



**MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**

November 27, 2018

CITY HALL

250 Hamilton Avenue

Palo Alto, California

Commissioners Present: Jeff Greenfield, Jeff LaMere, Ryan McCauley, Don McDougall, and Keith Reckdahl (arrived at 7:10 p.m.)

Commissioners Absent: Anne Cribbs, David Moss

Others Present:

Staff Present: Daren Anderson, Kristen O'Kane, Natalie Khwaja

I. ROLL CALL

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS

Chair McDougall: Are there any Agenda Changes, Requests, Deletions from any of the Commission members? I will note that I think we can move through the agenda pretty much on schedule. We do have an offer that if we get to Number 5, the Cubberley Community Center, that could be either done very briefly or moved to another time. I'm determined that we do the rest of the agenda well enough that we get to that item. I think it's an important item for the members here. If there are no other proposals to change the agenda, I'd like to invite comments, Oral Communications, from members of the community on topics other than the topics we have here.

III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Chair McDougall: The first card I have is from Monica Williams.

Monica Williams: Good evening, Chair McDougall and Commissioners. I'm Monica Williams, President of the Palo Alto Pickleball Club. On behalf of our members, I'd like to give you an update on the growth of pickleball in Palo Alto. We play every weekday at Mitchell Park. Yesterday, one of our volunteers, Kathy Levinson, offered a free pickleball clinic. Forty-four people showed up. We also had ten people playing on the two new



APPROVED

1 pickleball courts, a total of 54 people, and that was on a Monday morning. The National
2 Championships have just been held in Indian Wells, which is the home of the second largest
3 tennis stadium in the world. Over 2,000 participants played on 40 pickleball courts. We're
4 very proud that some of our members of the Palo Alto Pickleball Club won two gold medals
5 and three silver medals competing against the very best players in the nation. Every
6 weekday, weather permitting, we are inundated by many residents coming to Mitchell Park
7 to play or to learn how to play pickleball. This is a community feast for friendship,
8 exercise, and camaraderie. Unfortunately, the two new pickleball courts can accommodate
9 only eight people. The City of Santa Cruz has four permanent pickleball courts. Foster
10 City has four. Walnut Creek has eight. Sunnyvale has just installed four permanent courts,
11 and Concord has 14. Clearly, Palo Alto Parks and Recreation is lagging far behind its
12 neighbors. Just a year ago, we were presented with a Proclamation for the health benefits
13 pickleball provides the community. However, we're still playing pickleball every weekday
14 morning on three dilapidated and filthy tennis courts next to the Magical Playground. Each
15 day we have to get out of storage and set up 11 portable nets, whilst four just recently
16 resurfaced and beautiful tennis courts are mostly empty. We have given you all the
17 pickleball data you could possibly need, so our question is what can we do to actually make
18 something happen. Thank you.

19 Chair McDougall: Thank you, Monica. Mark Wiesel [sic].

20 Mark Wiess: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Mark Weiss. I live in Palo Alto.
21 I was one of 40 or so local residents who came out on November 10th for a glorious
22 morning up at Foothills Park. I saw Commissioners Greenfield, Reckdahl, and McDougall
23 there as well as staff, Daren. I want to give kudos to staff, Commissioners, the grand jury,
24 and activists for helping us finally dedicate the 7.7 acres of park. I look forward to seeing
25 what else we can do with that spot. What I'm here for tonight actually is Rinconada Pool.
26 I have been quite disturbed from what I have seen in the press. I've read the staff report,
27 and I've had a few conversations with this, including some ad hoc time running into staff
28 in the lobby or at the café. I've lived here quite a while. I'm kind of a duffer as a lap
29 swimmer. My sense is that this isn't quite right, so I'm really glad staff and Council pushed
30 it back to December 10th. I apologize that I did not come to the meeting when it was on
31 the agenda. I know you did adjudicate it or discuss it, deliberate it. I know we have an
32 Olympic swimmer as a Commissioner. My sense is we can get a better deal. If we're going
33 to privatize an asset like that, I think we can get a much, much, much, much, much better
34 deal in comparison. I've been doing events in Palo Alto for 25 years, not quite a PPP, but
35 I have rented the Cubberley theater for a number of times and produced events in the parks,
36 including as recently as October 18th I rented Mitchell Park for a jazz concert with Alison
37 Miller, who was on tour. I paid \$1,000 for one night. It ended up being more than 50
38 percent of my budget. I cannot believe that the best we can do is 1 percent for an asset like
39 that. Of the first \$1 million, we're getting \$10,000. That seems abominable. I'm sorry if
40 that's disrespectful. I think we have to look harder at this. I have a hard time believing that

1 out of 60 RFPs the only person that responded was the ad hoc incumbent. If we can't stop
2 it dead in its tracks and rethink this, maybe just give them a year. As an externality, Carol
3 MacPherson and Terri Baxter are very well known in the community. It's a smallish group,
4 but I really don't think you want to displace our Masters either. Thank you.

5 Chair McDougall: Thank you, Mark Weiss.

6 **IV. DEPARTMENT REPORT**

7 Chair McDougall: The next item on the agenda is the Department Report.

8 Kristen O'Kane: Thank you. Kristen O'Kane, Community Services. I have a few things,
9 and then I'll turn it over to Daren Anderson, who has some additional items to report on.
10 The first is I did want to let you know and Monica know too that we will be bringing
11 pickleball to the December meeting. It will be on the agenda, and we're hoping to have a
12 little bit more movement on a plan for some additional pickleball courts. We're still
13 working out some details. I just wanted to let everyone know there will be something.
14 That meeting is December 18th, not the normal fourth Tuesday. We are making some
15 progress. As you know, things just take some time. There's a lot of little details to work
16 out. We're working on that. A reminder. Everyone knows that the aquatics item did get
17 moved from last night's Council meeting to the December 10th Council meeting. We don't
18 have it on the agenda tonight, so we aren't discussing it. I just wanted to remind everyone
19 of that and just say that we're continuing to communicate with the different parties. Our
20 City Manager will be meeting with Carol MacPherson and will also be meeting separately
21 with Tim Sheeper. We're continuing to have dialog on the issue. We'll go from there.
22 Finally, an event coming up this Friday is our annual Holiday Tree Lighting event in Lytton
23 Plaza at 6:00 p.m. There are lots of performances by youth and adults, all holiday-themed.
24 I hope some of you or all of you can come out and enjoy the tree. Thank you. I'll turn it
25 over to Daren now.

26 Daren Anderson: Good evening. Daren Anderson, Open Space, Parks and Golf. I wanted
27 to thank the Commissioners that were able to attend that Saturday, November 10th, grand
28 opening and ribbon cutting for the 7.7-acre area. That went really well. Once again, I want
29 to thank all the Commissioners and ad hoc members who attended and helped make it
30 happen, especially Chair McDougall for helping emcee. He did a really nice job. Thank
31 you for that. I want to remind people that there's a Baylands Comprehensive Conservation
32 Plan meeting this Thursday, 6:30 p.m., at the Mitchell Park Community Center, Adobe
33 Room. We'll be covering the preferred ITT/Renzel Wetlands concept. This is something
34 the Commission weighed in heavily. There's the revised plan that reflects all the feedback
35 that we presented. We'll also discuss the draft action plan, which has the elements, goals,
36 methodology, and maps, and then a draft Byxbee Park conceptual plan and get input from
37 our stakeholders. We'll be bringing that back to the full Commission soon. The Baylands
38 Boardwalk project, I just wanted to give you an update. The project is progressing well

APPROVED

now. However, there were some delays in getting the wood necessary for the project, much later than we thought. It will mean missing the original date that they had targeted completion, which was January 6th. However, the contractor is still confident that they'll meet the deadline of their permit, which is January 31st. They still believe they'll meet it, but just wanted to apprise you due to the delay. We think the project will be a little longer than anticipated. In about 4-6 weeks, we'll be adding a bike rack to the golf course, something we've talked a little bit about in the past and decided to finally make that happen. It should have been included in the original design, but we're going to make it right now. It'll be located near the front door to the café. I wanted to also update you on the Foothills Park trails. We had 2.1 inches of rain this month at Foothills Park. I was concerned about how those new rerouted trails would fair. It's uncompacted soil. As you know, the previous areas had been washed out with rain. So far they've held up really well, and we'll be monitoring it with the next significant rain event. That concludes the Department Report.

Chair McDougall: Are there any questions or comments for Daren or Kristen?

Vice Chair Greenfield: Regarding the Baylands Boardwalk, does that mean it will be open by the end of January?

Mr. Anderson: I believe so unless there's some last-minute button-up work that's unaffiliated with or doesn't interfere with the permit regulations, things that wouldn't cause any noise, that kind of thing, small punch list items. Other than that, I believe it would be at the end of January we'd open.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Would we want to consider some kind of soft opening for the Boardwalk similar to what we did at the 7.7 acres at Foothills Park?

Mr. Anderson: I think that's very appropriate.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Finally, great work on the trails. I was out on all the new trails on Friday just after it had rained. Things were in good shape.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you.

Chair McDougall: Any other questions or comments?

Commissioner McCauley: Kristen, not to go into the substantive negotiations, is the staff anticipating for the aquatics program to make a different recommendation than they presented to the Commission last month?

Ms. O'Kane: Thank you for that question. The item was moved because the agenda was very full last night. The last item finished at 11:00. They were anticipating that the aquatics item wouldn't start until 10:45, 11:00. In anticipation of that, that's why it was moved to

1 December 10th. The exact same staff report will be posted this Thursday that was posted
2 for last night's meeting.

3 Commissioner McCauley: Do you anticipate any resolution of the issue between
4 Rinconada Masters and Team Sheeper?

5 Ms. O'Kane: When you say resolution—I'm a little hesitant to go into too much detail just
6 because this isn't an item on our agenda tonight. Could you clarify what you mean by a
7 resolution?

8 Commissioner McCauley: We obviously at our last meeting heard from lots folks who
9 expressed concern about the staff recommendation as it stood in October. It principally
10 dealt with the Rinconada Masters program and the perception that it wouldn't be renewed.
11 At that time, there was still negotiations going on between the City and Team Sheeper. I
12 don't know if those negotiations have concluded or not. If they have, do you anticipate that
13 that issue is resolved?

14 Ms. O'Kane: The contract was negotiated, and the contract signed by Team Sheeper is
15 included in the staff report. We expect to have the same staff recommendation going
16 forward on December 10th.

17 Commissioner McCauley: Forgive me. I haven't seen the staff report that went to the
18 Council. What is that recommendation?

19 Ms. O'Kane: To approve the contract.

20 Commissioner McCauley: Including a subcontract with Rinconada Masters?

21 Ms. O'Kane: No. It's a contract with Team Sheeper just as Jazmin presented to you on
22 October 23rd.

23 Commissioner McCauley: There isn't a resolution at this time concerning any subcontract
24 with Team Sheeper and Rinconada Masters?

25 Ms. O'Kane: It's not part of the staff recommendation.

26 Commissioner McCauley: I understand that the staff recommendation is limited to the
27 other piece. I'm just wondering is the other component resolved, we think it will be
28 resolved, or is it still something that is outstanding and unlikely to be resolved.

29 Ms. O'Kane: I'm hesitant on what to say in this venue, again because this isn't an agenda
30 item. I feel like we're getting into the weeds on this item. As I said, we're presenting the
31 contract to Council. It's a contract between the City and Team Sheeper.

APPROVED

Chair McDougall: I would agree. With due respect to Commissioner McCauley's interest and questions, because it's not agendized, we're on shaky ground. I would prefer that we move on to the next item. Thank you. I do want to add a couple of comments. Relative to the 7.7 acres and that opening, it's really important that we recognize the work that Daren and his crew did and particularly the work that Kathleen and her crew did. They were up there doing all sorts of stuff the day before, when I went up and checked over there. The Rangers just did a wonderful, wonderful job in the event and in preparation for the event. Please pass on our thanks to them. You mentioned the Baylands Comprehensive Plan. I plan on attending, and I want to encourage the other Commissioners to attend. That's getting to a really interesting point where we can make contributions. I agree with the comment about soft opening. I would go so far as to say in this particular case we don't need to do a soft opening like we did. We could just do an official reopening or whatever. The kind of reaction we got from Council Members for the 7.7 acres—any Baylands publicity and any publicity that we can get for the kind of work that's being done would be useful. I know you can't pick a date to have that opening yet. It doesn't even necessarily need to be on that exact date or something, but I would encourage that. I'd like to echo the work you did with the trail and the follow-up work with the trails. With that, I'd like to move on to the next agenda item, which is the approval of the draft minutes from October 23rd.

V. BUSINESS

1. Approval of Draft Minutes from the October 23, 2018 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting.

Vice Chair Greenfield requested "rule" on page 37, line 5, be revised to "role."

Approval of the draft October 23, 2018 Minutes as amended was moved by Vice Chair Greenfield and seconded by Commissioner Reckdahl. Passed 5-0, Cribbs and Moss absent

2. Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan

Ms. O'Kane: Kristen O'Kane, Community Services. I just wanted to introduce two of our Public Works staff, Karin North and Pam Boyle-Rodriguez. Tonight, we have a Public Works-focused agenda, which is great because we don't hear from them that often. The first item is on the Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan. I'll go ahead and turn that over to Karin and Pam.

Karin North: Hi, Commissioners. This is Karin North, the Watershed Protection Manager. Pam Boyle-Rodriguez is my fantastic stormwater manager, and she's been working fast and furious as well as Sarcart Suk [phonetic]. Our staff has been working fast and furious on this Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan. Pam's actually going to be the one giving the presentation. I just wanted to introduce her since you have not met her yet.



APPROVED

Pam Boyle-Rodriguez: Today, we wanted to share with you some information about what we've been doing to develop our Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan or GSI Plan. We're going to talk about what GSI is, a little bit of background about the plan and the stormwater permit that requires the plan, and some challenges that we ran into while we've been developing the plan and proposed solutions, and our next steps. First of all, what is GSI? GSI, as I mentioned, is green stormwater infrastructure. Traditionally, we've been managing stormwater by trying to get it from our driveways into the street and down the gutter into the storm drain inlet. Unfortunately, that alleviates a lot of ponding and flooding, but it picks up a lot of pollutants along the way from a lot of paved surfaces. Those pollutants go into our storm drain system, straight into our creeks and our Bay without getting treated. We're trying to look at how we integrate GSI, which uses more natural processes. Right here on the right, you have what's called a bioretention area or bioretention basin that has soil mix that has mostly compost and sand. It allows the water to infiltrate. It has a particular plant palette there with plants that can uptake pollutants. As you can see over here, there's a curb opening that is taking the stormwater runoff. If there's too many storms in a row, there's something right here called an overflow, so it will overflow into here, and it goes into the storm drain system. It doesn't go back onto the street. What we're doing with this plan is trying to figure out, looking at our public facilities, our right-of-way areas, how we can integrate GSI back into our system so that it's a combination of the traditional approach and a newer approach with GSI. Here's an example of a three-way intersection from the Charleston-Arastradero Corridor project that is being constructed right now. This is what it looks like now. The artist rendering here shows that it's going to have much safer pedestrian and bike safety components. There's going to be a lot of medians, a lot of increasing canopy along the corridor. Right here, here's a bioretention area. You can see that there's curb openings to capture the runoff from the street. It's, as you can see compared to here, sometimes called the bump-out. It allows for cars that are approaching this pedestrian area and this intersection—they're forced to slow down. Not only does this area help to treat stormwater, help infiltrate rain, but it also provides some safety features to the street. It basically changes the name of this type of street from a complete street, which has a lot of bike/ped safety, to what's called a sustainable street. I want to go back to the top just to point out that—as you all know, this is Mitchell Park. It has a green roof. It has some pervious parking, and it has medians that receive the stormwater runoff from the parking. All those are types of GSI features sometimes called stormwater treatment measures. This is from the Southgate neighborhood. The bottom here is from our pump station at Matadero Creek that we just finished. It has pervious pavement. This is a Middlefield-Kellogg project for bike safety. Going back to the presentation over here, all the counties in the Bay Area have to meet some requirements from the Regional Water Board that write a permit called a Municipal Regional Permit or the MRP. One of the many requirements in there are that all cities in the Bay Area have to submit to the Regional Board by the end of September 2019 a GSI plan that identifies GSI project potential for all planned and future CIPs on City property or on the right-of-way. They may or may not have projects or incentives, requirements for



APPROVED

private property but definitely have to identify potential for public property. That's why we're working on this GSI plan, to submit it by September 2019. Last year, we had a framework or an outline signed by our City Manager and submitted to the Regional Water Board. A couple of other things we have to do is show as a county that the GSI implementation does equal to pollutant load reductions to the Bay. That's done with a lot of very calculated calculations that I'm not going to go into right now. This other bullet about conduct early implementation, because the GSI plan takes a while to develop, the Regional Board wanted us to make sure that we are identifying potential—to put GSI in projects that are going in the ground now. A lot of large CIPs that have been identified, Fire Station 3 that's going in now, are required because of the size of the project to have GSI on the property. These are some of the basic components that are going to be in the GSI plan. It's a pretty thick document. In general, we've identified various project locations. These are all public properties owned by the City. Project locations, not project concepts. We've prioritized those according to particular criteria that we think works for the City. We have to have a system to track these projects, whether they're going to have GSI or not. We have to show the Regional Water Board that we're really vetting these projects as a City. We have to have guidelines and specifications for the construction of these features. We have to integrate the concept of GSI in all our City plans, so we need to update our Pedestrian and Bike Safety Plan; we need to update our Comp Plan. Luckily, the Comp Plan was just updated, and it does have sufficient mention of it. The North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan that is going on right now, we're working to integrate GSI into that. Any future plans that come up, any future policies, we have to not only acknowledge GSI but really integrate that concept into our work from now on. We have to evaluate how we're going to fund the implementation of this plan. A lot of times plans have to be created, and then they might get put on a shelf. The Regional Board is taking this seriously, and they're making us really figure out how we're going to pay for these projects. We have to come up with a plan, a schedule, basically all our next steps of how we're going to make this plan happen. The next permit that's currently being negotiated and going to be in play in a couple of years will probably have a lot of new requirements about how we have to implement the plan. While we've been for several months working to develop this plan and meeting with staff and doing a lot of research, we've identified some challenges that we know we need to solve or find a solution to, so that we can implement this plan successfully. One of those things is public and private properties aren't using standard specifications for these GSI features, which can result in some issues. We're inspecting these sites to determine how effective they are. There is also a related issue with some of these things not being constructed according to design. We're going to be contracting with a consultant to create some very specific engineering guidelines and specifications that meet all the Public Works and Utilities requirements, so that we also know how to deal with utilities that are in the street, whether they're existing or planned updates. Another thing is the stormwater management fee passed last year. There is a limited allocation to GSI. Most of that stormwater fee is going to our more traditional storm drain system upgrades, which we also need. We need to identify some additional

funding. After the plan is accepted by City Council, one of our next steps is to work on a very comprehensive funding needs and opportunity study, so that we can figure out how to fund these projects, both construction and perhaps more importantly maintenance. We also realized that we need to update our stormwater Muni Code. It just so happens that we're also doing that right now. We're putting adequate language in there so that we have sufficient authority to implement this plan per the permit and to enforce it. Probably one of the most important things is we're working internally with a lot of staff and trying to figure out what tools we need to put in place, so that we can now assess GSI potential in a very standardized way. We're hoping to use a map-based process with GIS and criteria that we all can agree on at least as a first step. We'd be doing field tours, site visits, and things like that. We have to come up with that process so that we're considering it consistently internally and we can present that to the public in a consistent manner. As you know, we have a lot of facilities that already have GSI, Rinconada Library, Mitchell Park, a couple of pump stations with pervious pavement, the Southgate neighborhood. We know now that we're not maintaining these consistently, and we need more information about how well they're doing, how well they're being maintained over time, are they being as effective as they should be, as how they were designed. We need to monitor these better. We need to maintain them more consistently. Staff needs to be trained, and contractors need to be trained as well. We're also going to be hiring a consultant to help us with a maintenance and monitoring plan, to assess our current features and to help us create something for the future. As you probably know, there's mixed emotions about GSI, especially when they're in certain parks and in neighborhoods. Not everybody might appreciate all the benefits that a community can have from GSI. One thing we're going to work on is an outreach strategy to try to share all the multiple benefits that GSI can bring. When it's integrated with all the plans, I think that will also help. I don't know if any of you saw this. Last summer, I think in August, there was this handout with our utility bill insert. One thing that we tried to do was try to get people to think beyond a small-scale cistern on a site or a pervious driveway. We're trying to get people to realize that we can do this at a street level. There's a stormwater planter receiving roof runoff. There's permeable pavement along the sidewalk. Here's a bioretention. There are two or three here that are receiving runoff from the street. Here's a tree-well filter. They're called suspended pavement systems, but they're basically like plastic crates that allow roots to grow, allow the trees to grow tall, meet urban forestry guidelines with soil volume requirements. Also, we can mix in soil that can infiltrate stormwater as well, the particular soil mix that we use in the bioretention area. This was one of our first major steps to the public to get folks to understand how large we can get Citywide. Our timeline. Here's a general timeline. We over the summer completed what we call a 50-percent plan. We've been meeting for over a year with the Stormwater Oversight Committee, which was appointed to oversee the expenditures of the stormwater fee. We also met with the City sustainability board, which has a lot of executive leadership on it. We're going to continue working with the Stormwater Oversight Committee. Next month, we're presenting to the Planning and Transportation Commission as well. Next month, we're hoping to have an

APPROVED

1 85-percent plan that we'll make available to everyone for review. Around February—it's
2 not in this timeline because it came about after we finished this—we're going to have a
3 public meeting and hope to have a 100-percent plan ready around March. We have some
4 time between April and June allotted in case we need to go to Council more than once, but
5 we're hoping to go to Council around April and get it accepted by June. As I mentioned,
6 it has to be submitted to the Regional Board with our annual report in September. For next
7 steps, we're really going to be digging even further into how we're going to implement this
8 internally. We have a website; we're going to improve our website. We're going to be
9 working on scopes of work and put out RFPs next year for those consultant products and
10 hopefully get our plan accepted next year, so we can really jump into implementation.
11 Thank you.

12 Chair McDougall: Thank you very much. Do we have any questions? Jeff, I'll start with
13 you at that end.

14 Commissioner LaMere: Sure. I appreciate all your work with this. I think it's a great
15 environmental benefit to us, both getting pollutants out of the Bay and recharging
16 groundwater. Although slightly off topic, I always find it interesting to see what is put into
17 the stormwater drains. I'll walk by a house that's building a basement, and they're pumping
18 out millions of gallons of water into our storm drain, which is not on this topic but just
19 something that came to my mind. Will we be trying to do some projects that would affect
20 existing infrastructure, for example, Ross Road which already has bump-outs from when
21 they constructed the bicycle lane, the bicycle area? That seems like maybe low-hanging
22 fruit for that. Is that correct?

23 Ms. Boyle-Rodriguez: Yes. In front of the YMCA, it has one stormwater feature. To be
24 honest, it wasn't designed as best as it could be. I agree we should look at how to retrofit
25 some of those areas. Once we do the main monitoring plan and get a better sense of what
26 is not working well, then we should look at retrofitting. We'd have to talk to an engineer
27 about how easy it is to retrofit some of those areas.

28 Commissioner LaMere: It's interesting that we're also potentially talking about synthetic
29 turf tonight. That would seem to be a great project where we're worried about runoff from
30 the synthetic turf and how this could partner with that in capturing some of that runoff,
31 whether it's the pellets or whatever is on that artificial turf that we choose. Thank you very
32 much for your work with this.

33 Commissioner Reckdahl: I do think it's a very good thing to work on. Raising the water
34 table around a park is going to help the vegetation, help the trees. There's a lot of beneficial
35 aspects for the whole community. Big picture, is your plan, like best practices, just
36 recommendations or is it mandatory requirements for all these?

APPROVED

1 Ms. Boyle-Rodriguez: It's mandatory. We're requiring that all the plans be updated. We
2 can't necessarily require GSI at every single CIP or every single project because there's no
3 funding at the moment. That's the largest obstacle right now. What we are doing is
4 requiring that it become more of a standard operating procedure. When staff is considering
5 a project, one of the number one things is can you integrate GSI. It doesn't have to be
6 something like a major project; it could just be thinking about "I'm not going to let the roof
7 runoff go to the pavement. It's going to go to landscaping." How can we design this project
8 so that we minimize impervious surfaces? It can be just from looking at different ways to
9 design the site to doing more. What we've been talking about with the Public Safety
10 Building is there's going to be trees all along that area. I mentioned the trees with the
11 suspended pavement system, those plastic crate things. We're trying to see if we can
12 capture additional runoff from surrounding streets because those trees are going to be in
13 the sidewalk there anyway. They're being put in as part of the project. Can we leverage
14 that? Can we do a little bit more? We've done a rough calculation that for maybe \$20,000
15 extra we can treat about 12,000 extra square feet of impervious surface.

16 Commissioner Reckdahl: Is the hope that there will be a separate fund that would pay for
17 this or that the incremental cost would have to be absorbed by the project itself?

18 Ms. Boyle-Rodriguez: I think partly it's going to be absorbed by the CIP. The maintenance
19 for the item we're not sure how we're going to deal with. Like I said, to construction the
20 bioretention area is \$20,000, but we have to maintain it for the life of the project.

21 Commissioner Reckdahl: Would you anticipate that these requirements would be in the
22 form of like 10 percent of your budget has to go to this or you have to have these features?
23 How would you regulate this?

24 Ms. Boyle-Rodriguez: I would say we're not sure yet. I think we're wanting to hear
25 feedback from management and City Council. Do you have anything to say, Karin?

26 Ms. North: As we go through the plan development, we're going to have some options
27 available. The decision will need to be made. Our ultimate goal is that GSI and stormwater
28 treatment will become integrated and integral in the system in the City and how we
29 maintain and manage our landscape because it's a benefit to the community. Rather than
30 it's a requirement or a mandate, it just becomes business practice that we look at a project
31 and see how we can improve it and how to get more. It basically complements all of our
32 Comp Plan, our Sustainability and Climate Action Plan goals, our urban forestry goals.
33 Everything is integral, and that's where we're going to try and see if we can just change the
34 mindset. The key for us is really going to be funding. That's a second piece that a
35 consultant's going to be used, how can we be creative about maybe trying to get another
36 funding source in.

APPROVED

1 Commissioner Reckdahl: Talking to people around what they would think of these
2 retention ponds, I think there's generally a positive attitude towards them. People do
3 wonder about mosquitos, weeds since it's going to be very wet. What about the mosquito
4 issue?

5 Ms. Boyle-Rodriguez: The bioretention areas, for example, have to be designed so that
6 they infiltrate within 48 hours. It's not a mosquito issue. We don't really have any plan to
7 put in retention ponds, large ponds, because we don't have room for that in our City. If that
8 came about, sometimes they do things to aerate the water. The Mosquito Abatement
9 Control District is very involved with our permit as well, and they actually go out annually
10 and inspect all these features that we have.

11 Commissioner Reckdahl: The vegetation that's in these areas has to be able to absorb all
12 this water or tolerate all this water. What about during the summer? Do you have to irrigate
13 that?

14 Ms. Boyle-Rodriguez: It does have to be irrigated. They are drought-tolerant plants, most
15 of them. They're not a type of plant you might see in a wetland or something like that. The
16 soil has a lot of sand, so it doesn't necessarily have standing water. Some of these features
17 do have to be watered in the summer, at least for maybe three years until well established.

18 Commissioner Reckdahl: The other thing was Bol Park. We had that plan that was
19 proposed where we actually would be capturing water and treating it and retaining it. Can
20 you talk about that?

21 Ms. Boyle-Rodriguez: Sure. That was a very preliminary concept that was part of a larger
22 countywide stormwater resource plan. It's a plan ...

23 Commissioner Reckdahl: Do we anticipate projects like that going forward or was that
24 just ...

25 Ms. Boyle-Rodriguez: I'm sorry?

26 Commissioner Reckdahl: Do we anticipate projects like that going forward?

27 Ms. Boyle-Rodriguez: Perhaps in other locations we could consider that, but we don't have
28 any plans for a project like that. It's basically like an underground tank. Something like
29 that can only be installed in parks that have a pretty large field. There would definitely be
30 some compromises to be made by the public because the fields would have to be out-of-
31 play for a year or less. In areas where we have a lower water table, it could very much
32 make sense, especially as we have more and more droughts. We have a lot of impacts from
33 climate change. It makes sense that if folks need to water the parks we're reusing the water
34 that's coming out of the sky. The treatment system underground includes a lot of pre-

APPROVED

1 filtration so that whatever is used to irrigate is very high quality. You can build monitoring
2 stations there, and you test that water over months until you're sure that it's the quality that
3 you need. It's not dangerous in any way. We would regularly monitor that water. We
4 have a sampling team that does regular sampling from our group anyway that could be
5 involved. Outside of the Bay Area, it's done in a lot of other cities. There's a project right
6 now in south San Francisco that is going to be built with a lot of Caltrans funding. It's not
7 a novel idea, and it hasn't been shown to be dangerous anywhere it's been done.

8 Commissioner Reckdahl: I would think the price tag may be pretty high.

9 Ms. Boyle-Rodriguez: It's very high.

10 Commissioner Reckdahl: Would it be cheaper to run purple pipe to every park?

11 Ms. North: Purple pipe is actually really expensive. We've been working since 2007 to
12 look at doing a purple pipe expansion project up to Stanford Research Park, and it's around
13 \$45 million. We just had a study session with Council last Monday, the 19th, where we
14 were discussing different options of what do we want to do with recycled water. That's a
15 whole other discussion. Basically right now, it looks like Council has—they each had their
16 own opinion. We didn't actually ask for an action item because this was a study session.
17 They all sounded like they want us to look at doing direct potable reuse rather than purple
18 pipe, nontraditional non-potable, and utilize maybe our groundwater basin or other water
19 sources within Palo Alto versus running purple pipe projects throughout our City because
20 of the price tag. There's more to come on that. We're spending a lot of time looking at
21 basically purified water, enhanced recycled water, lots of fun stuff. If you ever want us to
22 come back and talk to you guys about that, I'd be more than happy to.

23 Commissioner Reckdahl: Actually I would love that going forward. Thank you.

24 Commissioner McCauley: Thanks very much for the presentation. That's great. One
25 question just out of curiosity. Do these GSI features, particularly the streetscape-like
26 features, have a lifespan where you expect you have to go in and replace the GSI features
27 after some period of time?

28 Ms. Boyle-Rodriguez: It does vary between pervious pavement or a bioretention area. A
29 bioretention area has a lifespan of about 20, 25 years. You do have to go in there depending
30 on the land use maybe after eight years to replace the soil. There's typical landscaping-
31 type maintenance, like it should be composted every year. You have to replace plants. We
32 have to make sure the pipes don't get clogged yearly. All that maintenance is done by our
33 staff. Other than that, they maintain pretty well. The pervious pavement has to be
34 vacuumed regularly. Ideally, you wouldn't put it in a place where you might expect a lot
35 of fine sediment to blow over it. It probably wouldn't make sense to put it next to a beach
36 or something like that. The roof gardens, I don't know if you know that the green roof on

APPROVED

1 Mitchell Park has been really tough to maintain. They're very complicated, very expensive
2 to maintain. That is one feature that we're shying away from right now. Once everything
3 is established, folks are adequately trained to maintain it, it's not necessarily harder to
4 maintain than any other asset that we have and probably easier and cheaper to maintain
5 than a traditional storm drain system.

6 Commissioner McCauley: Forgive me. You just sparked a follow-up out of curiosity again.
7 Green roofs seem like a great thing. What's the difficulty and why that move away from
8 them?

9 Ms. Boyle-Rodriguez: There's a limited amount of soil. The type of plants that can live
10 up there, sometimes it's tough to get them established. You have to run irrigation up there.
11 Sometimes it can be a lot of energy cost to run the irrigation up there. If something goes
12 wrong with the irrigation, it can be more expensive to fix. We had an issue with a lot of
13 agricultural bugs on the Mitchell Park roof. I don't think they ever figured out where that
14 came from. There are some places like the City of Chicago that have big green roof
15 programs. It obviously makes a big difference in reducing climate change impacts as well.
16 We just need to learn more in the Bay Area at least for City projects. It's being done by
17 big private companies. At the municipal level, we haven't figured out how to do it a little
18 bit cheaper. It costs a few thousand a month to maintain right now the one on Mitchell
19 Park.

20 Chair McDougall: Jeff.

21 Vice Chair Greenfield: Thank you for the presentation. Getting some education on this is
22 very welcome and useful. The first question I have is what is the requirement or impact
23 regarding private properties or is there any requirement in both business and residential?

24 Ms. Boyle-Rodriguez: It just so happens, because we're updating our stormwater Muni
25 Code, we are proposing an update that all properties—let me back up and provide a little
26 bit of background. Properties that are new or redeveloped and that create at least 10,000
27 square feet of impervious surface have to have stormwater treatment onsite. That's
28 relatively common. That's, for example, the size of Mitchell Park or something like that.
29 Fire Station 3 met that requirement. Now, between 2,500 and 10,000 square feet
30 impervious surface, there has to be something called low-impact development. It's
31 basically site design, like I mentioned before, catching roof runoff, catching it in a cistern,
32 putting it to landscaping, using pervious pavement. It's smaller scale, and it doesn't fit an
33 engineering design like the GSI features. We are changing that requirement so that
34 basically any project that gets developed or redeveloped has to do that, which means they'd
35 have to capture the roof runoff or use pervious pavement or use a cistern, whatever they
36 wanted. They basically have to design their site as much as possible to reduce impervious
37 surface and then capture that stormwater runoff onsite. We are proposing that as part of
38 our Muni Code update. As part of the GSI plan, we're mentioning some ideas and some

incentives. We're hoping to get our plan accepted, meet the permit requirement deadline, and then dig a little further into private projects. Part of that is somewhat related to our funding options. If we require GSI at a project that is lot line to lot line and they have no room to put in a bioretention area, perhaps they could pay a fee that goes into a fund that helps to fund public GSI, in a street for example. Maybe they're going to put bioretention on their sidewalk for the parking lot, but maybe we come up with a compromise so that they put it on the street and capture some of the street runoff and the parking lot runoff. These are just ideas, and we're not requiring anything through the GSI plan because we do also need to meet the permit requirement. We don't want to get caught in too much negotiation.

Ms. North: That's Phase II. You can tell our staff is very excited about the next phase. That's part of what Pam had alluded to, that we need to get consultant help on funding strategies. These are some of the brainstorming ideas. We welcome your ideas as well. We'll have to come back to you guys when we get a better sense of what Phase II is about, how we fund all these projects.

Vice Chair Greenfield: There will be guidelines for business developments with the larger acreage. Presumably you're working in conjunction with the Planning and Transportation Department to get these Code changes put in for the permitting process. As far as the average 5,000-7,000-square-foot residential lot, minimal impact, I assume there's some guidelines and recommendations that people can help with. Moving further, you're planning to add enforcement authority. Will there be enforcement that will impact residents?

Ms. Boyle-Rodriguez: Perhaps. Our team is very involved in plan review. What we try to do is identify opportunities or even requirements that have to be met during the plan review stage, and then we talk to a lot of architects on the phone about how to meet those requirements. We haven't run into any issues in terms of site design enforcement. Between the 5,000 and 7,000 is going to be that requirement in the Muni Code update to have to keep the runoff onsite.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I'm talking about lot size as opposed to impervious. You're talking about if there's asphalt or cement covering 5,000-7,000 ...

Ms. Boyle-Rodriguez: That's correct.

Vice Chair Greenfield: ... or 2,500, which wouldn't likely be the case or may be the case.

Ms. North: We are trying to update our ordinance Code so when someone does a remodel on their house, they are taking those (inaudible) and not just hard piping them into the street. They have to be captured to irrigate your property. There are some things that we're proposing in this Code update that would actually impact some residences, but it's not going

APPROVED

1 to be a huge impact. It's just a greener, more sustainable design. When you're redeveloping
2 or remodeling your home, that's your ultimate goal.

3 Vice Chair Greenfield: I support the concept and the end goals here. Switching gears a
4 bit. Have you considered some type of neighborhood champion program for the
5 neighborhood GSI features? You have some planting areas; you have someone who lives
6 nearby or a guy who likes to walk the neighborhood, so you have some sort of direct, vetted
7 communication line to staff regarding maintenance needs?

8 Ms. Boyle-Rodriguez: We have thought about working with maybe a local nonprofit that
9 could help us perhaps maintain some features, and then build a volunteer base that could
10 help us and be, like you said, a champion. Our Zero Waste group has Zero Waste
11 Champions throughout neighborhoods. Perhaps that could overlap, help us keep track
12 even. If they see a broken irrigation line, they would have an appropriate contact number.
13 If they could help us weed, if they could let us know about different things. In the
14 Southgate neighborhood, there was a car that had parked into the bioretention area, so we
15 were notified about that. I think that's a great idea, and we are hoping to do that.

16 Vice Chair Greenfield: There are the neighborhood preparedness groups that are already
17 spread amongst the community that might be worth tapping into as well. You have goals
18 to improve outreach. I'm wondering if the goal of the outreach feedback or to push
19 acceptance? How do you straddle the line?

20 Ms. Boyle-Rodriguez: The general outreach effort would be more about acceptance of the
21 general concept. Every time there's a GSI project, it would go through the regular public
22 review process and go to Council, go to the ARB. There would be an opportunity for
23 feedback as well.

24 Vice Chair Greenfield: I'm asking with an eye to what happened with Bol Park where there
25 was a proposal for both the underground tanks and the bioswales. My impression is that
26 the bioswales idea was generally met with positive feedback and the underground tank not
27 so much. Is this a good precedent? If the community is up in arms about something, we're
28 trying not to push forward with this or it depends on what it is? I know it's a difficult
29 question to answer in the generalization.

30 Ms. North: This is where sometimes we're stuck as staff. Do we share a very high-level
31 concept before it's vetted, before we've had an opportunity to go to the community? We
32 learn as we move forward. Unfortunately, this is something we learned. Because it was in
33 the stormwater resource plan, we wanted to put in all the high-level concepts. The way we
34 look at is if it was in the stormwater resource plan within the county, then we could
35 potentially get grant money. If it was not included in the stormwater resource plan, then
36 we in the future could not get grant money. We talked about it at our Stormwater Oversight
37 Committee meeting; the members there were very excited by this, and they wanted to share

APPROVED

1 it with Bol Park members. Would we do it in that manner in the future? No, we probably
2 would wait. "We know you're excited by this, but we actually need to have a public
3 meeting. We're not there yet." We try to slow down the process. People are excited, and
4 community members are excited, and we got stuck. Would we do that differently in the
5 future? Yes.

6 Vice Chair Greenfield: Part of the reason I'm asking is how can we as a Commission assist
7 with that. In this particular case, as soon as the Bol Park plan was released, residents of
8 the Bol Park area contacted me as part of the Parks and Rec Commission. "What do you
9 know about this? Oh, nothing." I contacted staff.

10 Ms. North: As I said before, it was very, very concept level. They thought we had already
11 decided on it, which we hadn't. We hadn't even gone through a whole vetting process.
12 That is where we'll go back if—right now, Bol Park is not high on the list for projects based
13 on the ranking that Pam and her team have done. We spent a lot of time on something that
14 actually is not ranked pretty high. We've learned that the marketing and how you express
15 the information and how it's been tweaked too can be a challenge.

16 Vice Chair Greenfield: Depending on the development path of this, we may want to
17 consider an ad hoc within the Parks and Rec Commission to help assist you.

18 Ms. North: If we were at a level where we were really fleshing it out and bringing it out to
19 the community, we'd be coming to you, and you'd be invited to any public meeting that we
20 had. It was a very high-level concept that our Stormwater Oversight Committee was very
21 excited about. It made our lives a little bit more challenging than we anticipated.

22 Vice Chair Greenfield: Just one final question. You mentioned some of the master plans
23 will need updating. I'm wondering if the Parks and Recreation Master Plan will need some
24 updating as well. It's the one we just finished.

25 Ms. North: I think the Parks and Rec Master Plan actually has a line about GSI, but it's not
26 elaborated on. If it ever did come up for renewal—if I remember correctly, I think we did
27 manage to sneak it in. It's not the level of detail that we'd obviously like. It's one of those
28 things where Council still hasn't accepted this plan yet.

29 Commissioner Reckdahl: We did discuss swales and other water retention issues in parks
30 and said that was best guidelines.

31 Chair McDougall: Thank you for your presentation. I want to say the same as Jeff just
32 said. I'm very enthusiastic about the goals and ambitions and the fundamental idea of what
33 you're trying to do. I have to say I'm probably not as enthusiastic as everybody else here
34 is about the work that you've presented and the status that we're at. You've been working
35 on this for a year, year and a half. You've got nine months left to go. Frankly, I felt in the

1 presentation there was a lot of "we're thinking about that." I would have thought at this
2 particular point, because this is the only time on your timeline that you're going to present
3 to us, you might have been more specific than "we're thinking about that." Before you go
4 all the way back to Council, I would like to invite you to come back and give us an updated
5 presentation. I'm not going to ask you to respond to any of my comments. The one thing
6 that bothers me in particular is an ad hoc has spent time on our CIP numbers recently for
7 the various projects. What I listened to right now—as we go through those projects, some
8 of them are obviously impacted by this, and some of them are not. I hear 20, 30-percent
9 impact to any of those projects. Where we've got a number in there right now that says
10 \$250,000, I can imagine if we say, "Daren, come back and tell us how much this is going
11 to cost if you comply to the GSI," he's going to come back with another \$75,000 or
12 something. Imposing that kind of funding on parks and rec in particular but to the City in
13 general without visibility is my concern here. I don't see that there's visibility of that. I
14 kind of doubt that in your outreach plan you're planning on telling the citizens, "By the
15 way, this is going to be good for you. You just need to know it's going to cost the City
16 another \$20 million or something." By the time you do these projects—you've mentioned
17 over and over again the maintenance issue. When we look at our CIP projects, we've got
18 10 percent, 20 percent of the money at most left over to do something new. Everything
19 else is maintenance. I'm kind of worried by the funding implications of this. I understand
20 that some outside body, outside the City, said we have to do this, so we have to do this. I'd
21 really like to hear more about where the money's coming from. Are we going to go to the
22 federal government, and they're going to give us money? Are we going to go to the State?
23 Are we going to go to our citizens and do a bond measure to fund this? The important part
24 of all this is not necessarily the implementation. It's what the standards are. You've
25 confused me relative to whether the standards apply to the projects that we do, the
26 commercial projects, or residential projects, and how all that comes. I'm not comfortable
27 that you've got a good definition of that. The fact that we've done some GSI projects and
28 we haven't bothered to measure them, so we have no idea of are we doing anything useful.
29 We're going to spend all this money, we're going to do all this effort, and we have no idea.
30 This is something where, as was commented—our Parks Plan was completed last year.
31 There was something about swales, but there wasn't anything big about this, and that GSI
32 was not a whole chapter. Now, a year later, we're going to spend millions of dollars to
33 implement GSI even though it was not on the horizon before bothers me. I also see that,
34 as you go through this, your plan doesn't call out a step where consultants get involved. As
35 I heard it, I think there's four different places where you're going to invite consultants in. I
36 wonder if, at some point, something like this—I've asked this question within our own CIP,
37 whether there's knowledge that we like to build ourselves rather than simply contracting
38 out, and the consultant builds the knowledge and gets to use that knowledge to go sell the
39 same information to Mountain View or whatever else. Maybe some of these things are not
40 consultant-rich projects as opposed to in-house Public Works projects. The last thing I
41 would comment on is in a specific level you talked about in lots of these projects the trees
42 are going to be there anyway. This is good for the trees because we're going to capture the

1 water for the trees, which are going to be there anyway. I would have been interested, in
2 the list of five things that you have on the front page of the document we were given, if
3 there was a number six, which is you weren't just going to deal with what was going to be
4 there anyway, but it was habitat that was deliberately being built. We took down the trees
5 in front of my house because they had elm disease. Two years later, they replaced them. I
6 worry that the City cares about trees, take a survey and ask people, "What do you care?
7 Why do you like Palo Alto? We love our trees." I see nothing in here that says you're
8 going to do anything about that. You're going to help the trees that might coincidentally
9 be there. The picture you showed of Arastradero had trees in it, but I didn't see anything
10 in your writing or your conversation that explicitly called out that you were going to put in
11 some plants or whatever, but plants that are contributing to the things that people like in
12 the City, which is the trees that are part of it. A bit of a rant. I would encourage you to
13 come back and give us an update, if nothing else to practice on us before you go to Council.
14 Thank you for your time and the effort that you're putting into this. As I said, the goals are
15 correct. Thank you. Karin, you're willing to stay?

16 Ms. North: Sure. To be honest, we actually really appreciate your feedback. We've been,
17 as you saw, spending a lot of time on this. Actually our City staff is doing a good chunk
18 of the work because we don't have a lot of money for consultant support. We do value all
19 of your input. It is still at 85 percent; we're not done yet. It's a little challenging when
20 you're giving an update when we don't have the completed 85-percent, but we want to keep
21 on moving on with our schedule. We do appreciate your input. Yes, the funding is a huge
22 issue. We know our CIPs too are, just because of the construction and getting people to do
23 work in Palo Alto, a challenge.

24 Chair McDougall: As a citizen as opposed to a Commission Chair, I might write you the
25 rest of my notes.

26 Ms. North: That would be great. I'd greatly appreciate it.

27 **3. Horizontal Levee Conceptual Design**

28 Chair McDougall: Would you like to talk to us about the horizontal levee conceptual plan?

29 Ms. North: Sure. We're switching gears a little bit. We actually went to Council about
30 sea level rise, a study session, I think three years ago. Julie Weiss is actually working in
31 partnership with the Office of Sustainability on a sea level rise policy and plan. In
32 conjunction with this, there are a lot of buzz and a lot of excitement about these horizontal
33 levees. We're going to give you an update on what's going on. Currently, our existing
34 levees in Palo Alto are not FEMA rated; they're not the FEMA accreditation standards.
35 We're looking at SAFER, which is another project—I don't know if Public Works has been
36 to discuss SAFER with you guys. There's a SAFER feasibility report that's not done yet,
37 which is probably why they have not come to talk to you. Hopefully, in early 2019 we can

1 come back to you to talk about SAFER and our sea level rise policy and plan development.
2 We're trying to meld all these together. You know what the horizontal levee is. Rather
3 than building the levees higher, they're building them longer. It helps with waves. It helps
4 accrete, so the sediment will build up. It will give our saltmarsh harvest mice and clapper
5 rails somewhere to go. Now in the king tide, they go to the levee, and then they're basically
6 free picking. All the naturalists come and say, "Palo Alto's the prime example of how you
7 don't want to have your levee system work with our king tides." It helps with flood
8 management. For us, since it's right next to the wastewater treatment plant, you can utilize
9 the wastewater treatment plant effluent to provide that freshwater habitat, which is upland
10 and which is a nice benefit. This gives you an example of what the horizontal levee system
11 looks like. It's much longer so your eye can see it. It's not your traditional levee where it's
12 just a big wall, which we don't really want to see. That's what we've seen in some of the
13 preliminary SAFER alignments for levees. Some of the options are really big walls to
14 protect our community. We're trying to see if there are other options out there. We were
15 lucky that we were approached through—across the Bay, Oro Loma Sanitary District has
16 a test bed horizontal levee system; they got some money. We were asked if we wanted to
17 be another concept area for a horizontal levee. Daren and I said, "Absolutely. Why not?
18 Free money and a free concept." We're not going to say no to that. This was a collaboration
19 with Environmental Sciences Associates and San Francisco Estuary Institute. SFEI does
20 phenomenal research throughout the entire Bay Area. As a wastewater treatment plant and
21 stormwater, we fund them. This is another research project that they do. They evaluated
22 seven sites within our community, and we vetted some of those. We decided to go for the
23 three. This is still high-level concept. Just like Bol Park, we haven't made any decisions
24 yet. We picked the three sites because of the proximity to the wastewater treatment plant,
25 obviously water availability because putting pipes in ground, as we were alluding to earlier
26 with the recycled water pipelines, is really expensive. Trying to tie it into our SAFER
27 project as well. The con is also tying it in with our SAFER project because no one wants
28 to have a levee. Everyone likes to have control over it. We're trying to tie it in timing-
29 wise hopefully by 2019, and then we can get it integrated more. This is our Embarcadero
30 conceptual design. This area is essentially the airport, where you can see my airport
31 parking lot. It's the widest part when you're walking out there. Right now the habitat's not
32 that great, and that's part of the reason why it ranked higher. This would be our Phase I,
33 the area that's poor habitat, wider zoned so we're not impacting our existing saltmarsh. We
34 would be potentially one of the first ones to actually get a horizontal levee into an open
35 waterway. Keep in mind it took them three to five years to permit the test levee design at
36 Oro Loma that doesn't even discharge into the Bay. This is still fine, new, and exciting.
37 The second phase, if it works well, would be the build out along this portion, which is right
38 in front of our wastewater treatment plant and right in front of the Environmental
39 Volunteers and up towards the Ranger's station. This gives you a little better sense of the
40 space needed. The thing about the slope is it's a very shallow slope. That's why you need
41 more space for it. This is Embarcadero Road, and this where the new SAFER levee top
42 would be. We could have all this great habitat, utilizing our freshwater from our effluent

APPROVED

and providing this brackish marsh that could provide refuge for the saltmarsh harvest mouse and the clapper rail, Ridgeway rail. This gives you a sense of the slope and the gradient. This is another view of it. We can have kind of a riparian corridor, walking trails. This is just a very high-level concept. This is the 2018 construction costs and the 2021 construction costs. That's why we're looking at doing Phase I first, to see how long it's going to take to get built. The escalation in costs between 2018 and 2021 and the 35-percent contingency. We haven't done any design engineering work at all. The nice thing is we do have some funding to get more of a conceptual design done. We're continuing to partner with the San Francisco Estuary Partnership. We're going to get a 30-percent preliminary design, and then we'll come back to you guys. We actually have some funding through the USEPA climate ready estuaries, and we're trying to see if we can find some other funding for the remaining project phases. With Measure AA and anything that has to do with the Baylands, finding outside funding is feasible. You need to have a shovel-ready concept. We're trying to do 30 percent and then think about all the permitting requirements since it is an area adjacent to existing saltmarsh, which will be very challenging permitting-wise. We're always up for a challenge. That's the horizontal levee discussion. I'm here in the hotseat again for the Renzel Marsh after this, so keep on going.

Chair McDougall: Jeff, do you have any comments?

Vice Chair Greenfield: Could you repeat what SAFER stands for please? I'm not trying to put you on the spot. I got Strategy to Advance Flood Protection.

Ms. North: We've always called it SAFER. Strategy to Advance Flood Protection, Ecosystems, and Recreation. This was in partnership with the San Francisco Creek JPA. HDR is the consultant working on it. Redwood City and north in East Palo Alto have already done a feasibility study on SAFER. Mountain View's also done a feasibility study for sea level rise, and Palo Alto has not. A few years back, we decided to throw in some more money so we could make sure we bridge it. It doesn't make sense to have people to the north and to the south, and us in the middle not have a plan. That was the strategy. That's why it's called SAFER because it's linking it with the people to the north.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Could you say a little bit more about why the three choices out of seven were moved forward and four of the original options were no longer considered? What was (crosstalk)?

Ms. North: Some of it had to do with logistics and location. In the report, you will see that they had some on the other side of the duck pond, which we don't need. Some were down in Mountain View benefitting their area, but our effluent pipeline doesn't go down there. It would be a challenge to get our—putting pipes in the ground costs quite a bit of money. Recycled water goes there, but we don't have effluent. We don't have recycled water in the volume that would be needed. That's why we targeted just the areas where we thought it would benefit Palo Alto specifically.

1 Commissioner Reckdahl: You said we have recycled water but not effluent?

2 Ms. North: Recycled water goes through another treatment process and has a chlorine
3 residual, and that goes down to Mountain View and irrigates a lot of the Shoreline
4 amphitheater. Treated effluent does not have chlorine residual, so you have to remove the
5 chlorine before you discharge it into the Bay. It just makes it a little bit more challenging.
6 That is Title 22, recycled water versus treated effluent, which is what we're proposing to
7 use in these habitats.

8 Mr. Anderson: Another one I wanted to point out on this and the reason I was really excited
9 is the Baylands Master Plan, which was last updated in 2008, had recommended several
10 sites for restoration that had been filled, much like Harbor Point was done in the '80s and
11 '90s. It's all filled, all parking lot, much like this spot over here that we're talking about.
12 All the way up to the pathway and beyond is all fill. I've pulled out chimneys from there.
13 I've heard a rumor that it was fill from the earthquake in San Francisco and all sorts of
14 strange things. The habitat value in that spot is very poor. It was already delineated as a
15 site for restoration through the Baylands Master Plan. I thought it could be a fabulous spot
16 for restoration that would involve volunteers to fix that properly.

17 Chair McDougall: Ryan, do you have any comments.

18 Commissioner McCauley: Could you go to the slide that has the cross-section showing the
19 levee? What is the top of the levee? If someone is looking at it, is that exposed? What is
20 the material?

21 Ms. North: We don't know at this point in time what that material would be. That would
22 be determined when we do the design. This is still a concept; it can be however we want.
23 The levee in front of the wastewater treatment plant is the road. In other areas, the path
24 that you would see is the top of the levee. That's something we as a community would
25 determine.

26 Commissioner McCauley: Could it be organic materials rather than ...

27 Ms. North: Absolutely, yeah. It just happens that our road is a levee. Everywhere else it's
28 organic materials.

29 Commissioner McCauley: What's the approximate width of the levee that's exposed there,
30 that's not part of the wetlands?

31 Ms. North: I guess the typical 8-10 feet, which is standard for most of our pathways. I
32 think in the Baylands some of them are not as ...

33 Mr. Anderson: Some are very wide; some more narrow.

APPROVED

1 Commissioner McCauley: Big picture, appreciating the very good intentions behind the
2 project generally and the concept, what is the risk of unintentional degradation of the
3 existing wetlands? To construct these, I imagine you're going to disrupt the existing habitat
4 pretty significantly. How do you both abate those disruption and issues and ensure that it
5 works long-term?

6 Ms. North: For the construction, we would have to avoid birding season. We would need
7 to put in any kind of protection measures. Our goal is to construct the area that's already
8 impacted, not touch the actual wetland area. I anticipate we would put a band in, where
9 we wouldn't touch it, and we would let that naturally evolve over time. This is why we're
10 picking Phase I where it's the widest area that we could impact. If you look at the habitat
11 along the edge, it's not great habitat for the current species that are there. If we could create
12 a buffer zone of a brackish marsh, that would benefit them. That's where the biologists and
13 the experts will come in.

14 Commissioner McCauley: Is this something you can design in the first instance and get it
15 right or is this more or less a trial and error sort of thing?

16 Ms. North: That's part of the reason why that they have this—I would urge you guys to go
17 to Oro Loma and see their test bed. They have, I think, 20 different cells. They've tried
18 different planting schemes. It was a partnership with Save the Bay. Now they know which
19 soil structure works, the planting, the densities, and the water quality. This is why it took
20 so long to get the permitting done. In the Alviso area, they're going to do an ecotone levee,
21 which is different from a horizontal levee because it's usually in freshwater. There will be
22 a lot of lessons learned before Palo Alto gets a project complete. It's usually the same
23 consultants for the different locations.

24 Commissioner McCauley: What do you anticipate would be a timeline from construction
25 through when you have a habitat that is mature?

26 Ms. North: I don't know the answer to that right now. That would have to be built into
27 when we do 30-percent design. When we get to the next stage, we'd need to see how long
28 it takes for that band area to adapt over time. It can be fairly quick, but we also know it
29 can take time. Because the saltmarsh can get completely inundated with sea level rise,
30 we're trying to figure out a solution in the interim to give the saltmarsh harvest mouse and
31 the Ridgway rail somewhere to go.

32 Commissioner McCauley: I actually have another question. Appreciating that this is
33 viewed as being the best option, what are the alternatives?

34 Ms. North: A big wall, raising the road in front of the plant significantly higher, keep on
35 adding concrete and having no shoreline. That's one option. I have a feeling sea level rise
36 will not be during my time on this planet, but maybe my kids or my grandkids. We're

1 trying to see if we can provide opportunities for the best option in the future. The nice
2 thing about Palo Alto is we have, as Daren was alluding to, this strip of land that was
3 already in the Baylands Master Plan to be improved. This could be a good test case to see
4 how well these horizontal levees work. We're not talking about the entire area. We're just
5 talking about one small phase of currently not great habitat right in front of an airport that
6 we could see if we could improve. It's probably going to take five, six years to get through
7 regulations on this just to get approval, or longer. It could be ten years.

8 Commissioner McCauley: One very brief comment, and then I'll let you go. I'm always
9 concerned about impact to users. As you go through the process and start thinking about
10 ways to stage this in order to accomplish this—it's obviously a long-range plan—try and
11 be very mindful about ways to reduce the impact to users in real-time. We're talking
12 presumably about big earth-moving equipment needing to be in the Baylands, the
13 disruptive nature of that perhaps to everything that would be accessed from that area on. I
14 don't know how you would go about doing it efficiently without using big earth-moving
15 equipment.

16 Ms. North: I'll leave that one up to Daren.

17 Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm a little confused about how this is constructed. The write-
18 up was talking about how some of it was reclaimed sediment from flood control channels.
19 Some it was also saying natural sediment. How much of this that we see in this diagram
20 on Slide 9 do we put down and how much does nature put down?

21 Ms. North: I don't have all that because this is still conceptual level. We might have a
22 little more idea in terms of volume of sediment being moved during the 30-percent. We'd
23 need to build up some of it, the levee portion closest to the road. The goal is that over time
24 the Bay would naturally accrete. In the lower South Bay, the current salt ponds that are
25 getting converted are naturally accreting. Soil is building up in the margins. We're trying
26 to set it up so we can continue that pattern of less imported soil and local.

27 Commissioner Reckdahl: What is the treatment area? What does that mean then?

28 Ms. North: The treatment area is essentially the initial area. Imagine the pipe with a
29 diffuser underground for our treated effluent. It would be a slow level. That's what they
30 call treatment. Our water is already discharged; it's shallow. We discharge ...

31 Commissioner Reckdahl: On this diagram, this is a pipe that's going underground and
32 providing water just ...

33 Ms. North: Providing water to this area.

34 Commissioner Reckdahl: ... like drip irrigation.

1 Ms. North: It's subsurface drop irrigation, a little bit different than what you would be
2 thinking about. It's trying to create a brackish marsh utilizing our treated effluent. If you
3 think about our effluent channel, you know we have alkali bulrush near the manmade
4 effluent channel adjacent to the airport. We've been monitoring how we have changed the
5 habitat there over time. My team is looking at that over time. We know we have freshwater
6 marsh; we also know we have brackish marsh. The alkali bulrush has out competed some
7 of the saltmarsh plants, the pickleweed. We would anticipate we'd have some similar
8 habitat gradient change. This wouldn't be on purpose.

9 Commissioner Reckdahl: Everything to the right would be accumulated sediment that
10 nature deposits?

11 Ms. North: That's the anticipation. This area would be accumulated sediment.

12 Commissioner Reckdahl: When we look at these different spots around the Bay, are there
13 different spots where we think more sediment will accumulate or are they all roughly the
14 same?

15 Ms. North: I would need to check with my sediment expert at SFEI because I don't know
16 that. I understand in the lower South Bay all along the margins it's accumulating. I'm sure
17 there are certain areas where it accumulates faster than others, but I don't know that.

18 Commissioner Reckdahl: I like the idea of this horizontal levee, but how much does it help
19 the flood control? It seems very good habitat, but this is more of a habitat program than a
20 flood control.

21 Ms. North: It's a combination. If you think about this entire levee, it's a long levee. If you
22 did the traditional levee, you'd have to make it really tall. It's aesthetically pleasing.

23 Commissioner Reckdahl: I can see if we have breaking waves, that would make a lot of
24 sense. We're more like a bathtub there. Won't the bathtub just rise up? What really matters
25 is the height of that final (crosstalk)?

26 Ms. North: Over time as that bathtub is rising up, you're accreting sediment, and you're
27 also getting plants built up. Essentially that levee is naturally building itself up over time.
28 If you do the traditional levee, it's not going to have the opportunity to build up any
29 sediment in front of it.

30 Commissioner Reckdahl: We think sediment will eventually go up higher than that big
31 berm in the middle there? At the highest point, we think the natural sediment will go above
32 that?

33 Ms. North: No. Think about our king tide events. Eventually we are going to have storm
34 surges in the lower South Bay. When San Francisco has a storm surge, it goes over their

APPROVED

1 waterfront area. We're trying to make it so we do have a habitat refuge area as well as our
2 existing levee. If we did not build this long levee, this levee system would have to be taller.

3 Commissioner Reckdahl: I could see it'd have to be taller for habitat purposes. If you're
4 trying to keep the water to the right and dry to the left, won't that just be keeping the top of
5 that berm higher than the water?

6 Ms. North: According to the folks that have been researching this for the horizontal levee
7 plans, the soil would naturally accrete over decades. The plants, when they breakdown,
8 would also build that area up. You would essentially slow down how fast that levee would
9 need to be built. If this breaks down and all of a sudden the water is here, this levee is
10 going to have to be built faster, taller. The safer plan is to build the base of the levee so
11 you can keep on adding on top of it. Our goal is to not have to keep adding on top of it.

12 Commissioner Reckdahl: Are these safer levees going to be like Byxbee where you can't
13 plant anything on them or can we have plantings on the side?

14 Ms. North: The safer ones that are still in the feasibility?

15 Commissioner Reckdahl: In Byxbee Park, we have this big barren area, and we can't plant
16 much on it because we're worried about the roots.

17 Ms. North: That's because it's on a landfill. That's different. This is not going to be a
18 landfill.

19 Commissioner Reckdahl: Even on existing levees, we're limited to what we can plant. We
20 can't plant trees by the edge of a flood control levee. With the SAFER levee that you're
21 showing, would we have the same constraints in that you wouldn't be able to plant trees on
22 top of that?

23 Ms. North: On top, yes. In that transitional zone, we could plant.

24 Commissioner Reckdahl: Where the people are walking, they're going to be walking on a
25 barren area?

26 Ms. North: They'd be walking on a trail.

27 Commissioner Reckdahl: There's going to be this little elevated spot of gravel that goes
28 across everything. They're going to be sitting above all this vegetation below them?

29 Ms. North: Yes.

30 Commissioner Reckdahl: I hate that.

1 Ms. North: That's how levees are. How do you incorporate habitat and a levee at the same
2 time? That's what we're trying to come up with a solution. Levees are levees. We have to
3 protect from sea level rise.

4 Chair McDougall: Karin, are there horizontal levee research papers or documentation?

5 Ms. North: Yes.

6 Chair McDougall: Rather than continuing that conversation here, I would encourage we
7 make that available to the Commission. Maybe we can come back with more educated
8 questions after we've seen that. Would that make sense, Keith?

9 Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm happy right now anyway.

10 Commissioner LaMere: Just a couple of quick questions. What's the current build time on
11 these? How quickly are they able to construct these levees per square foot or cubic foot or
12 whatever?

13 Ms. North: Currently, no true horizontal levees that face the open water have been built to
14 date. There will be an ecotone levee by Alviso, but I don't know the build time on that yet.
15 I can get that information for you. I think they just got project funding approved, and
16 they're almost through all of their permitting. We don't have that data yet.

17 Commissioner LaMere: How would our City fund something like this? Do we have a fund
18 that deals with sea level rise? What's the funding source?

19 Ms. North: No, we actually don't have a fund that deals with sea level rise. The SAFER
20 feasibility project funds came out of Public Works' General Fund. The work that we're
21 currently doing on the horizontal levee was all done through grant money. We're actually
22 looking for more grant money. That's also in the timing of how long it's going to take.
23 We're doing it because it's interesting, we like a challenge, and we know it's good for the
24 environment.

25 Commissioner LaMere: I assume it's eventually going to be needed, correct?

26 Ms. North: Correct. As I mentioned earlier, I have a staff person, Julie Weiss, working
27 with our Office of Sustainability to develop a sea level rise policy and eventually a plan.
28 In 2019, they're planning on coming to you and the City Council. We're busy.

29 Commissioner LaMere: Thank you so much for all your work. I really appreciate it.

30 Chair McDougall: Thank you very, very much. I want to make a few comments. I very
31 much appreciate the really advanced transparency of what you're doing here. I've even
32 talked to you about sometimes Public Works surprises us or we find out after it's done.

Ms. North: That's why we're trying to come to you early and often.

Chair McDougall: That's exactly what I want to recognize. I understand you're doing that. Some of the questions we're asking are totally unfair considering the advance transparency you're giving us. Thank you for that. My comments would be the same as before relative to measurement and the bio blitz that was planned and is now delayed relative to Byxbee and the artwork up there. I don't know how you do a bio blitz in the marsh right now. At some point, you're going to want to measure is this better or not better relative to the habitat. Hopefully, you don't have to measure is it going to work relative to flooding, but that's an issue too. As early as we can, let's identify what the measurement is or how we're going to measure. The work on the Boardwalk, as Daren mentioned. If Commission members haven't been out to see that, you should go see it. It would help you understand how you could build something like this and not necessarily destroy what's already there the way they're going about it. I was there the day they sunk one of their tractors into the Bay. The other thing to consider that I would be interested in—you had two numbers up there, \$1.4 million and \$1.6 million in two different years. By the way, what's the maintenance cost after the fact? I would like to see that when you come back. To remind the Commission, this is not preservation of the Baylands any more than Byxbee Park is preservation of what we have there. It's all restoration. What you're trying to do is rescue something that was severely damaged at one point and filled in without necessarily the appropriate conservation approach. In walking along there, you can see some of the stuff that's in there. I've already heard from Environmental Volunteers some questions. I don't know if you've met with them. They had lunch with somebody from Public Works that told them about this. I would encourage us to go to the board or maybe train me and give me these slides to make sure their expectations are set, that they don't think this is going to happen in front of their building in March. I would encourage that we deliberately do that since they are, as Ryan said, worrying about the users. Again, thank you. I think it's great that you're here with this.

Ms. North: Great points. It's still at a very high level, concept level. We're not anywhere near construction. We're not even at 30-percent design. You guys love hearing us talk.

4. Renzel Marsh Update

Chair McDougall: Now, I'd like to introduce Karin.

Ms. North: I think this is my third time here about the Renzel Marsh. Who's been out there lately or driven past it? It looks dramatically different. We're getting close. In terms of the maintenance improvements, we've excavated all the cumulative settlement, and we created that new island. The reason we created the island is because we don't have the money to dispose of the soil. We found an interim solution and created a habitat island. Otherwise, we would have had to let the pond be dry for longer and then excavate the soil. We figured this was a better solution at this point in time. We've removed all that

APPROVED

1 overgrown vegetation. We did leave some cattails in the northern portion of the marsh so
2 they can grow back as soon as water is put back in. We assume that over time it will turn
3 back into a marsh habitat. We have a north end and a south end with a berm between with
4 a spillway and with pipes, if you guys have seen those. They're in already. The berm
5 around is complete, and the actual berm between the two ponds is also complete. That's
6 all done. Frank and Elise and team with Public Works did a phenomenal job of getting that
7 done. Thankfully, we had a soil broker, so the soil didn't cost us any money. That's actually
8 why we needed to do it now. We're still trying to repair the inlet and outlet piping, which
9 is why we don't have any water in it. We've selected a consultant; we're just trying to get
10 the contract signed. This is our soil stockpile area. This will be a big moat. We've seeded
11 it; now that it's rained, we'll see what grows. We can see some little green stuff coming
12 up, which is great. The whole perimeter of the berm has been seeded as well, so that should
13 also eventually grow in with native grasses. We're hoping to transition it from a
14 construction site back to a habitat. As you can see, this will be the cattail area, and this
15 will be the deeper pond. This is what it currently looks like. They've put the jute netting
16 in, and then they hydroseeded it. That's for stormwater protection since I asked them where
17 the stormwater compliance was. We wanted to make sure we were in compliance with our
18 stormwater. The island is still there; we didn't take that out. The nice thing is this
19 maintenance trail that we can get around and drive a vehicle. We can actually maintain it.
20 We won't have the berm that you couldn't walk around without twisting your ankle. This
21 is the spillway here. This is another island. Down here, there's a little dip. If the water
22 gets really high, there's another spillway. It's really hard to capture the images. I have a
23 lot of photos on my iPhone, but they weren't all great. We had three bids. We did select a
24 consultant as a contractor to do this inlet and outlet piping. As you may know, we've lost
25 a lot of staff, and our procurement process is a challenge, so we're trying to get a contract
26 signed. With the rain, they need to get this done fast. With the holidays and nesting season,
27 the contractor has about two months to get this done. They think they can do it all. We
28 met with them on Monday to start discussing the project. As soon as that's done, we'll have
29 Daren or Kristen give you guys an update, and hopefully you'll see the water in there.
30 That's the goal, to get the water in as soon as possible. We are applying for Measure AA
31 grant funding. That's on our parcel tax, and that helps with improving the habitat around
32 the perimeter of the Bay, to look at our remnant slough and the whole Renzel Marsh and
33 see if we can improve the whole Renzel Wetland. That's in alignment with the Baylands
34 Comprehensive Conservation Plan. Have you got more questions for me? The Renzel
35 Marsh is almost done.

36 Chair McDougall: Do you have any questions? Keith?

37 Commissioner Reckdahl: When we start filling this, we throw water in this side but
38 freshwater is put by the golf course. How do we select how much water can flow through
39 this marsh?

1 Ms. North: This marsh was built in 1991. Between 1 and 3 million gallons of water per
2 day is our allocated (inaudible). We're not taking any water from the golf course. This is
3 effluent, our secondary effluent location.

4 Commissioner Reckdahl: My understanding from the water treatment is some of it goes
5 through the channels by the golf course that we dump up there, and some of it we dump on
6 this side. How do we decide how much we pipe through this pond?

7 Ms. North: We decided the volume of water based on the 1992 California Coastal
8 Conservancy grant that tied the saltmarsh portion—by Byxbee Park, there's an
9 underground. At high tide, the water flows into the saltmarsh and then down, and it's
10 pumped into Matadero Creek. Because they didn't want to put a lot of salty water into
11 Matadero Creek, we put in this freshwater marsh to help mitigate that. It's essentially a 1:1
12 ratio. It hasn't been getting that freshwater to dilute the saltwater. It's a short time period,
13 so we don't anticipate that it's going to cause problems in the flooding basin because that
14 takes years. Does that answer your question?

15 Commissioner Reckdahl: That answered my question.

16 Ms. North: It's around 1-2 million gallons of water per day.

17 Commissioner Reckdahl: We're not looking at the health of the pond. We're looking at
18 the health of the creek downstream.

19 Ms. North: The health of the pond was an added benefit.

20 Commissioner Reckdahl: We're happy with the flow through it? If we increased it or
21 decreased it, would it change the health or is it not very sensitive?

22 Ms. North: It may help in terms of reducing nutrients. Wetlands naturally absorb nitrogen.
23 We remove ammonia, but we don't remove nitrogen or phosphorus at our treatment plant.
24 It's like a polishing wetland. That would be better if we could divert more flow through
25 there.

26 Vice Chair Greenfield: Could you clarify what is the public access to this area once it's
27 completed?

28 Ms. North: That actually goes hand-in-hand with Daren's Baylands Comprehensive
29 Conservation Plan, which you guys have been part of. Do you want to take that one?

30 Mr. Anderson: We shared the outcome of our outreach to both the stakeholders and the
31 Commission on the recommendations where we'd have routing and where we wouldn't.
32 Public Works understands that and is willing to comply. As we've talked about before,
33 we've done this in other areas, so it can work. We said we only wanted the marsh side open

APPROVED

1 and the road around the berm would remain closed as a non-trail. As you can see from the
2 photos, it looks like a road. It's 15 feet wide, and people are going to walk on it. We'll do
3 the same thing we did at Byxbee when we didn't want to have every single service road to
4 be a pedestrian or bike trail. We put up a sign that said this is a maintenance service road
5 only, no public access. Public Works will help facilitate that.

6 Vice Chair Greenfield: You'll be able to walk on the marsh side from the south. Where
7 do you end up on the north side?

8 Mr. Anderson: It'll connect with the existing road from the ITT area I believe.

9 Ms. North: We're saying that they can walk along this perimeter. We need to improve the
10 access here, which is part of the Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan. Currently,
11 we do have a maintenance bridge that we would not want to encourage residents to walk
12 on. It's our outfall pipe with a plastic grate over it. The steps down are like you're lucky if
13 you don't slide down on your bottom. That's another Phase II project, to see how we can
14 get the trail access.

15 Vice Chair Greenfield: When this area opens initially, it'll be a dead-end for pedestrian
16 access?

17 Ms. North: When we finish the Renzel Marsh, we will not have trail access. It will need
18 to be built into the Byxbee Park Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan with a trail.
19 At that time, the trails will be marked. If someone wanted to walk it, you would come in
20 on the ITT road. You could actually walk the whole perimeter of it, which we're not
21 encouraging because that's not a trail.

22 Vice Chair Greenfield: Daren, could you project when we might be able to open this area
23 to the general public, pedestrian use?

24 Mr. Anderson: Karin's right that people will start using it immediately. They already are.
25 The Baylands regulars will continue and are using it. We'll publicize it and start adding it
26 to maps probably after the BCCP has been recommended by the Commission and adopted
27 by Council. That Phase II piece that Karin's talking about, that's currently—people hike it.
28 It's a perilous hike. That one's a conversation with Public Works to see how far away that
29 would be. That could happen sooner rather than later. They'll need access on that one too.
30 Is that correct, Karin?

31 Ms. North: Not anymore.

32 Vice Chair Greenfield: It sounds like a safety issue if people are accessing it now, and
33 we're aware of that.

34 Mr. Anderson: We'll work on that.

1 Chair McDougall: Karin, the only comment I have is to apologize for mispronouncing
2 your name earlier.

3 Ms. North: No problem.

4 Chair McDougall: Congratulations. What you've done here is great.

5 Commissioner McCauley: I just wanted to echo Jeff's comment. The sooner you're able
6 to get that trail up and running the better, even if it's not quote/unquote official, if it's in a
7 state where you think people could actually access it.

8 Chair McDougall: The issue from the Baylands Plan is how much access are you going to
9 allow relative to the habitat that you're creating and are you wasting a habitat by making it
10 so accessible that animals wouldn't stay there. That's the discussion, where should you
11 allow access and not allow access. I would invite the Commission members to participate
12 in the Comprehensive Plan. Karin, thank you very much for the marathon session that
13 you've provided us.

14 Ms. North: Thank you. We look forward to coming for future items. Sea level rise will
15 probably be the next one you'll see me.

16 **5. Cubberley Community Center Synthetic Field Replacement & New Restroom**
17 **Facility**

18 Ms. O'Kane: Peter should be on his way.

19 Chair McDougall: I don't think we're any earlier or later than he would have anticipated.
20 We've done a decent job of being efficient.

21 Vice Chair Greenfield: I have a general question I could occupy time with regarding the
22 printouts that we get at the meetings. About a year ago, we went away from having the
23 packets sent to us. Now, we effectively arrive and have the packet waiting here for us,
24 which seems to defeat the purpose. I want to check in with the other Commissioners and
25 staff and clarify what we would like to have. It's nice having a printed agenda. Do we
26 want anything else in terms of materials in front of us when we arrive?

27 Chair McDougall: Maybe Kristen can fill us in. The bottom line was we said, "Let's go to
28 having it sent to us in softcopy. We don't need to get the hardcopy here." The problem
29 with not having a hardcopy is visitors don't have that. You can see there's not hundreds of
30 copies back there; there are ten copies back there. I think they went with a decision that,
31 if they're making ten copies for the public, they might as well make seven more to put up
32 here. Kristen, does that make sense?

APPROVED

1 Ms. O'Kane: You're right, Commissioner Greenfield. The Commission decided to go
2 electronic unless a specific Commissioner let Natalie know they wanted a printout. We do
3 need to provide copies for the public. If the Commission prefers not to get the full packet,
4 we can go back to that.

5 Chair McDougall: Do we want a quick poll on whether you want the hardcopy? Let's just
6 do a quick poll.

7 Vice Chair Greenfield: I'm fine with no hardcopy.

8 Commissioner McCauley: Having a hardcopy on the dais is helpful. Without it, I would
9 be lost.

10 Commissioner Reckdahl: In general, I don't think I need it. I find it useful if we have
11 oversized park plans or something like that. Being able to look at it all in one spot is better.
12 My printer only goes to 8.5 x 11. I would appreciate oversized printouts, but the other
13 printouts I get online.

14 Vice Chair Greenfield: If I may, Don? It might be worth taking this offline with the other
15 Commissioner members who aren't here today.

16 Chair McDougall: I wasn't necessarily going to decide here. I called it a straw poll. Jeff,
17 the question is do you want hardcopies.

18 Commissioner LaMere: I'm fine with electronic copies.

19 Chair McDougall: We'll complete a poll with everybody.

20 Ms. O'Kane: Natalie can send out an email to the Commission confirming.

21 Commissioner McCauley: If I might propose something. It sounds as though everyone
22 but me is happy not to have printed copies. I'm happy to grab printed copies from the back
23 of the room.

24 Chair McDougall: Thanks for that, Ryan. We have Peter joining us again. Peter, welcome.

25 Peter Jensen: Good evening.

26 Chair McDougall: We're going to talk about the Cubberley synthetic field.

27 Mr. Jensen: Peter Jensen, Landscape Architect for the City of Palo Alto, Public Works
28 Department, here to present an informational item about two projects. They're very close
29 proximity to one another. It's going to seem like one, but they are two different CIP
30 projects. One is the replacement of the synthetic turf at Cubberley field and the addition

APPROVED

of a restroom facility there. I'm going to go through the presentation fairly quickly. I don't know if we need a lot of detail on this. You've all seen the synthetic turf out there. It was installed in the 2009-2010 area. It's now to the age that it needs to be replaced, and that's what we intend to do. The replacement of the field—I guess we could talk about the restrooms first since that's the order of this presentation. The restroom is a new item to the Cubberley field; it does not have one currently. Portable restrooms are brought in for that facility, which aren't ideal for the area due to the amount of programming that happens on the field. You can see in the slide where we are proposing to put the restroom, which is adjacent to the grandstand between the synthetic field and the baseball field so there is full access to all the field amenities out there. The biggest impact of putting in the restroom—right now the location where the restroom is going to be is fairly void of any type of development. It's an open asphalt-and-dirt area. The biggest impact will be the trenching of the sewer line out to Nelson Way, which will occur either down the pathway or along the pathway. We haven't mapped out how that's going to work. We will keep the access open along the path to the neighborhood to the south. We're recommending a specific bathroom, an Exeloo bathroom. This goes along with the prefabricated restrooms we've been installing in our parks. This particular bathroom has some features that we like as far as the cleanability of it, the durability of it, and the security aspects of it. It will consist of two universal ADA stalls. It has a service area that runs between them and that makes the bathroom very easy to service and to keep supplies on site. Like the bathroom at Mitchell Park, which does not have a storage facility, every time maintenance comes, they have to bring all the materials themselves. This will help a little bit with that. Looking at the inside of the restroom, it uses stainless steel amenities. The sink as well as the towel dispensers are built into the wall, so they're more difficult to damage. This provides us the lowest maintenance and the longest-lasting facility as well as the security that is important to the surrounding community. The bathrooms would be open during park hours. The park closes at 10:00; I'm not sure, Daren, when the opening is. 7:00?

Mr. Anderson: It depends on the park, but yeah. Foothills Park is 8:30.

Mr. Jensen: The bathroom also has the option of securely locking itself during the closed hours. It has some safeguards such as a motion-detector light inside. If there is movement in there, patrol officers can see that someone is in there. This bathroom has the ability to control the amount of time the door is locked. You can set it at different intervals. Most of the time it's set at 10 minutes. At 10 minutes, the door will unlock itself, so you can't lock yourself into the bathroom.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What are the walls made out of?

Mr. Jensen: This is something we reviewed with the community at the meeting on November 15th. You'll see two sample images up there. One is a concrete board exterior, which is the light version. The green version is an aluminum sheet-metal exterior. In the

meeting, the community liked the concrete board more. It allows itself to be painted in multiple colors. It's easy to maintain and paint. The initial paint will come with an anti-graffiti layer. That wears off over time, but it can be painted very easily. The other nice aspects are good ventilation on the top, which is key to keeping it clean on the inside. The bathroom is brought on the back of a truck and set into place. The other interesting aspect about this bathroom is it doesn't require a lot of large footings or a concrete pad, so it saves a little cost there. We have to bring the sewer line there, but water and power are already at that location. The larger aspect of the project is replacing the synthetic turf. The idea is to replace it with the same turf that we used at El Camino and the Stanford playfields. We went through a process of testing the turf for different contaminants. That has been a question in the past about turf. Mostly, the contaminants were embodied in the recycled rubber infill that was used, which did have some runoff contaminants. We no longer use that material. The infill material that we're using now is a TPE material, which is a better material and is free of toxins from the tire crumble. We're comfortable with using this material. As I mentioned in the staff report, we're always interested if a contractor would like to use something different, but it would have to meet the requirements we set up in the original test, which were based on federal figures for pollutant amounts. One thing we haven't decided and will have more conversations with the user groups about is the striping of the field. Currently, the field is striped for soccer. The Stanford fields have one field striped for soccer and one for soccer and lacrosse. Maybe we can add lacrosse striping to the field. Because it's not programmed that way right now, it would behoove us to have more feedback from the user groups that are using that field. Bid alternate items include replacing the decomposed granite running track around the field with an all-weather rubberized track. I haven't found an answer why, but apparently the most economic track material is red in color. We will probably be going in that direction. All the tracks are installed that way, and there's extra if you want to change the color to blue or green. Red will probably be the direction. This is all based upon the bids that we get back. We would like to do this work—it's part of the CIP put forward in the budget book. With the escalation in construction, we're going to hold it as a bid alternate to make sure, if we do go over, we can still move forward with the synthetic turf field because that's the most important aspect of getting it replaced. Another aspect of that was a smaller, rubberized surfacing next to the bathroom area that could be used for a group or individuals to do unprogrammed stretching or other physical activity. The restroom will go through the ARB process. We'll present a palette of colors to them and, in that process, select what color the building is going to be painted. Our hope is we can produce the bid package in the next couple of months and get it out to bid. When the funding comes available, which for the field and track is June 2019, we'll be ready to move on that. The down period of field use occurs between June and halfway through August, so we'd like to get the field back to usable conditions when sports start to rev up in the fall. The restroom work will coincide with that. It may start a little bit after that so it's not in the way of the turf being installed. It probably will be completed in the fall, a month or two after the track is done.

APPROVED

1 That is the proposed timeline for it. I'll turn it to the Commission for any questions about
2 the project.

3 Commissioner LaMere: Excited about this project and getting the field replaced. Glad
4 also to hear about it. I was curious about the toxins and the infill and what kind of progress
5 has been made with that, which is exciting. I have a few questions. With the restroom, is
6 it air dryer only for your hands or is it paper towels? What would we be doing with that?

7 Mr. Jensen: There's the option for both. I haven't discussed with Facilities the way that
8 they would like to go on that. Usually they like to have the hand dryer so they don't have
9 to keep installing paper towels. That's probably what it's going to have.

10 Commissioner LaMere: Who takes care of the maintenance of those? Is that something
11 that's contracted or is that something City staff takes care of?

12 Mr. Jensen: I believe we do contract the bathroom. I don't know what vendor does it.

13 Commissioner LaMere: I'm very much in favor of hopefully getting that track installed.
14 That would be exciting. Is there any possibility of any partnerships with any groups or any
15 outreach? As we've done with other projects, have you looked at funding shortfalls and
16 determined what user groups might be interested? I don't know how much of a shortfall
17 we'd be talking about, of course. There's not that many tracks for people to use. Besides
18 the high schools and Stanford, it's something that's not there. With the installation of it,
19 there could be great use by the City whether it's for different kinds of camps or different
20 kinds of activities or events.

21 Mr. Jensen: I'm not quite sure what the group is, but I have received an email stating that
22 a stakeholder group is interested in donating some money. It's a modest amount compared
23 to the whole project. They are interested in doing that if it needs a boost in the funding to
24 get us there. We have not done any other type of outreach as far as funding goes and asking
25 for that amount.

26 Commissioner LaMere: What do you anticipate if there is a shortfall? Is there any way to
27 estimate or too early in the process?

28 Mr. Jensen: It's hard to say just on the way prices keep going up. If the shortfall is under
29 \$100,000, that probably gives us the option of going to the public and getting some funding
30 for that. When it gets over that amount, it becomes a little more difficult.

31 Mr. Anderson: If I could tag on. At the public meeting, we had hoped that we'd be able to
32 do this. Getting fresher estimates that Peter has put together, it feels like a longshot. From
33 my perspective, I want to do a reality check. It is unlikely that we'll be able to do the
34 synthetic track with this project. The great part is what we did hear. I received 20 emails

APPROVED

1 alone from people who regularly hike it, and they pointed out the same thing as you did.
2 Great community asset, perfect for exercise for adults and multigenerational ages. We've
3 got good documentation, and it would be a great enhancement. It's desired. It won't be
4 possible with this particular project.

5 Commissioner LaMere: What does something like that cost?

6 Mr. Jensen: It costs between \$800,000 and \$1.2 million.

7 Mr. Anderson: Peter helped inform me that it would not be prohibitive to build the field
8 as planned and come back to do the track at a future point. They're not mutually exclusive.
9 We can reevaluate how much funding we have and submit another project request in the
10 not-too-distant future, if we're not able to fund it. I want to make sure we set expectations
11 based in reality. It'd be a challenge to make it (crosstalk).

12 Commissioner LaMere: I appreciate that and your work. Thanks, guys.

13 Commissioner Reckdahl: How is the track used today? Is it people dropping in and
14 running around it or is there any organized use?

15 Mr. Anderson: Mainly just impromptu drop-in use.

16 Commissioner Reckdahl: If we put a rubberized track, would we expect to have organized
17 use or would it still be drop-in use?

18 Mr. Anderson: I think there eventually would be organized use. I think the demand would
19 be great.

20 Commissioner Reckdahl: I think it would be great. I'm just wondering if we shrunk it
21 down to six lanes or something smaller, would that meet all our use. If you're talking about
22 organized uses, a six-lane track would not be nearly as good. Is this our last crumb rubber
23 field? All the other turf fields have been replaced with the new virgin latex?

24 Mr. Anderson: That's correct. Thermoplastic elastomer.

25 Commissioner Reckdahl: The prefab bathrooms, have we used them in our parks before?

26 Mr. Jensen: Not this particular one. It's being used quite a bit in the South Bay. San Jose
27 is using it, and I think down in Morgan Hill they've started to install a few of them. I've
28 seen it installed. It's a hardened bathroom. The other option we looked at was the golf
29 course prefabricated bathroom, but it doesn't have as much security, and it's not as hardened
30 as this bathroom is. Golfers are a little more gentle on restroom facilities than standard
31 park users.

1 Commissioner McCauley: Daren, with respect to the track, are there any interim steps you
2 can take for the current track to shore it up, weatherize it?

3 Mr. Anderson: Peter's got that built in. At a minimum, we'll be able to address some of
4 the challenges. We've got low spots, so regrading would be in order and perhaps some
5 hardening agent, which is typically decomposed granite to help it drain correctly. It'll hold
6 up a little bit better.

7 Commissioner McCauley: That's all part of the CIP?

8 Mr. Anderson: That one we can afford.

9 Commissioner McCauley: With respect to the bathroom, will there be an infant changing
10 station in either one?

11 Mr. Anderson: Yes. The changing station is engineered for adults as well. It's inclusive
12 in that respect.

13 Commissioner McCauley: With respect to the location of the bathroom, in a prior meeting
14 there was a note that some of the seasonal lighting, the mobile lighting that's being put in
15 place at Cubberley, may presently be in the location where the bathroom is planned. Is that
16 what I understood?

17 Mr. Anderson: When we presented this at the community meeting, Neal Aronson who
18 leads that endeavor to do the temporary lighting was there and didn't see any conflicts with
19 the location proposed.

20 Commissioner McCauley: You think you'll be able to continue to accommodate the
21 seasonal lighting with the bathroom location?

22 Mr. Anderson: I believe so.

23 Vice Chair Greenfield: Thank you for the presentation. I think you definitely have the
24 priorities set correctly. The field certainly is screaming out for refurbishment. Adding the
25 bathrooms is a very high priority for that area. Getting the separate bids for the track and
26 the workout area is great. That's definitely the right way to go. I have a question about the
27 workout area. Would it be possible for the extensions outside the oval track to be used for
28 that type of workout rather than adding a separate area?

29 Mr. Jensen: The track is a different material than—it's tighter and not as attenuated just
30 because it's meant to have spikes in it. The workout area would be using more of a
31 playground rubber matting, which has a little bit more attenuation to it. You could use the
32 track. It's a lot softer, of course.

1 Vice Chair Greenfield: I just thought I'd throw that out there.

2 Mr. Jensen: Both items are bid alternates. We would do the track before the workout area,
3 just depending on the price of course. If we did the track and not the workout area, people
4 would start to use the track for that purpose.

5 Vice Chair Greenfield: If the track is in the \$1 million plus/minus \$200,000 range,
6 presumably the workout area would be much lower than that. Perhaps that could be
7 included in the first phase, so it could be done before the track.

8 Mr. Jensen: That would be nice, yes.

9 Vice Chair Greenfield: Is there any consideration for a changing table in the restroom?

10 Mr. Jensen: I think Ryan asked that question. Yes, both restrooms have it. It's engineered
11 for adults to use it with the inclusive idea that cognitive development doesn't preclude
12 adults.

13 Vice Chair Greenfield: Regarding the turf selection criteria, there have been some issues
14 at El Camino Park with rippling and bunching and some general tears at the seams. I've
15 also seen some issues at Mayfield. I'm a little concerned about what we've just put in. It
16 doesn't seem to be wearing as well as we'd hoped it would. I'm certainly getting a lot of
17 feedback from the community on this and hope we will consider this when we make our
18 next selection.

19 Mr. Anderson: Absolutely. Peter and I have talked about building into this contract—the
20 modern contracts are phrased a little differently than previously at least for the City of Palo
21 Alto. My hope and intention is that the new contract will be incumbent upon the contractor
22 to come back regularly and fill infill. In our preexisting ones, it fell upon staff to do that.
23 Sometimes the installer will say there's problems with the infill, that's why such-and-such
24 seam failed. All the liability shifts over to the installer, which is the way I'd prefer it. I
25 think that'll help with some of those problems.

26 Vice Chair Greenfield: Perhaps there can be some wording in the contract that the lines
27 put on top of the turf in a different color shouldn't fail within x period of time, like 2, 3, 4
28 years. We're not doing well at El Camino Park with that. Regarding the striping plan that's
29 currently just for soccer, would this be one long field and two short fields?

30 Mr. Jensen: Yes.

31 Vice Chair Greenfield: In different colors obviously. One other request I've heard from
32 referees is to have the turf laid out in such a way that there's some sort of pattern that you
33 can see across so you can be square on the line. When the field is laid out to go longways,
34 when there's some sort of lines, you can see them along the way. We can talk more about

1 this if what I'm saying isn't clear. I really look forward to getting this completed. The
2 schedule you've set is prioritized well.

3 Chair McDougall: You're suggesting that when they mow the turf, they mow it all in ...
4 A couple of comments. Either picture of the bathroom doesn't look particularly attractive.
5 It looks like a cinder-block building. Obviously our concerns are not only safety and the
6 issues of locking, but then cleanliness. I always believe people show more respect to
7 something that's attractive in the first place. I'm questioning whether we've gone far
8 enough with attractiveness. Maybe we should even go to the Arts Commission and see
9 about getting it painted with flowers on the outside or something that shows more attention
10 was paid to its attractiveness. In Carmel, it's now built with rocks all around it, and it's got
11 a rooftop garden on it. Everybody thought that was kind of neat. I would encourage us to
12 do something like that, that showed some interest in having it kept attractive. I'm not as
13 enthusiastic about the track. In terms of scarce resources and money that we're spending,
14 we're trying to spend it with youth and with adults and with seniors. Particularly in a
15 concentrated facility like this, I doubt that a walking track would be substantially less
16 expensive than a running track, but I'd bet it would be something less expensive. In terms
17 of who the users are, I've always asked who are we designing this for. We're designing the
18 sports fields for the athletes. Maybe the track could not be for the athletes, but for the
19 casual walkers or for the wellness crowd. Maybe that would cause us to have a different
20 design point. Even when you talk about the stretching and exercise facility, you could go
21 further and make sure there was something associated with that relative to senior exercise.
22 That would be a better design point now that we're making it for the whole not just for one
23 cohort. I can't remember whether there's a good bike rack installation or not. I hope that's
24 part of the considerations.

25 Mr. Jensen: Yes, definitely will.

26 Chair McDougall: Anybody have any other comments or questions? Peter, thank you very
27 much. Really appreciate it.

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

29 See item VII

30 **VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR DECEMBER 18, 2018 MEETING**

31 Chair McDougall: The one item is Tentative Agenda for December 18th. We've already
32 said we'll have pickleball on that agenda. I don't know if the purple pipe question, Keith,
33 is something we should try to bring into that meeting.

APPROVED

Commissioner Reckdahl: I don't think there's a rush. If they had something on the shelf they could give us, fine. I'd rather have them take a couple of months and give us a good answer.

Chair McDougall: Is there anything else that people would like to have?

Vice Chair Greenfield: Daren, do you think we'll be ready for the policy review by the next meeting?

Mr. Anderson: The park rules and regs? I'm going to need more time. That one's probably going to be in the new year. I apologize for that.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Did you mention that Acterra was coming?

Mr. Anderson: Acterra will be doing a partner presentation. I should also note we can bring the CIPs for discussion at the December meeting.

Chair McDougall: CIPs and pickleball all in one night. Kristen?

Ms. O'Kane: We may or may not have something to discuss with respect to aquatics. I believe Monique might be giving a presentation on the Aspen Institute final dialog report on the future of libraries and community services. Monique received a grant from the Aspen Institute to do some work on the future of libraries. We brought community services into that discussion. It was an all-day retreat. Commissioner McDougall was there. There were members of all different organizations from the community, other Commissions, other groups. It was a conversation about libraries and community services, and the future of our organizations and how we can continue to partner with each other and other organizations. A report has just been completed on that conversation. Monique will give a brief presentation on the outcome.

Chair McDougall: That would be really good. It was a really interesting day. They did a nice job with that. I think we've got a long enough list. The challenge will be to come up with the right topics.

VII. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair McDougall: Are there any Comments, Announcements, any ad hoc things that people would like to bring up? Keith, you have your light on.

Commissioner Reckdahl: North Ventura is still going on. We have monthly meetings on that. There's a website. I'd encourage other Commissioners to look at the material on the website. If you have any comments that you want me to relay, please send them to me.

Chair McDougall: I'm going to make sure it's GSI compliant.

APPROVED

1 Commissioner Reckdahl: There's a big interest in the creek, could it be unconcreted and
2 made accessible, and Boulware Park, do we have interaction with that.

3 Chair McDougall: She did mention the Ventura plan tonight. Jeff, anything you have to
4 report from any of your commissions?

5 Vice Chair Greenfield: I was encouraged by Council to continue pushing for a meeting
6 between the Parks and Rec Commission and City Council. I know Kristen has
7 communicated that we're not in line to get this done this year, but let's continue to push and
8 get it scheduled soon please.

9 Mr. Jensen: There's a tentative ceremony being planned—right now, it's December 17th—
10 for a signing ceremony for the 101 pedestrian/bike bridge. It's where the Water District
11 and some other agency is going to sign the approval to start constructing the bridge. I think
12 Google is involved as well with a donation towards the construction of the bridge. I'll
13 email something to the Commission if you want to attend that. The City Council Members,
14 the Mayor will be there. It'll be not the start to construction but a sign that we're getting
15 close to start constructing that overpass.

16 Chair McDougall: I think we would appreciate knowing about it. There are people who
17 are interested enough that they might want to attend. The bio blitz that was planned for
18 Byxbee—I forget whether that was a week or two weeks ago—was canceled by Kathleen
19 because of the smoke. It will be moved to a January date. I would still encourage people
20 to think about participating in that.

21 **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

22 Meeting adjourned on motion by Commissioner Reckdahl and second by Commissioner
23 LaMere at 9:36 p.m.