansal: We are trying for that.

1 Vice Chair Moss: If it goes to October 2018 or November 2018, can we go halfway out
2 by January 31, 2019, and finish it up the following year or do we have to do all or
3 nothing?

4 Mr. Notaro: The problem with the halfway out is we've only got existing Boardwalk that
5 goes 25 percent out, that's open. We need to target, if we're going to split it, try and get it
6 back all the way up to the current open portion. We'd have to try and construct 75
7 percent.

8 Vice Chair Moss: You're going from the outside in. I'm thinking to go from the inside
9 out.

10 Mr. Notaro: I see. If you go from inside—if we have a ...

11 Commissioner McDougall: Or go from the middle in, in the first tranche and then go
12 from the total end to the middle.

13 Mr. Notaro: If we're resigned to a two-season construction, then you have the ability to
14 build out from the one end. Then, you would have use of half of the structure for January
15 to September. You'd lose it again until they finish the construction. Yeah, that is a
16 feasible option, I think, from the staging we can do.

17 Commissioner McDougall: If it's 3 years, a third.

18 Mr. Notaro: We don't want to go that route.

19 Commissioner McDougall: The other thing I would suggest is that communications and
20 marketing about the status needs to be part of the plan and the scheduling that you have
21 there. To the Chairman's point, people are frustrated, and part of that frustration is lack
22 of understanding of what's happening.

23 Ms. Bansal: We will make sure that we ...

24 Commissioner McDougall: There needs to be a Facebook page for the Boardwalk or
25 something.

26 Ms. Bansal: Absolutely.

27 Commissioner Cribbs: This is crazy probably. Is there any way that somebody at CEQA
28 could understand about the nesting birds and the short season that we have to construct
29 this and give us some sort of go, start? Did we ever ask that? I know you're not
30 supposed to be able to do anything until you have the design and have it submitted and
31 having CEQA review it. Because not everybody has this issue about the nesting birds

1 here with only—what is it—5 months for construction, can we not get some sort of
2 variance or a pass or something?

3 Ms. Bansal: I do not think that is possible with the permitting agencies. When we were
4 doing Interpretive Center, we had the same limitations. Maybe we can do a 6-day work
5 during construction. We can incorporate something like that to expedite construction.

6 Commissioner McDougall: I'm afraid it's only because they understand. They do
7 understand the nesting birds; that's the problem.

8 Ms. O'Kane: It's a matter of complying with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. It would be
9 a violation of a federal law.

10 Chair Reckdahl: If we go outside of that range, you're saying?

11 Ms. O'Kane: Yeah.

12 Chair Reckdahl: Anything that you can do to move things in parallel, to do things
13 iteratively instead of just waiting for the final and passing it on would be very good for
14 the project.

15 Ms. Bansal: We will make sure—we will work with our consultant, and we will also
16 have discussion with permitting agencies.

17 Chair Reckdahl: You're coming back next month for the PIO?

18 Ms. Bansal: We are planning for that.

19 Chair Reckdahl: That PIO will have the final design or is that ...

20 Ms. Bansal: It will still have preliminary design but all the project components and scope
21 of the project.

22 Chair Reckdahl: The PIO then will go to Council thereafter. Council has funding
23 arranged? We don't have to ask for funding on this. This is ...

24 Ms. Bansal: The design funding is in the CIP, and \$1 million is in 2019 fiscal year
25 budget, already in the budget.

26 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. We appreciate it.

27 Ms. Bansal: Thank you very much.

28 Commissioner McDougall: Is the presentation that you gave available on the website for
29 us?

1 Ms. Bansal: We will make it available tomorrow.

2 Commissioner McDougall: Could you do one thing for me? Could you add your names
3 to the front page?

4 Ms. Bansal: Absolutely.

5 Commissioner McDougall: If you do that, that would give some of us the opportunity if
6 we were meeting with Council Members to make sure that we were lobbying and helping
7 them understand what we're trying to do here.

8 Ms. Bansal: Thank you.

9 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you.

10 **3. Review of the Rinconada Park and Junior Museum & Zoo Long Range Plan**
11 **and Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration**

12 Chair Reckdahl: The next is Rinconada Park and Junior Museum and Zoo Long Range
13 Plan and draft. Peter Jensen will be talking about that.

14 Peter Jensen: Good evening, Commissioners. Peter Jensen, Landscape Architect for the
15 City of Palo Alto. We're going to go through a presentation tonight for the Rinconada
16 Long Range Plan as well as touch on the environmental work that is associated with the
17 project in conjunction with the Long Range Plan. Because the Zoo facility of the Junior
18 Museum and Zoo is within the boundaries of the park, the two projects were tied
19 together. We'll be touching some on that as well because the environmental report ties
20 those two things and starts to look at the development of the Long Range Plan and what's
21 recommended in that as well as the proposed Junior Museum and Zoo development,
22 which you've seen recently and will see again. I'm going to go through a presentation.
23 We'll go through the Long Range Plan first. When we're done with that, I think we can
24 do questions specifically to the Long Range Plan. I'll do a short presentation very similar
25 to the Master Plan CEQA work that we did there, the environmental work, and then we
26 can answer questions about that as well. John Aikin is here from the Junior Museum and
27 Zoo. If there are specific questions about that, they can address those as well. Just go
28 through the presentation here. The Rinconada Long Range Plan started in 2012. It was
29 put together to review and evaluate the park and make recommendations on the future
30 development and improvements of the park. It went through a full design and
31 community outreach process, which we can talk about that schedule. The goals of the
32 Rinconada Long Range Plan were to create a better connection and awareness to all the
33 community facilities that exist around and within the park; coordinate and update the
34 park resources and amenities to reflect the current and future needs of park users and
35 guests; respond to park usage as it relates to the surrounding uses and the neighborhood;

1 also to address building and ADA Codes and to coordinate the user group objectives.
2 This is a schedule of the process that was undertaken for the Long Range Plan. It
3 included several meetings with the Parks and Rec Commission as well as the community.
4 A stakeholder group was also involved; that was made up of representatives of the
5 facilities around that, some City staff including the Children's Library, Lucie Stern, the
6 Junior Museum and Zoo, the Art Center, the Library as well as the community groups
7 that use the park regularly including the swimmers, the tennis association, the Girl
8 Scouts, the Boy Scouts and the like. You can see that in the process of 2012 and 2013
9 the major work was done to put the Long Range Plan together. At that point, the CEQA
10 work started. Like I said, it was tied to the JMZ project. That project has been under
11 development. If you've been on the Commission for a while, I think you've seen it a few
12 times over the last few years. Getting that design finalized to a point where we could
13 embark on the CEQA work has dictated the schedule we've been on. If you'd like to see
14 more information on the project, the project webpage does have all the presentations that
15 went along with the process of the project. In general, what we found from the
16 community was that the community wanted to maintain the park pretty much as it is
17 today. The Plan does a good job of addressing that need. The actual—let's see here. The
18 actual park and how it's broken down into its pieces in the Long Range Plan are known as
19 the park elements. Those park elements that were really reviewed were the pedestrian
20 and bicycle circulation, the gateways into the park, the playground areas, the area around
21 the Girl Scout house which is the location of the only group picnic area in Rinconada
22 Park, the main lawn area, the tennis courts, the pool area, the part that runs along the
23 street frontage along Embarcadero known as the arboretum because of the existing
24 mature trees that are there including an historic or heritage oak tree number two for the
25 City of Palo Alto which is a 200-year-old oak tree, the concrete bowl, the Magical Forest,
26 the substation perimeter, and then the Hopkins Street frontage. If you had an opportunity
27 to take a look at the Long Range Plan report, it broke down the park into these elements,
28 and then they discussed what the recommendations were for future either maintaining or
29 improving those spaces. One of the neat parts about Rinconada Park is that it does sit in
30 the middle of very diverse facilities for the City. I named them previously . It does act as
31 the hub. One of the main factors for the Long Range Plan was looking at the circulation
32 through the park and how it could be enhanced to connect the facilities that do exist
33 around the park. This diagram was put together looking at the different levels of paths
34 that are there. The yellow is the primary pathway that's connecting from the Library over
35 to the Lucie Stern Center, which would be a more enhanced walkway. The orange
36 represents some secondary walkways that feed into the main walkway. The purple are a
37 level below that, that are connecting the secondary pathways together. It was very
38 important—we looked at actually two different designs for the main pathway in the
39 process of the Master Plan's development. One that followed and went more towards the
40 Hopkins side. It was felt by the Commission, staff, and the community that the more
41 direct link through the middle of the park currently, very similar to what it is now, would
42 be the way to maintain that. I would like to say too that in the development of the Junior



1 Museum and Zoo plan that we've developed a better connection from Middlefield Road
2 into the park, which is a great enhancement from what we started to look at in the Long
3 Range Plan a few years ago. It's also interesting to note too because you've seen the
4 process of the Parks Master Plan for all the parks. This is a Long Range Plan, which is
5 very similar to that, even though it was put together a few years ago. In the process of
6 time, things change and evolve. You'll see that the parking lot design shown in the plans
7 here is not what is being proposed today. It's been tweaked a little bit because of the
8 more intense design process that has gone into the Junior Museum and Zoo. The
9 recommendations of the Plan over time will be something that we can revisit. The
10 majority of them are very good recommendations that don't impact the park a lot but add
11 the amenities we need there. Like the Master Plan, it is an evolving document, and it's
12 not totally set in stone. I'm going to go through four slides here. Each one of them
13 represents a different aspect of the recommendations to the park. This one is the existing
14 park element to be enhanced. These are things that exist currently in the park, and the
15 recommendation is what we can do to improve them slightly. The first one is the open
16 turf area. That's talking about maintaining that space as it is now. That's a very
17 important area of the park. It's used for large group gatherings. We would like to
18 maintain that. We'd like to improve the irrigation and drainage of that site to make it
19 more usable and to make it more sustainable. The children's playground to the west, right
20 behind the Girl Scout house, will remain in that location with continued equipment
21 upgrades and ADA upgrades as we deal with playgrounds over time. The multiuse
22 concrete bowl will maintain its current form, adding some amenities like power. That
23 can be used more as a performance space that it doesn't have the opportunity now. The
24 arboretum area would be to address removing the turf in those spaces to help mostly the
25 existing oak trees that are there. The tennis courts, a slight shift of the tennis courts to
26 allow a pathway. We'll talk about that pathway in the future. If you walk through
27 Rinconada Park in that location, you have to circumvent the well site and through the
28 Magical Forest to get to the pool. That seems to be a popular path to get to the pool, and
29 we'd like to make that an actual, real path that addresses some safety and access concerns
30 at that point. The pool area, maintaining the pool area and expanding the deck. The
31 Long Range Plan doesn't delve into a recommendation of expanding the pool. I think we
32 all realize that that is an option to do in the future if that is decided. What the Long
33 Range Plan does do is expand the pool deck around the pool to provide the opportunity to
34 have a full-size, 50-meter pool installed there. Of course, when we talk about the
35 implementation over the long range, we can talk about when we're planning on doing that
36 and the cost of doing such a thing. The group picnic area adjacent to the Girl Scout
37 house will remain, just be enhanced with new tables and a new trash receptacle area to
38 remove the dumpsters from that area. The Girl Scout house location would remain the
39 same with some added amenities there. We are proposing to add some type of fire pit
40 area that would replicate the Boy Scout house fire pit area to provide the same amenities
41 to the Girl Scout house. The main loop walkway, we would maintain that. We've heard
42 from a lot of community members that the pathway around the main turf area is used as



1 an exercise facility, so we want to maintain that circular pathway and even have the
2 opportunity to increase the distance of it. These next items are existing elements in the
3 park to be impacted more by their improvements or renovations. This includes the
4 children's tot lot. Currently, that children's tot lot is closer to the tennis courts under an
5 existing heritage oak tree. It's not the greatest location in association with that oak tree
6 because of the compaction and just the hard playing that's happening under it. The Plan
7 is proposing to relocate that tot lot closer to the Girl Scout house, combine it with the
8 existing children's playground over there. The other reason for doing that is it allows
9 caregivers the opportunity for their kids to play in one location without having to watch
10 in two far locations. Providing a new restroom structure. The current one that's in the
11 middle of the park, we'd like to remove that aspect because it does block a key view
12 straight through the park that's connecting all the elements. That would be done by
13 adding on a new aspect of the pool building for a restroom facility there. We'd have to
14 have a new restroom building structure anyway to meet current ADA standards. Moving
15 that, like I said, out of the line of sight would be beneficial. The fencing around Walter
16 Hays School, enhancing that somewhat. Right now, it's chain link, and it does take up
17 quite a bit of view out there. It's not the most pleasant. That could definitely be
18 addressed. Creating a better connection to the rear of Walter Hays School, we heard that
19 a lot from the community. A lot of the students from Walter Hays actually come in
20 through the backside, through the park. There's not really a direct path to get you to that
21 gate. We looked at doing that as well. The reconfiguration of the Lucie Stern/Rinconada
22 parking lot, which is hard to figure out and drive through. Looking at renovating that to
23 make it a better and safer experience. This next slides discusses the new improvements
24 to the park that don't exist there now. That would be the addition of two new group
25 picnic areas. As I mentioned before, Rinconada Park only has one designated group
26 picnic area now. There is demand to have more group picnic areas. One of those
27 locations is behind the tennis courts, which there are picnic tables there now. This would
28 just be a more organized and larger group picnic area out along Hopkins on the west side
29 of the tennis courts. That development with that picnic area in the Long Range Plan is
30 proposed to have a covered picnic shelter. The tennis association has shown interest in
31 wanting to develop that and help fund that structure. The local tennis group uses
32 Rinconada as their main facility. They hold tournaments out there. They don't really
33 have a check-in or a place for their committee to meet. Along with funding that, they
34 have requested that the structure have a room for them to use for storage and for their
35 meeting and also have an outdoor area that larger groups can meet. It also could be used
36 by the community when they are not using it for picnic purposes. The next one is called
37 out for bocce courts.

38 Chair Reckdahl: Where would this new building be?

39 Mr. Jensen: It's right next to the tennis courts, right here.



1 Chair Reckdahl: That's where the tot lot is right now.

2 Mr. Jensen: The tot lot is more underneath the oak tree, but it's right adjacent to it. The
3 bocce courts and the group picnic area are in this area adjacent between the pool and the
4 power substation. The Plan recommends to activate that area and to provide some type of
5 usable activity in that space. Bocce is an option. When we get closer to developing that
6 space and when we get it on the books as a CIP to do the project there, we'll have further
7 discussions about what that space is actually going to be developed as. We want to add
8 two trash enclosures. If you've been through the park, you'll see that the dumpsters are
9 scattered around. We want to make a specific place for them that is more concealed, that
10 trucks coming to pick them up can more easily access than where they are now.
11 Developing a better plaza outside the pool area, providing adult exercise equipment in the
12 park associated with the playgrounds, providing entry monuments at the entries, mostly at
13 the entry from Rinconada parking lot and then from the Newell Street entry. The idea is
14 to either use art or some type of structure or architecture there to highlight that those are
15 the main entries. From the parking lot or from across the street at the Library and Art
16 Center on the Newell side, you would very clearly see where the entryway to the main
17 connection pathway that leads you through the park. Developing a new walkway along
18 Newell, along the power substation. Right now, along Newell there is a stand of redwood
19 trees that are planted underneath the high voltage lines there. Continuously they are
20 topped every few years because they, of course, cannot grow up into the high voltage
21 lines. Unfortunately, the redwood tree is known for its height and columnar form; it's not
22 that way anymore. That continuous cutting of the tree like that will eventually lead to the
23 tree's demise. What we would like to do there is actually remove the redwood trees from
24 that location, pull the walkway off the back of the curb and get it more towards the
25 middle of the space, have it more meandering in that space, much more of a nicer
26 pedestrian walk that's leading you from the corner to the main walkway, and then
27 replacing the tree planting in there with a more appropriate size for the power lines,
28 native trees in re-treeing that area to help conceal the power substation there.

29 Chair Reckdahl: Where are those trees on the map?

30 Mr. Jensen: That area would be right along here.

31 Chair Reckdahl: (inaudible)

32 Mr. Jensen: Right along Newell. If you're standing at the Art Center/Library and you're
33 looking right here, you're looking right at that row of trees. Of course, for sustainability
34 purposes we'd like to address removing some of the turf area that's out there, especially in
35 spaces where it's not really usable, on the edges, and also capturing and filtering of storm
36 water onsite. We have an opportunity to do that as well. The last slide for improvements
37 are the recommended street improvements around Rinconada Park. Most of these have
38 started to occur already. Like I said, we started to do this back in 2012 and 2013. You'll

1 see actually a project right now going on, on Middlefield at the Lucie Stern Center.
2 That's adding an enhanced walkway there. That was one of the aspects and
3 recommendations of the Long Range Plan. A few years ago, an enhanced walkway was
4 installed on Newell between the Art Center and the park. We'd like to also add an
5 enhanced shuttle stop along Newell. There's one there now; it's basically a park bench.
6 We talked about covering it or making it special somehow in that location. If you've
7 been to the park, there's head-in parking that runs along Hopkins. There is a location
8 now towards the west. If you move towards Lucie Stern, that parking could have the
9 opportunity to be expanded to give a few more parking spaces over there that would start
10 to address some of the tennis and pool users, to give them a little bit more flexibility with
11 our parking to use those facilities. The next few slides I'll go through show the ideas
12 behind implementation. The Long Range Plan is set up to be developed over a 25-year
13 period. That's mostly based on economics and getting all the money necessary to
14 renovate the park. We're looking at doing a project there every 3-5 years to fulfill the
15 Long Range Plan. It will go through the process just as the projects of the Master Plan go
16 through our standard CIP where the projects will be on the books. We know we want to
17 do these things in Rinconada Park, and we will discuss them and address them every year
18 to try to get them into the calendar. These next slides, like I said, focus on what those
19 phases will be. That first phase looks at the west end of the park. It's more in association
20 with the development of the Junior Museum and Zoo. While that project is going on, of
21 course, we want to renovate the parking lot and then renovate some of the amenities that
22 are down there like the playground. That constitutes the first phase of the project. We'd
23 like to finish enhancing the pathway that runs through the park, since that is one of the
24 main objectives of the Long Range Plan, which would focus on Phase 2. We'd look at
25 the development of the space in front of the pool as well as the development of the
26 second group picnic area. The third phase starts to look at the main lawn and renovating
27 that space as well as developing the third group picnic area and the covered picnic trellis
28 with renovations also to the Newell walkway, completing the connection of the walkway
29 along Hopkins. That, I guess, is a two-phase thing. Currently there is no sidewalk along
30 the Magical Forest section, which is this section right here. It has the decomposed
31 granite pathway. We'd like to connect the concrete path from there to there, so it is a
32 continuous one. There also is not a concrete path between the parking area and the tennis
33 courts. There is ample room to create a walkway there, so we'd also like to continue the
34 walkway in front of the tennis courts as well, and that hooks up to the sidewalk that's on
35 the other side to enhance that whole edge and the connection to that whole edge. It also
36 looks at the pathway improvements to the arboretum and upgrading those paths there as
37 well as kind of the secondary entries along Embarcadero to give the park more of a
38 statement so you can notice it and see the entryways from Embarcadero as driving by.
39 The fourth phase is the development of the arboretum, which again there's not a lot of
40 development there. It's mostly the renovation and removal of turf to enhance the trees
41 and then the minor renovations for the concrete bowl. The fifth phase is looking at the
42 Magical Forest and developing area between the pool and the power substation that's



1 there. The sixth phase is put further down the line. I touched a little bit earlier on
2 creating a pathway in this location that currently ad hoc-ly exists there now, but we'd like
3 to make a real pathway. In the scheme of the tennis courts, the paving will need to be
4 replaced at that point. When it does, then we'll shift the whole tennis court area over 15
5 feet, but that is not really required for the next 10-15 years' timeframe. We're going to
6 allow that transition to play itself out naturally. Of course, the final phase of this is the
7 swimming pool area. You can see what's happening here is the development of the
8 expanded pool building with a restroom facility inside. There's also been some talk to
9 have a multipurpose room in there that could be used for classes. A lot of classes happen
10 at Lucie Stern. It's a beautiful building, but I don't think it was intended to be a
11 gymnasium. It would be nice to have another space for small-scale classes to have a
12 location. You see the actual pushing out of the pool deck area that would allow the pool
13 to be expanded to a larger size in the future. The next slide starts to talk a little about our
14 schedule. We're here tonight to represent the Long Range Plan to the Commission since
15 most of the new members have not seen the project at all. We will be coming back at
16 some point when the CEQA aspect is done. I would say that is currently going on now.
17 It's a 30-day review period we're in the middle of. It ends on September 5th. If you have
18 any comments per that environmental study—again it's for the Long Range Plan and the
19 Junior Museum and Zoo—September 5th is the deadline or cutoff to comments per that
20 environmental study. I will get more in detail of the findings of that study in a second.
21 Of course, we will take the actual Long Range Plan and the environmental study to
22 Council for adoption. I'm hoping that happens at the end of this year, that we can do that.
23 Phase 1 construction, again, is predicated on the construction of the JMZ or the Junior
24 Museum and Zoo, which I think we're currently looking at around the summer of 2019.
25 Whenever that takes places is when that first phase will kick off and be done. It'll, again,
26 focus on the parking lot and then that west end of the park. With that, I'll take questions
27 and comments about the Long Range Plan.

28 Chair Reckdahl: (inaudible)

29 Commissioner McDougall: You shouldn't have done that, Keith. First off, I wanted to
30 say I'm impressed with all of this. I'm particularly impressed with this fold-out drawing
31 that has probably 700 different items on it. I will talk to this, the presentation just made
32 briefly for a minute. The slide that says project goals talks about create better connection
33 and awareness and facilities around and within the park. The one thing that I thought was
34 missing from this is another version. I understand why this one is just the park. In fact,
35 there are tennis courts here. There's the Library here. There's another park across the
36 street. There's the community center. Then, there's Lucie Stern and whatnot down here.
37 The same comment that I made with the bridge, the safe routes, and access and so on. I'll
38 use this while I'm holding it up. On that same slide, project goals, it says park users and
39 guests. Down below, it says coordination of user group objectives. I'm missing the same
40 thing I've missed on again the bridge one, for example, of who really is the audience. On

1 the bridge one, it was are we the spandex crowd or the weekend crowd or the Google
2 crowd or whatever. Here, I didn't see anything either in the presentation or the
3 documents before that that said what we're really worried about is the aging population of
4 Palo Alto because that's the speech you get all the time or is it the teens or whatever.
5 What, I think, this addresses is the organized groups, the tennis players, the swimmers, all
6 of whom had their own lobbying capability. It didn't address the people who didn't have
7 that. The reason I say that is, if you go back to some of the other park stuff we've done
8 and said, "What are people most interested in, in Palo Alto," you get access to nature.
9 Nothing here really says, by the way, access to nature. On the other hand, you're doing
10 things that are access to nature. That's why I looked at this and said the arboretum area
11 and behind the power station area and the Magical Forest and then extending that across
12 the street to the rest of the redwoods and the other parks that are over there are all in
13 nature area. It would seem to me that if we looked at all of that as a nature area, maybe
14 we would address it differently in terms of access. I was there today because I knew we
15 were doing this tonight. I wanted to go through it again. I live relatively close, so I go
16 there all the time. If you go into the Magic Forest, you find feathers on the ground.
17 There are birds in there. How do we make this more of a nature area? This whole area is
18 suitable for accommodating that. The next diagram is the one that shows the paths.
19 Thank you for doing that because I was going to recommend we have something like
20 that. My first comment would go back to the slide above where it says pedestrian and
21 bicycle circulation. I would love to see two diagrams, one that said bicycle circulation
22 and one that said pedestrian circulation. They're not the same thing. I advocated them
23 being separate in the Comprehensive Plan all along. Different people do different things.
24 Inside a park like this, they're counter to one another, I believe. You have to worry about,
25 if you have a 15-foot wide path, does that mean you can go faster on your bike, and it
26 then becomes more dangerous. I don't know. I think we should address that. The other
27 thing that this does—I have a couple of friends who are currently having to use a walker.
28 I end up going to Mountain View Baylands or whatever with them or going to Stanford
29 with them where I can take them with their walkers. Wouldn't it be nice if there was a
30 trail—if this thing showed a trail all the way around, not just around the grass area but all
31 the way around the park? Silly me, when you said circulatory pathway, I got sucked in
32 because I said circular, but it's not circular. It's a straight line through the middle of the
33 park. I would sure like us to see—if you were really imaginative about it, you could
34 make a very long walk that went across the middle of the park, through the arboretum,
35 around behind the Magic Forest. You could make it so it was all walkable, and you could
36 even cross the street and go all the way around the Library and through the redwoods
37 there. Since we're always getting speeches about the aging population, I'd sure like to see
38 that. We're trying to address that by having adult exercise areas. Adult exercising is
39 walking these days if we could address that. You say that one of the elements of
40 maintenance is the Magical Forest, and then you say in a further slide that one of the
41 things you're going to do is put a picnic area into the Magical Forest. I think those are
42 contradictory, particularly if you do what you've done in the arboretum, put concrete



1 platforms on which to put the picnic tables. That's a dangerous thing to do with all those
2 redwoods. In the next slide, we talk about the restroom structure being part of the
3 swimming pool. Does that mean the restrooms will only be open when the swimming
4 pool is open?

5 Mr. Jensen: No.

6 Commissioner McDougall: We need to make that clear, that that's one of the things. I'll
7 skip some of this stuff. The other thing is you've got an enhanced shuttle stop along
8 Newell. I guess that's okay because I can't figure out where else you'd put a shuttle stop.
9 It'd sure be interesting if you could make the shuttle stop be an indentation or something.
10 In redoing the whole park, I'm not so sure why you wouldn't change where the main
11 entrance was instead of just having it at the two ends. Could we maybe put the main
12 entrance to be along Hopkins? I applaud what you're doing by adding potentially seven
13 more parking spots along Hopkins. Is that all? Can't we find a way to add more? The
14 parking usage here is a bit of a contradiction. It's not a contradiction; it's a conflict.
15 We're going to put in a brand new, beautiful Junior Museum and Zoo that's going to
16 attract, I believe, more people. You've got more parking, and now you're making that
17 also parking for people at the same time for your park. I would try and find that.
18 Anything we could do to eliminate access along Embarcadero? One of the other things
19 you said is you want visibility of the entrance into the park on Embarcadero. I would do
20 anything you possibly could to hide the entrance. Yes, you may want to get into the park,
21 into that part of the arboretum, but I think the parking right up against the fire station
22 there is a very dangerous thing when you're coming along Embarcadero. If we're going
23 to the park, maybe we can walk a little further. The only other thing I thought when I
24 was over there is as you redo some parts of the park, if there was some ways to make
25 some elevation change, even little mounds that made you—it's just incredibly flat. I've
26 got more notes, but I'll write them down and send them to you. Thank you. I told you,
27 you'd be sorry to let me go first.

28 Chair Reckdahl: (inaudible)

29 Commissioner Greenfield: Thank you. Lots of excellent plans and ideas and details. I
30 especially like the enhancements near the Girl Scout house, the combined play areas,
31 removing turf in the arboretum, protections for the heritage oak in the tot area, improved
32 focus on alternate transportation. I do like the idea to have separate bike and pedestrian
33 circulation diagrams. The connections to adjacent facilities is important to consider.
34 Maybe it doesn't fit in this document, but it would be nice if we could find a way to
35 dovetail that in. Could you just clarify the main parking lot plan as far as the flow?
36 There's access from Middlefield, and there's access from Hopkins. Those sections do
37 connect over the raised pedestrian way?

38 Mr. Jensen: Yes.

1 Commissioner Greenfield: That'll be a raised pedestrian bikeway that you have to go
2 slowly over. Thank you. Regarding the Magic Forest, mention is made that the
3 redwood's shallow rooting structure would "limit improvements in this area." I'm
4 struggling with the implicit philosophy of this wording and wonder if we could focus on
5 advocating and planning for planting species native to the redwood forest understory and
6 look at that as being the development rather than considering hardscape. I agree that we
7 want to avoid concrete in the area for picnic areas or what have you.

8 Mr. Jensen: I think the idea was that the actual picnic tables would be just loose picnic
9 tables. They would not be attached to the ground. They actually would not sit on any
10 type of pad; they would just sit on the existing grade that was there. The Magical Forest
11 does take up an area of the park. It is a beautiful space but not overly used for items. I
12 think there is some debate on having anything there at all, just benches. When we have
13 that aspect of the project to enhance that area, we do want to hash that out and discuss
14 more of what we want to have there. The idea would be to have the least amount of
15 impact. Right now we would consider the Magical Forest as one entity as all the trees are
16 growing together. They're basically all as one. Because of that interconnectedness, it
17 does make it very difficult to start to build or develop things in there that have any type of
18 impact at all. Currently, they are and have been under extreme stress. Unfortunately, the
19 redwood tree our City is named after, El Palo Alto, lived in a very isolated area. Outside
20 that area, redwoods require a lot of irrigation. We've had to address that and start to
21 water those trees more because we do want to maintain that space.

22 Commissioner Greenfield: The trees are certainly cherished here, and they also don't
23 really belong here historically or ecologically. I think that's all the reason to focus on
24 preserving this grove. They have suffered in the drought years of being under-watered.
25 Could we consider adding interpretive signage about redwood forests and redwood
26 ecology to further focus on that area? It seems like that would be a plus for the area.
27 You mentioned there was a desire to improve the path through the area. I'm assuming
28 that doesn't mean paving in the area or is that paving on the side by the tennis courts? Is
29 that what you're talking about?

30 Mr. Jensen: Yeah, it would be closer to the tennis courts. We do want to try to limit the
31 amount of compaction to the soil there and direct people to a more established pathway.
32 We did try to move it on the other side of the well site to avoid impacts to the trees.

33 Commissioner Greenfield: There were mentions that there would be bike racks added,
34 but I didn't see them on the diagrams anywhere. I was wondering if there was a reason
35 for that or if they could be added so people could comment.

36 Mr. Jensen: We can put a symbol on there showing the degree of the additions.

1 Commissioner Greenfield: I understand this Plan's been in progress for a number of
2 years now. Pickleball seems to be rapidly growing in popularity. It could be expected
3 that it'll have a strong foothold within the next 25 years. I'm wondering if it would
4 appropriate to include any reference to pickleball within the tennis court and pool area
5 section.

6 Mr. Jensen: At the time of the—like I said, all these projects will come back to the
7 Commission and to the community for further feedback. When this plan was started in
8 2012 and 2013, pickleball didn't even exist at the time. You can see this is an interesting
9 study that goes along with the whole Master Plan thing. As time goes on, things will
10 change. Because we have this process where we'll come back and look at these and study
11 these things again, who knows? Maybe pickleball won't exist anymore and there will be
12 another game that we want to look at. That's why I prefaced that area that the bocce court
13 is called out. Who knows exactly at that time what we do want to put in there to activate
14 that area? Definitely, all those things will come up through the process of renovating
15 those spaces.

16 Commissioner Greenfield: In a similar vein, you were subconsciously referring to this
17 earlier. The Magical Bridge type facility is looking for a location in north Palo Alto, I'm
18 sure, on the other side. Is there any consideration that something could happen in
19 Rinconada Park? Maybe it's not appropriate to include it in the document at this time. Is
20 there a place to make a reference to that?

21 Mr. Jensen: I don't know about the scale of the playground being the size of Magical
22 Bridge. Definitely we will bring the ideas and elements that were learned from that
23 playground and the popularity of the playground into what we design and build there in
24 the future. It will be a lot more inclusive. It will have some very similar equipment and
25 accessibility aspect to it. Again, I'm not sure if the scale of the playground will be the
26 same, but it definitely will live along the lines of more of a Magical Bridge than what it is
27 now. Now, it is really not inclusive or accessible at all with the tan bark and the
28 equipment that's there. We do want to address that in the future.

29 Commissioner Greenfield: This discussion would come up at the time the playground is
30 redesigned?

31 Mr. Jensen: Right.

32 Commissioner Greenfield: The older kids and the younger kids. Thank you. Just a
33 minor point in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. On page 37, I'd suggest correcting
34 the scientific names of the tree species. The littleleaf linden is called out as Tilian
35 cordata; it should be Tilia cordata, remove the "n." The linden planetree is referred to as
36 Platanus. I'd suggest Platanus x acerfolia. That's all. Thank you. Great stuff.

1 Chair Reckdahl: (inaudible)

2 Commissioner Cribbs: I will wait 'til the end.

3 Commissioner LaMere: Thank you. A quick comment is I appreciate the ideas of
4 putting some—finding ways to shade areas is very good, especially for the adult area and
5 the younger kids. One thing about the tot play area, as we think about design of that, is
6 it's important to, if it's for tots, have some sort of barrier to entry for the older kids. If
7 there is any shared playground space, it doesn't matter if it—you might think a bigger kid
8 wouldn't want to play on that. They'll migrate towards the whole space. I have a 5-year-
9 old, and I see that often going to different types of playgrounds. We go to Eleanor
10 Pardee a lot where you see that. They have an older playground, and within that same
11 complex there's one for more towards 3-7 or whatever. You still get older kids coming
12 over there. Especially if it's for tots, find a way to keep it separate for them. I also saw
13 the idea for the field as those tress age out, you mentioned not replacing them. Is that
14 maybe they become multiuse perhaps for a soccer field at some point? I don't know if
15 they're big enough. Just other ways to use those fields.

16 Mr. Jensen: Yes. The idea would be not to—I think mostly the idea was not to
17 recommend planting any more trees out in the turf area. Mostly that's just for the trees
18 because usually new trees take on a lot of damage when they're planted in the turf area.
19 The existing trees out there are in good health, so they could live past the Plan. The idea
20 would just be that where they are currently, we wouldn't replace it right in the exact same
21 spot. We do and will plant more trees and more native trees in the future around the park,
22 but we would like to keep that turf area open for group activity.

23 Commissioner LaMere: I have a question about the multiuse concrete bowl. Does that
24 currently see use by groups?

25 Mr. Jensen: It does on a smaller scale, not a lot. I think the last thing I really remember
26 being programmed there was the yoga that was done in that space. Rhy can speak more
27 to that.

28 Rhyena Halpern: Rhyena Halpern, Assistant Director of CSD. We use that amphitheater
29 space sometimes for the twilight summer concert series we've had there. We had the clay
30 and glass festival there once in the last 5 years. We've had irregular regular use there.
31 That's one thing we hope, when we actually do reconfigure the park, we'll be able to
32 make it a more usable space.

33 Chair Reckdahl: The summer concerts, are they always in the bowl or are there other
34 locations in the park where they do them?

1 Ms. Halpern: They're at different locations in the park. We also have them at other
2 locations, California Avenue and Mitchell Park. We've actually been using a lot of
3 different locations. We've had them in the bowl, and then we've had them closer up to
4 the west end as well. We try out different ones depending on the sound, the amplification
5 needs of the particular concert.

6 Chair Reckdahl: With the changes to the bowl proposed, would you anticipate that all the
7 concerts would be at that new location or would you still move them around to different
8 parts of Rinconada?

9 Ms. Halpern: I'm not sure because we're moving them around to different parks and
10 locations too. I don't see Rinconada being the only or even the main ...

11 Chair Reckdahl: I'm not talking about—if you were to have a concert at Rinconada.

12 Mr. Jensen: I think it mostly depends upon the concert and the anticipated crowd.

13 Ms. Halpern: We haven't determined that.

14 Mr. Jensen: Most of the activities like that, outdoor movies and things of that nature are
15 done in the turf area because it is a larger space that can accommodate a larger crowd.
16 The bowl is restricted in its layout to the size of the crowd. I think that's one factor that
17 limits the bowl space. There are other things we can also discuss with the bowl when we
18 start to enhance it. There was discussion of installing moveable skate apparatuses, that
19 attach to the ground, that you could move out of the way to open up the space if you
20 wanted to use it to active the space more. When it was designed, it was designed as a
21 skate bowl. That's what RHA intended it because at the time that was a good thing to do.
22 People did a lot of skating. That's mostly why the bowl was developed. The little stage
23 part that's out there now, which is an ad hoc little concrete space, was added afterward.
24 The Long Range Plan recommends moving that over a little bit to reduce the amount of
25 sun in spectators' eyes and to get it a little bit closer to the pool building, which has the
26 power and those types of things that would be easier to get to that location.

27 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you.

28 Commissioner LaMere: I imagine with some of this, especially with the Junior Museum
29 and Zoo, there's hope for even higher usage of the park. Is that correct?

30 Mr. Jensen: It's felt that the development of the Junior Museum and Zoo will definitely
31 have a higher use at the beginning just because it's a new attraction, a new building. The
32 overall review of that facility and because of the size of the display areas are fairly close
33 to what there is now, it's not anticipated that the actual use will go up in that respect.

1 Commissioner LaMere: One of the reasons I ask is just in terms of—there's times where
2 Middlefield is so impacted. Some of you who work with Lucie Stern or are in that area
3 just know that it—whether the transportation committee or whoever is looking at
4 Middlefield—seems to get more and more crowded by the month with people using it as
5 a way to get places or for the bigger trucks especially to find their way around Palo Alto.

6 Ms. Halpern: One thing that is going to mitigate that is in the new parking lot design
7 we're actually going to be able to accommodate buses a lot easier. Hopefully we'll see an
8 increase in pedestrian and bike visitors, but we'll also be able to have buses instead of all
9 those single cars and accommodate a lot more. Right now, we accommodate about one
10 bus a day, and we'll be able to accommodate about five. We'll be able to see a lot more
11 visitors with less impact in the traffic.

12 Chair Reckdahl: By buses, you mean school buses?

13 Ms. Halpern: Yes, yes.

14 Commissioner LaMere: Thank you.

15 Chair Reckdahl: (inaudible)

16 Commissioner Cribbs: If you don't mind because I'm going to excuse myself. Thank
17 you. All I'd love to say is that I love Rinconada Park forever and ever and ever. I'm glad
18 we're doing this. It's great to see the thoughtful responses and the plans that you put into
19 this. I loved all of the comments that the Commissioners have made. It's all good,
20 especially the part about pickleball, the swimming pool, and the bowl area, which has a
21 ton of history because there used to be the Pickle Family Circus in the bowl area many,
22 many, many years ago along with Tai Chi and the women's equal rights march last
23 spring. I wouldn't want to lose the bowl at all. I love it that you're thinking about putting
24 sound in there. I think that's going to be really great. As an event organizer, I would
25 welcome that. The only thing that I have to say about this is that summer 2019, is that
26 when Year 1 starts of the 25-year Plan?

27 Mr. Jensen: Yes.

28 Commissioner Cribbs: I was hoping I misread that because that's what I understood too.
29 I would just say that I really liked our Chairman's comment today that children do grow
30 up. If there's any way that we can accelerate the park Plan, it would be a great thing to
31 do. That's all. Thanks for letting me leave early too. I appreciate that.

32 Ms. Halpern: Can I just add something that you'll like to hear to that? We're actually
33 expecting to break ground on the new JMZ, if all of our plans go as planned, in June
34 2018. That's about a 2-year process. When Peter says it'll be a year later, it's to

1 coordinate the west end park improvements with the JMZ construction. We are moving
2 really, really quickly, constantly. I just want you to feel really assured of that.

3 Commissioner Cribbs: Thank you.

4 [Commissioner Cribbs left the meeting at 9:15 p.m.]

5 Vice Chair Moss: This is really terrific. I had many of my questions answered. When
6 the Junior Museum and Zoo presented to us earlier this year, they talked about doing the
7 bathrooms for Rinconada Park so we didn't have to do it ourselves, at least they would be
8 used by both facilities, the park and us. I was wondering has that changed.

9 Mr. Jensen: It has. Looking at—let's go back to these slides. The original footprint of
10 what was studied in the Long Range Plan for the Junior Museum and Zoo pushed the Zoo
11 quite a bit further into the park. Along with that pushing out, one tradeoff for that would
12 be the rear structure of the Zoo would also house a restroom that would be accessible to
13 park users. Because of the reduction of size into the park as well as just the cost of the
14 overall project, that aspect of the project was removed as far as the bathroom being
15 incorporated within the structure of the JMZ. It is still the recommendation that we do
16 have a bathroom installed at the west end, giving the park two restrooms, but it would
17 stand more as an individual structure closer to Hopkins due to the fall of the utility that's
18 out there to hook up to. Currently, that's the idea. The Long Range Plan is still calling
19 out and recommending a bathroom down there. It sites it in the Junior Museum and Zoo,
20 but we know that cannot take place at this point. We do still want to recommend to have
21 a restroom facility added to that end of the park.

22 Vice Chair Moss: They will have their own bathrooms separate and distinct from the
23 bathrooms that we want to add in the park?

24 Mr. Jensen: That will be within the Junior Museum building. Access-wise you'd have to
25 walk into the building to use that bathrooms. We would like to provide just park users a
26 facility that they didn't have to access the Junior Museum and Zoo.

27 Vice Chair Moss: The Junior Museum ought to use that same bathroom and not waste all
28 that space that they could be using for their exhibits. I don't know. Similar to that
29 question, at one point we were going to have them come out into the park—the Zoo come
30 out into the park a little, tiny bit and have a little mini, mini amphitheater where they
31 would show animals or share animals. What happened with that?

32 Mr. Jensen: That was something that was discussed within the development of the Zoo.
33 Again, because of the reduction of the encroachment of the Zoo into the park, that's not
34 an aspect of the development of the Junior Museum and Zoo plans. When we do work on
35 and bring back the plans for that west end of the park, we can look at that. We have

1 started to study a more expanded group seating picnic area that's closer to the Zoo that
2 can be used to facilitate outdoor activities. Most notably the flying of the bald eagle is a
3 popular thing that occurs in the park. That area could allow groups to gather at to partake
4 in that event.

5 Vice Chair Moss: The last question I had is that we've had separate discussions with
6 Kristen about dedication of undedicated land. One of the pieces is the tennis courts that
7 are, I guess, not in the park. They're just across the street. There are tennis courts and a
8 parking lot. As part of this Master Plan, is it possible to add those tennis courts, get them
9 dedicated and added to the park?

10 Mr. Jensen: I think that would require further discussion with staff.

11 Daren Anderson: Hi. Daren Anderson, Open Space, Parks, and Golf. We call them the
12 Newell tennis courts. That is dedicated parkland. It is part of Rinconada; although, it is
13 separated by the road. It's already dedicated.

14 Vice Chair Moss: They should include it in the Master Plan—the Long Range Plan.
15 That's all I have.

16 Chair Reckdahl: A lot of good stuff. I liked a lot of the comments. The 3-D topology,
17 having some berms or something for the kids because it is very flat would be a good
18 addition. I love the Magic Forest, so let's not mess with it. I like maybe putting some
19 benches in there, low-impact benches. I like the native species under the redwoods. That
20 would be a really good—if we can work that out, that'd be another good addition.
21 Multipurpose rooms are really good for the camps, birthday parties. There are a lot of
22 reasons why you want some space right at the pool. I think that should be a good
23 addition. Phase 1 will add the tot and the older kids playground next to each other. What
24 will happen to the existing tot playground when you do that?

25 Mr. Jensen: The idea would be to leave it until the next phase of that development, and
26 then we would remove it. I think it has another 5-10 years of its life before it actually
27 needs to be renovated. We will be looking at that. If that project doesn't come along by
28 the time that playground needs to be renovated, then we probably will just remove the
29 equipment at that time and open up the space.

30 Chair Reckdahl: West restrooms, we have no restrooms down there. If we have a
31 separate building, how much of a penalty is that from cost and logistics as opposed to
32 having it butt up against an existing either Girl Scout building or the Junior Museum?

33 Mr. Jensen: It's definitely an amenity that takes up some space out there. We looked at
34 the location closer to the group picnic area behind the Girl Scout house. There's an
35 existing screen fence that exists there, that runs along Hopkins, that screens the picnic

1 area from the street. That would be a good location to put it in that location and meld it
2 into that screening so there is really no visual impact to the park. There is an area there
3 that's in the "Y" of the existing path, that it could fit, that's not overly usable. We have
4 started to look at an area where that's feasible to do, that has as limited impact on the park
5 as far as using space and being an obstacle and incorporating the feature into that end of
6 the park.

7 Chair Reckdahl: The cost and maintenance of these small buildings are not a big deal?

8 Mr. Jensen: No. It would be very similar to the restroom that was put in Juana Briones
9 Park, a standalone, prefabricated structure. It's a \$300,000 project; \$50,000 is associated
10 mostly with the utility hookup to that building. It's a new facility as well. We've also
11 been discussing ways to fund these aspects of it. We have a standalone CIP for restrooms
12 that we could consider using for that. We could also start to use perhaps park impact fees
13 because it is a new facility that doesn't exist down there. I think there's a lot of
14 opportunities to get the restroom without impacting our CIP funds for that.

15 Chair Reckdahl: Finally, the last thing is parking. Parking is so tight there on weekends.
16 When I look at the tennis courts, can we put parking under the tennis courts? Is that
17 feasible or is that just too expensive?

18 Mr. Jensen: Any time you—I think it's five times the amount to go down than it is to go
19 up. It definitely does have some cost associated with it. That's something that we could
20 look at in the future doing there.

21 Chair Reckdahl: We won't replace the tennis courts for like 15 years.

22 Mr. Jensen: It's an opportunity that could be explored. Parking is difficult there. I think
23 it would have to give and supply a good amount of parking. Adding another 20, 40, 60
24 spaces when the park is used for large events is not going to have much impact on the
25 parking that is existing there. It will mostly flow out into the neighborhood as it does
26 now. It's not addressed in the Long Range Plan now but may be something that can be
27 discussed further in the future.

28 Ms. O'Kane: I just wanted to add that the goal is, instead of encouraging more cars to
29 come, encouraging people to take public transportation, to walk or bike. People will start
30 using less cars in the future. I'd prefer, from my standpoint, to encourage people to get
31 away from taking cars to the park.

32 Commissioner Greenfield: I'll support that viewpoint.

33 Commissioner McDougall: I like that as well. That goes back to my safe routes to the
34 park idea, the same as Safe Routes to School and stuff. I think that'd be really important.

1 Chair Reckdahl: If you can get people to do that, that's great. My concern is right now
2 the neighbors are really impacted. Is there some way of squeezing out more parking?
3 Does anyone else have follow-ups? What's the status going forward? We have the
4 CEQA underway.

5 Mr. Jensen: The CEQA is underway. The slides here are similar or the same to the slides
6 that we looked at for the Parks Master Plan. These few slides go through the reason why
7 we go through environment and have CEQA done for the project. The environmental
8 review Initial Study did look at both projects, like I said, the Junior Museum and Zoo and
9 Rinconada. If you want to cut down to the chase, there was not a lot of mitigation that is
10 required, found in the Initial Study. Your standard things that we look at normally,
11 nesting birds at the time of construction need to be reviewed, dust needs to be mitigated.
12 If any historical things are found during the digging, the digging stops. You have to have
13 an archaeologist come in and take a look at those things. All of those standard
14 mitigations that go along with construction projects are the mitigations that are
15 recommended by the environmental study. Because the park and the Junior Museum and
16 Zoo are both existing entities, there's nothing major that is planned to change or to add to
17 the park that would have a substantial impact is why the Mitigated Negative Declaration
18 was the process that we went in. If you'd like me to go further of why we have CEQA
19 and how it came to be—the bottom line is that no major impacts from that study were
20 cited. The mitigations are our typical, standard mitigations that we would have for any
21 development project in the park.

22 Chair Reckdahl: Hopefully, we'll have Junior Museum breaking ground the following
23 summer.

24 Mr. Jensen: That is the plan.

25 Chair Reckdahl: The Phase 1 would be the following summer after that.

26 Mr. Jensen: It'll be coordinated with that. I imagine that probably is going to be about a
27 year timeframe as they build the building. They are going to stage in a portion of the
28 existing parking lot. They have to get themselves to a point where they can unstage
29 themselves to start working on the parking lot and that end of the park. We're probably
30 talking about the next year.

31 Commissioner McDougall: Keith, I didn't hear summer. I heard June.

32 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you, Don. Thank you very much. This looks like a fun project.
33 I hope I'm around for the whole thing.

34 Mr. Jensen: I know it has been a while since it's been back. You didn't get a chance to be
35 involved in the original rounds of coming to you and community meetings. I am happy

1 that we're almost there and seeing the light at the end of the tunnel and the first phase of
2 the development of the park being scheduled. That's good. Thank you very much.

3 Chair Reckdahl: Thanks, Peter. Good job.

4 **4. Buckeye Creek Hydrology Study**

5 Chair Reckdahl: Next, we will move on to Buckeye Creek.

6 [The Commission took a break.]

7 Vice Chair Moss: I think we're ready.

8 Mr. Anderson: Good evening. My name's Daren Anderson with Open Space, Parks, and
9 Golf. I'd like to introduce my colleague, Curt Dunn—he's the Supervising Ranger up at
10 Foothills Park—and my consultant, Jonathan Buck with ENGEIO. We are here tonight to
11 share with you the draft report for the Buckeye Creek hydrology study and to collect your
12 feedback. I'm going to provide you with a brief overview of what we've done since our
13 last meeting, March 28th. We'll focus mainly on the recommended action, which we're
14 calling the preferred alternative, as well as the other options that the City can consider
15 and the cost projections. Lastly, I'll go over the next steps. After the March 28th
16 Commission meeting, staff and the consultant further developed the creek improvement
17 concepts and shared them at a community meeting on June 12th. Although there were
18 only four participants at the public meeting, there was unanimous support for the
19 recommendations to solve the creek's erosion problem. Acknowledging the fact that we
20 got such little turnout, we decided to make poster-size display boards of our proposals
21 and post them at the park. We did it in three areas, Wildhorse Valley/Las Trampas, and
22 the 7.7 acres and inside the Interpretive Center. Rangers would talk to people, and they
23 could also just leave notes as they come up to this. We got about ten notes on the
24 feedback, which were all generally positive. I'll just go over a couple of the ideas, so you
25 have an idea of what some of the park visitors are thinking. When I say that, a lot of the
26 people we've been speaking to about this project have been environmentalists, and they're
27 very focused on creek and habitat improvements. We wanted to make sure we're
28 reaching out to other constituents of Foothills Park as well. This was an endeavor to do
29 so. Some of the comments reflect that. Some good suggestions saying, "Please consider
30 adding benches and campsites along the new creek sections if possible." I assume they
31 mean up by the Wildhorse Valley section. Others commented that they loved the idea
32 and would love to see a beautiful, healthy creek. They're all for making the place look
33 better, and we should do whatever it takes to do it. Some people said, "I think you would
34 be better off spending your money to fix those closed trails before you improve the
35 creek." Just as a side note, that's something we are working on now. It would be
36 different dollars, so they're not competing. Another person wrote, "Creek restoration is a
37 fantastic idea. I think it'll be much more diverse and interesting and allow full enjoyment

1 of the creek." A last one I'll mention was a little bit different. It said, "After shifting the
2 channel, wait to do any planting until the creek has run its course. Let nature dictate what
3 comes next." Using that feedback, the feedback from all our community meetings, the
4 stakeholders, the Commission, our ad hoc, and our park visitors, the consultant developed
5 our preferred alternative design. While there are other options that we should definitely
6 look at and consider—I'll go over them today, and they were in the report as well—the
7 focus of the draft report is that preferred alternative. I'm going to break down the three
8 core sections of this preferred alternative in order of priority. The first is the Wildhorse
9 Valley section. I'll ask my partner, Curt, to use the mouse to highlight different areas.
10 This is an area where we create a new section of creek in what is currently that grass
11 meadow in Wildhorse Valley. It would meander through this area. It actually is most
12 likely the historic floodplain. It's really putting the creek back where it was originally
13 intended to be, kind of where it wants to be. Right now, it's being choked off in what's
14 really a glorified drainage ditch. It's deeply channelized. We've talked ad nauseum about
15 the challenges the creek has and how it's been constrained and pushed off to the side.
16 This would create approximately 2,600 linear feet of new creek channel and about 5.5
17 acres of new floodplain. I want to clarify. This would result in two creek channels on
18 each side of the Wildhorse Valley. There's the existing one that would remain and then
19 this new one on the other side. They'll merge together—Curt will point this out on the
20 map—in Wildhorse Valley just above Orchard Glen picnic area, if that makes sense. The
21 second portion ...

22 Chair Reckdahl: Right now, it goes under the road. There's a bridge that goes under that
23 road. It would use that same bridge?

24 Mr. Anderson: Yes. The existing channel will remain in that portion. That's correct.
25 The second section I want to tell you about, also part of the preferred alternative, is in the
26 lower reach. This is in the Las Trampas Valley. In this area, it would create
27 approximately 3 acres of floodplain by removing the soil material and that existing grass
28 field. This is the manicured, mowed grass area across from the Interpretive Center.
29 Much of that is fill material and, again, that was most likely from all indications historic
30 floodplain where that grass is and where we would recommend taking about half of that
31 grass area. It would even meander and become this new floodplain and closer to the
32 historic alignment. I should point out we had had some questions I just want to clarify.
33 There is an existing channel there. Again, it's deeply channelized. To add a little clarity
34 on what would happen, as we excavate the soil out towards the center of the turf, that
35 deep, channelized area would be filled with soil from our project. It would just have a
36 nice easy grade up towards the center of the turf. The last section of our preferred
37 alternative is the 7.7-acre area. Much like the Las Trampas Valley section, this would be
38 widening the section of the creek. It would take about two-thirds of the flat area adjacent
39 to the creek, and it would bubble out. There would still be enough room for a pathway on
40 the exterior of that portion if we chose or you could even put a pathway inside that

1 floodplain because it's not going to be full of water most often. It'd just have to be with
2 the understanding that whatever trail or amenity was in that floodplain area would be
3 surrounded by native plants and vegetation and the kind of trail that would need a little
4 more maintenance or it'd be a simple, more meandering style of trail if we chose to do
5 that. That improvement on the 7.7-acre area would result in a 1.2-acre floodplain. The
6 next one is just a graphic some of you might have seen at the public meeting. If not, it
7 just gives a little more clarity on what these restoration principles would look like in
8 terms of how we'd be slowing down water. I'll turn to Jonathan towards the end if you
9 have specific questions about how that works and where that would be in the creek
10 channel on Buckeye. The preferred alternative would retrofit existing grade-control
11 structures too. We've got these grade-control structures. You might remember they are
12 rock gabions; that's the metal-enclosed rock areas that are in a number of areas along the
13 creek but mostly in the Wildhorse Valley section. Also, wooden gabions are wooden
14 grade-control structures. They were put in, in the '70s and '80s to slow down this water
15 and help address the erosion problem. They are at the end of their useful life, so that's
16 important to note. I'll get back to that in a moment when we talk about alternative
17 choices instead of the preferred. That would be a part of the preferred one, that we'd have
18 to do that. The cost of this preferred alternative including design, permitting,
19 environmental review, and construction is approximately \$9.7 million. It would take
20 approximately 5 years to complete all those portions that I just mentioned. The draft
21 report does include that detailed, itemized cost estimate for the preferred alternative. It
22 recommends that we do the entire project and fund it at once due to the severe condition
23 of most of the portions of the channel and the complex permitting process associated with
24 creek restoration. Let's look at the alternative options. This is in the Staff Report and in
25 the body of the draft report. I just wanted to go over these because these are important
26 when we're talking about a \$9.7 million project. One option the City could choose is to
27 do nothing, which is what we've done for the last 40 years or so since the last grade
28 control structures were put in. I just want to explain what that means. The idea is it
29 wouldn't cost us anything, but that's not quite true. Those grade control structures, I said
30 they're at the end of their useful life. In about 5-10 years, they're going to fail. They'll
31 fall apart; additional portions of the creek will collapse. The pedestrian bridge that goes
32 across to Los Trancos Trail—this is in front of the Interpretive Center—will collapse.
33 There's not a lot of support on either end right now. If we have additional erosion, it's not
34 long before that fails. Five to 10 years, I think, is a realistic expectation for that. When
35 that happens, we're talking about vastly increased erosion, vast amounts of sediment sent
36 downstream, big impacts to the environment, and necessitating some structure to protect
37 most critical but not solely the utility corridor in Wildhorse Valley. We've talked before
38 about this utility corridor where we've got water lines, sewer, electric, fiber, phone all
39 hugging the very edge of this creek edge all through that section. If the grade-control
40 structures fail, then you're putting that infrastructure at risk. We'd have to come in and do
41 something. It's really not a no option; it's really a deferred option with expedited and
42 increased costs if we were to wait 5 years and do it after the fact. There's also the risk



1 that, when we come to time to do this no-action thing and they fail, the regulatory
2 agencies say, "We're not going to let you only fix the grade-control structures. We're
3 going to require you to do more." That's a very real possibility that could happen.
4 Another alternative that I mention in the Staff Report is we could propose just to do the
5 grade-control structures and the pedestrian bridges now, if we wanted, as a minimum
6 project. Just knowing that this would not solve our erosion problem; it would not solve
7 our sedimentation deposition or flooding issues. Given the current state of that channel,
8 the retrofitted grade-control structures would need to be designed even more robust than
9 in the preferred alternative because they'd be standalone now with no other
10 improvements. They'd be more expensive and have to be significantly more substantial,
11 essentially being able to address those large sediment loads. They'd be more expensive.
12 This scenario would be difficult to permit. As I mentioned, it's possible the regulatory
13 agencies would say, "No, we're not going to let you fix the creek problem solely with
14 engineered rock solutions." The approximate cost for that grade-control structure and
15 pedestrian bridge with the permitting and design would be about 1.3 million if we went
16 with that minimum project. The third alternative I discuss in the Staff Report is we could
17 split these into separate, individual projects and perhaps phase them. There are different
18 combinations that are possible. Because the majority of the sediment is coming from the
19 upstream portion—this is the Wildhorse Valley portion—that would be the preferred
20 spot, the best bang for the buck in terms of addressing the most problems for the least
21 amount of money. If we were to do that, that would be the spot, the upper reach section
22 first. Of course, if you were to do that, you would also have to do the grade-control
23 structures throughout the reach of the creek. If you were to do all of that, it would be
24 about \$3 million. That's just the upper reach and your grade-control structures
25 throughout the creek process. I'm going to ask Jonathan to explain in a little bit more
26 detail later on during your question portion why those costs change depending on if you
27 phased it, why we're recommending that you do it all in one shot. When you go back to
28 the regulatory agencies on a piecemeal basis, it could be far more expensive. The same
29 thing with scaling your construction too if you're bringing them out at one time versus
30 multiple times if we phase it. That's why we suggested that we fund it all at once and do
31 the project as one, contiguous project rather than a phased solution. However, as I
32 pointed out in the Staff Report, the funding is an issue. We don't have \$9.7 million
33 allocated. In fact, we have no money allocated to this project. The Staff Report
34 discussed some options. One is a series of grants that ENGEO has identified, that would
35 be applicable, possibly fitting. There's no guarantee those are available. Another is
36 mitigation matching. Again, I'll have Jonathan explain the details of that. Essentially, it's
37 when there's another project somewhere in the Palo Alto area or even the Bay Area where
38 they're impacting creeks and they can't mitigate it themselves, they pay us because ours is
39 a net positive in terms of creating habitat this other project would take away. They'd pay
40 us for that. We would potentially make—this is a very crude estimate—somewhere
41 between 1 and 1 1/2 million if we were to sell and be successful with those mitigation
42 credits. There's still a big deficit if we were to go for this preferred alternative that I



1 mentioned. We'd have to figure that out. Also, I have not yet had a chance to discuss
2 this with the City Manager's Office, so that will be one of the next steps, to go over that
3 with our City Manager's Office and make sure they're comfortable with it, discuss the
4 financial impacts to the City per this recommendation. It could change a little bit pending
5 some feedback from upper management with the City Manager's input. The last thing I
6 just want to say is in terms of next steps—I should point out, perhaps you've been seeing
7 them. We had some sample photos of what those restoration sites would look before and
8 after to give you just a rough idea of some comparable sites and what we could expect to
9 see out at Buckeye Creek. The next steps would be I'm going to do a check-in with the
10 City Manager's Office. Depending on how this goes and how our conversation goes
11 tonight, in theory we'd come back next month with an action item for the Commission to
12 take an action and say, "Yes, we recommend that Council review this, adopt it, and direct
13 staff to pursue funding." Any comments from my colleagues on the presentation?
14 Anything we missed that's critical?

15 Male: No. I think you summarized it (inaudible).

16 Mr. Anderson: Anything from our ad hoc committee members that would like to chime
17 in?

18 Vice Chair Moss: Certainly, it would be great to do the whole project. I think what you
19 said about if we did nothing, we still have major maintenance costs. It's not just the
20 existing structures but also the channel has gotten much deeper, especially near the
21 Interpretive Center. You're going to have to probably double the depth of the current
22 structures, which will cost some significant amount. Probably, you're going to have to
23 fill in the gully with about 5 feet of something. I just want to make sure that the Council
24 knows that in your report. The other problem is that we can't wait 5 years to get the
25 money to do something. We really have to address that sooner rather than later. I'm also
26 wondering if we couldn't give you, after everybody has spoken here, an action today.
27 Why do we have to wait 'til next month to give you a recommendation.

28 Chair Reckdahl: It's not agendized. We didn't agendize it as an action item, so it can
29 only be a discussion this month.

30 Vice Chair Moss: My last comment is that you talk about paths down to the creek to get
31 people, kids to go down to the creek. Those paths, are they going to be concrete or
32 something that's going—you couldn't put gold dust because that will wash away. What
33 do you intend to do to make those more permanent?

34 Mr. Anderson: Currently, there's no trails designed to this, but it could be. It would
35 probably be more in keeping with the rest of Foothills trails. It'd be the natural dirt there,
36 compacted. To some degree, there's an element where you let the public figure out the
37 best route. It'd be a mix of us providing what we think is the least disturbance to the

1 habitat and where we haven't planted plants. A lot of these are going to be big, naked
2 floodplains at first, where we come in and plant a lot of stuff. We'll put in some access
3 points. I can tell you from 20 years of helping manage open space access to creeks—
4 they're going to go whether you provide them a spot or not. People are going to go down
5 to the creeks, and I would much rather provide them a safe, open place where they're not
6 going to be trampling on sensitive plant species or impacting the wildlife. I envision a
7 clear, safe path that gets them where they want to go and then a monitoring process
8 where we truth our guess. Is this the right spot? Do people really want to go there? If
9 it's wrong, we correct it quickly and find the more appropriate spot assuming it's
10 environmentally friendly.

11 Vice Chair Moss: You may have to reinforce it a little bit or it might wash away.

12 Mr. Anderson: I think that's entirely possible. Especially on big rain events like we had
13 this last winter, that's entirely possible. It might be the kind of thing where it's not a very
14 expensive trail. It's just a very casual one that doesn't have to be robust, and we know it's
15 going to take a little brush work and a little compacting each year perhaps.

16 Vice Chair Moss: That's all I had.

17 Commissioner LaMere: Are we asking questions now or should we wait for the
18 presentation to talk a little bit more about the creek restoration? What's the ...

19 Mr. Anderson: That concludes our presentation. I just wanted to see if the ad hoc had
20 any specific comments they wanted to make. If not, that concludes the staff presentation,
21 and we can just answer any questions the Commission has.

22 Commissioner LaMere: Just a quick question. With a restoration like this and the money
23 that we're spending, nature takes its course I suppose. This would be lasting, pending
24 what nature does to it. As far as it becoming channelized again or it becoming where
25 there's lots of required maintenance, what's the future looking like if you're spending \$9
26 million?

27 Mr. Anderson: I'll let Jonathan address this one.

28 Jonathan Buck: That's a good question. The answer is that if we're going to spend \$9
29 million, we're going to try to provide a project where future maintenance costs are I'm
30 going to say negligible. Keep in mind you have a mile of creek, and that's why it's so
31 expensive. In order for us to get permits from the federal and state agencies, we basically
32 have to show that we are restoring the creek channel back to something that is not going
33 to require I'm going to say regular maintenance. How's that? There's always some
34 periodic maintenance with all of the flood control channels that we have. The idea is that

1 somebody isn't going in there every year and scooping out sediment. Does that answer
2 your question?

3 Commissioner LaMere: Yeah. Thank you very much.

4 Commissioner Greenfield: Thank you. As a member of the ad hoc, I've contributed a lot
5 of comments to Daren already, and I'll be more brief. Just a few things I'd like to outline.
6 I'll start by saying I'm fully supportive of the preferred alternative. It's an awesome plan,
7 and it's great to see that we're garnering community support in modest numbers for now.
8 As I've popularized the plan, it's been very well received in my skewed circle. I do think
9 the funding issue is going to be a big question mark, and that's not a surprise to anyone in
10 the room. One question I have is do we have any idea of what percentage of the funding
11 will ultimately fall to the City to come up with, with respect to the alternative funding
12 sources you've outlined.

13 Mr. Anderson: I think we'll get guidance when I meet with the City Manager's Office
14 and our budget team and ask them that very question. They may give me guidance and
15 say, "Good luck with the grants. You're going to have to find enough grants to support X
16 percent of the project." I'll find out more when I speak to them, I think.

17 Commissioner Greenfield: That comes before you go to Council or after Council?

18 Mr. Anderson: That's correct. This would be before. I'm hoping to do this in the next 2
19 or 3 weeks.

20 Commissioner Greenfield: I think Council would certainly appreciate having a better
21 idea of what we're talking about here.

22 Mr. Anderson: I agree.

23 Commissioner McDougall: Do we have any friends in the City Manager's Office?

24 Mr. Anderson: We do.

25 Commissioner Greenfield: Excellent. A couple of comments. Daren, you were
26 explaining the two creek channel restoration process in Wildhorse Valley. I'd really love
27 to see that outlined much more clearly in the document. I know the area well. I'm an
28 interested party. When I first looked at the document, it was really hard to follow.
29 There's this new creek. There really are two creeks. Just spell it out. Say there's going to
30 be a new creek channel added. This will be a second creek. The west side will flow here.
31 The east side will flow there. Just really spell it out. That would be both in Section 4.1.2
32 and also in the upper reach section of 4.2.2. It will really help people looking at it to get
33 a clear understanding. Perhaps in some of the initial summary remarks as well, when
34 talking about the three sections, point out in the upper reach section that's happening

1 there. In Section 4.2 of the lower reach, you mention that the fill material would be some
2 of the area that's being used. I don't see that spelled out. That's a question mark. It's got
3 to be filled in; can we elucidate what we're planning to fill it in with as appropriate? In
4 the cost analysis of Section 6.1, I see we're adding three new footbridges in Wildhorse
5 Valley in the drawings, but I don't see these called out in the Table 8 cost estimates, the
6 three new pedestrian footbridges in Wildhorse Valley, the connections to the existing
7 trails. I'm not sure that those have been accounted for in the estimate.

8 Mr. Anderson: I confirmed with Jonathan they are. I'll make sure they're clear in the
9 revised estimate.

10 Commissioner Greenfield: Other than that, I can forward more comments to you offline.

11 Mr. Anderson: That'd be wonderful. Thank you.

12 Commissioner Greenfield: Great job, and let's keep this moving.

13 Commissioner McDougall: I'll only echo great job, especially in all these tables. I spent
14 a lot of time trying to sort those out. I would caution us not to talk about \$9 million and
15 talk about \$10 million, and then maybe come in at 9.7. I think that might be better. For
16 me, the only question is the ongoing frustration of the 7.7 acres. You know from the
17 conversations we had that I view that as 1 1/2 acres of problem. Basically that 1 1/2
18 acres is the floodplain that you're defining. Maybe if you look at it that way it's not a
19 problem because the other 5 acres is that hillside. We talked about could we create a path
20 or something through there that would provide initial access to that and allow us to move
21 on. That's my only comment. The rest of that is great. If Curt would stop showing
22 pictures of all these great, meandering streams that was just getting us all excited, then
23 we'd be a lot better off.

24 Chair Reckdahl: I too am quite happy with this except for the \$10 million part. The
25 design is good. The question is not whether we're going to spend money. The question is
26 do we do it on our timetable or mother nature's timetable. A series of Band-Aids may
27 end up being just as expensive, and you'll end up with nothing with it. Our only choice is
28 to move forward because the erosion out there is real. If you go next to the—what used
29 to be a hillside is now becoming a cliff. We may lose bridges and lose access to some
30 really good hiking trails. I don't think we have any option. We have to find money
31 somewhere. Hopefully, you can find it through grants or some other ways of doing it.
32 Good luck.

33 Commissioner McDougall: One quick question. When you're talking about the cost of
34 doing nothing, is there a liability from residents or whatever is downstream from our
35 park? If we keep dumping silt, they'll end up flooded or respond.

1 Mr. Anderson: There's no doubt that we would have a significant impact. If we waited
2 'til the grade-control structures failed, we would send enough sediment down there, in our
3 estimation, to severely negatively impact the neighbors and perhaps cause flooding. The
4 legal liability I'm not quite sure; we'd have to check with the City Attorney.

5 Commissioner McDougall: Maybe that risk should be mentioned in the document.

6 Chair Reckdahl: David.

7 Vice Chair Moss: I don't want to give anybody the idea that we don't want the full
8 solution and that the no solution is really not valid either. The option you gave of doing a
9 portion of it, the Wildhorse Canyon, first and maybe we only have enough money to do
10 that. Can you give a little bit more information about the impact that would have. Would
11 it solve 20 percent of our problem, 50 percent of our problem, or 80 percent of our
12 problem? I'm willing to bet you that the Council is going to ask that. Do you have any
13 rough idea?

14 Mr. Anderson: I asked Jonathan that exact question. I said, "If we just do Wildhorse
15 Valley and the grade-control structures, what does that get us?" I know people are going
16 to ask that very question, what percentage. The truth is it's difficult to answer especially
17 with that kind of detail. Anything more to say, Jonathan?

18 Mr. Buck: I would say it would solve somewhere between 50-65 percent of your
19 problem, something like that. It's probably more than half; let's put it like that.

20 Vice Chair Moss: That's the \$3 million solution?

21 Mr. Buck: Right.

22 Vice Chair Moss: As opposed to 9.7. That's a huge difference in the price. We probably
23 will get some pushback from Council about that.

24 Chair Reckdahl: Does that 3 million include the grade structures, updating those?

25 Mr. Buck: I believe so. Keep in mind I don't know if that number includes the soft costs
26 associated with that solution. You'd have to add another 20 percent onto that number. At
27 least, I think that's—I'm not sure exactly what we have written in your Staff Report.

28 Vice Chair Moss: We have 3 million ...

29 Mr. Buck: We need to clarify some of those numbers in terms of what the real costs are.
30 I think that's a construction cost.

1 Commissioner McDougall: I would suggest that you clarify that. Any 80/20 rule just
2 doesn't sound right when you say we're going to spend a third of the money and get 60
3 percent of the—that just doesn't sound right. I'd expect it to be the other way around. I
4 think we should do some homework, as David suggested, on that.

5 Mr. Buck: Will do.

6 Chair Reckdahl: If you look at that big gulch over by the Interpretive Center, by the
7 footbridge, that looks pretty severe. I'd be surprised if just Wildhorse Valley would fix
8 that.

9 Mr. Anderson: It won't. Wildhorse Valley will not fix it at all. It'll just minimize some
10 of the sediment deposition further down. It won't solve the ...

11 Chair Reckdahl: That gouging will still be the same.

12 Mr. Anderson: The gouging will still continue.

13 Commissioner McDougall: When you're answering David's question, you're answering
14 what percentage of the silt problem. If, in fact, the next thing you have to do is take that
15 bridge out just because it's unsafe, now it's not a financial cost, but you're going to reduce
16 the usability of the park. You're going to have to do that with more than that one bridge.
17 You're never going to open the 7 1/2 acres, which you've been told you have to do.
18 There's an incremental cost—there are usability costs not financial costs and not silt
19 costs.

20 Mr. Anderson: And potential issues with the permitting. As Jonathan had mentioned, it's
21 entirely possible the regulatory agencies don't accept a minimal project. They put us
22 through the wringer and require more.

23 Chair Reckdahl: What's our confidence that, if we do this preferred alternative, it gets
24 through regulatory?

25 Mr. Anderson: We sat down with the regulatory agencies and discussed it and got our
26 guidance. The preferred alternative is predicated on their feedback. We have a good
27 indication that it would receive approval. To that point, you never quite know for sure.
28 Things change; personnel change, and opinions change. We are talking about not a 6-
29 month process, but permitting would likely be a year, I'm sure, at least.

30 Chair Reckdahl: Any more questions? Thank you.

31 Mr. Anderson: Thanks very much.

32 Chair Reckdahl: What's the next steps going forward?

1 Mr. Anderson: The next step is I'll check in with the City Manager's Office. Pending the
2 outcome of that conversation, come back with an action item ...

3 Chair Reckdahl: For next month?

4 Mr. Anderson: ... for approval next month for the PRC. Then, it would go to Council as
5 soon as I can get it on their agenda, October or November most likely.

6 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you.

7 Mr. Anderson: Thanks.

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

9 Chair Reckdahl: Next, we move to Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates. We have
10 the output. Does anyone want to talk to their action?

11 Vice Chair Moss: Before Daren leaves, AT&T property. I and Don are going to the
12 Friends of the Palo Alto Parks on September 9th, before our next meeting. One of the
13 things that they were very interested in was the AT&T property because maybe they can
14 help us buy it. You have been going through some iterations with other departments.
15 What's the latest? What do I tell them?

16 Mr. Anderson: I don't have any new news on that since we last communicated on it.
17 We're in the waiting game is what I heard from our Real Estate Division, who's been
18 corresponding with AT&T to find out when they're going to release, what their plans are
19 for dividing the property. The last I heard in my communications with Real Estate staff
20 was that we were still waiting for information. I don't have any new information,
21 unfortunately, for you tonight.

22 Vice Chair Moss: If you could get one more—I don't know—talk with them before
23 September 9th, I'd appreciate it.

24 Mr. Anderson: I can do that.

25 Vice Chair Moss: Thanks.

26 Chair Reckdahl: Back to ad hocs. Does anyone have anything they want to talk about
27 their ad hocs or was what's in the summary good enough? Well move on.

28 **V. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

29 Chair Reckdahl: Comments and Announcements.

VII. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR SEPTEMBER 26, 2017 MEETING

Chair Reckdahl: Tentative Agenda. Right now, on the handout we have five things, four PIOs. I guess three PIOs and one CEQA. I think the park dedication we have to move to October unless those PIOs slip.

Ms. O'Kane: It's possible that the Baylands PIO and the bike bridge PIO may have to move. We have to get legal advice from our City Attorney's Office. The reason we didn't have the JMZ PIO on today is because the CEQA recommendation needs to happen at the same time. CEQA will not be done for Baylands Boardwalk and the bike bridge.

Chair Reckdahl: We can't do a PIO without CEQA?

Ms. O'Kane: Correct. Those may slip 'til October. The way things have been going I'm sure we'll probably get a few more things added to September.

Commissioner Greenfield: If it slipped, would you move anything from October?

Ms. O'Kane: We could. We could present either Youth and Teen Services—any of these really could move to October. I think we'll be fine.

Chair Reckdahl: You can talk to the people who are presenting and see who's is far along and can present easiest. Any of those from October we can move out.

Vice Chair Moss: (inaudible)

Chair Reckdahl: That's a good point. November 28th, do we want to start talking about what alternate date for November?

Ms. O'Kane: November and December.

Commissioner Greenfield: November 28th ...

Vice Chair Moss: It's after Thanksgiving.

Ms. O'Kane: That's the Tuesday after Thanksgiving.

Commissioner Greenfield: That should be fine. It's the Tuesday after Thanksgiving.

Chair Reckdahl: Let's leave that for now.

Commissioner Greenfield: December 26th might be more problematic.

DRAFT

1 Chair Reckdahl: We'll have to decide when we get closer whether we just bump the
2 November 28th one to early December and combine those two. Let's keep
3 November 28th for now.

4 **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

5 Chair Reckdahl: Unless anyone has anything else, do I have a motion to adjourn?

6 Meeting adjourned on motion by Commissioner Greenfield and second by Commissioner
7 McDougall at 10:05 p.m.

