



APPROVED

**MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
August 26, 2014
CITY HALL
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California**

Commissioners Present: Stacey Ashlund, Deirdre Crommie, Jennifer Hetterly, Abbie Knopper, Ed Lauing, Pat Markevitch, Keith Reckdahl

Commissioners Absent:

Others Present:

Staff Present: Daren Anderson, Catherine Bourquin, Rob de Geus

I. ROLL CALL CONDUCTED BY: Catherine Bourquin

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS:

None.

III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Chair Hetterly: I have one card, David Carnahan, Deputy City Clerk for the City of Palo Alto. Hi.

David Carnahan: Hello. I'm here tonight to speak to you guys about the upcoming recruitment that we're doing for the Architectural Review Board, Historic Resources Board, and the Planning and Transportation Commission. I've brought some applications. They're going to be on the back table there. If you guys know of anyone, any community members that you think would be prime candidates for these, again that's Architectural Review, Historic Resources Board or Planning and Transportation Commission. We really encourage all of our Board and Commission members to reach out to other community members they know, since you guys are the voice of the City within the community in a way that the Clerk's Office isn't. Applications are due September 22nd. If you think of anyone you know, send them our way, pass them an



application, or just shoot them an email and say contact the Clerk's Office. We'll get them started. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you.

IV. BUSINESS:

1. Approval of Draft June 24, 2014 Minutes.

Approval of the draft June 24, 2014 Minutes as amended was moved by Commissioner Ashlund and seconded by Vice Chair Lauing. Passed 7-0

2. Highway 101/Adobe Pedestrian Bicycle Overcrossing Project—Review Design Competition Guiding Principles.

Rob de Geus: Good evening, Commissioners. We have Elizabeth Ames from our Public Works Department joining us to help with the presentation.

Elizabeth Ames: Good evening. I'm Elizabeth Ames, Project Manager, Public Works Department. I have Hung Nguyen here. He is our Project Engineer, and he's out in the audience. Just as a little bit of background, the last time I met with the Commission was a long time ago. I think it was just before the public scoping meeting. That was in September 2012. We met with the community to discuss the Adobe Bike Bridge Project over at Adobe Creek crossing at 101. We talked about different alternatives, and we had Caltrans there. Since then, we've been in this rigorous study mode. It's actually taken a very long time to get to this point. I actually thought we were going to start the draft EIR process, public circulation, last year, but we encountered some issues with the configuration into the flood control basin or the Baylands area next to Adobe Creek. As you can see with this first slide, that's the landing area to the right on the eastern side of the bridge. We've done a lot of studies, and we're still working with Caltrans. We feel relatively confident that we have addressed the federal species there. We have had a field meeting with the local agencies, Fish and Wildlife. We've got the semi-green light to proceed in this area. With that informal approval, we wanted to go ahead and start this design competition. A little background on the design competition. The City Council asked the City staff to inquire about how we could do a design competition. We returned with this qualification-based competition concept last summer. We had engaged a conversation with the American Institute of Architects. But then we had that glitch with the environmental clearances, so we held off on the competition until now. What we are proposing to do is prepare these design guidelines to help the design firms get an understanding of the project context, the site, the constraints. We have a lot of design constraints because of the Caltrans right-of-way. We have the design guidelines included in the packet. The overarching concept is to come up with these guiding principles. It's

APPROVED

not really a mission statement. I actually took this similar presentation to the ARB a couple of times and realized that the mission statement is very hard to nail down. It's very word specific, so we're trying to incorporate these design principles. My main objective tonight is to hopefully get some feedback from you on the design principles, which will be included in the guidelines. That will all go to the design teams should Council agree to proceed with the competition, which is scheduled for September 8th. That is a long background. Sorry about that. I believe this is in your packet. It's a graphic that illustrates the focus alignment. This is a great graphic to show the Commission just to get your minds around what alignment we are focusing on and where the tie-in to the trail systems are. On the west side at the confluence of the Adobe Creek here and Barron Creek a little bit south, we have this starting point of the bike bridge and it ramps up at 5 percent. Then it wraps around here. This is actually some private property, that I believe now is owned by Google. They've been very cooperative so far in informal discussions about the property. It would wrap around this way going towards the east, over Frontage Road. This is West Bayshore and then here's 101. It goes over East Bayshore and then wraps around into the flood control basin. This, again, is that area that was very sensitive, I would say, with the federal agencies. We've got an OK to enter into this footprint. You can see a dashed line here of this area that we're still studying, but we feel confident that we can actually put the ramp of the bridge on it. It wraps around this, so it ties into the Bay trail. This is the linkage that's critical; that the Commission emphasized almost two years ago when I met with you. The connectivity to the trail system was very important. This focus alignment here, that we're using, was submitted to the grant agencies. We did get \$8 million in construction funding for this, and it was based on this particular alignment. Although we're still trying to get the environmental clearances for that, we're assuming that this will go smoothly. This is the focus of the competition. I'd like to get your comments on the guiding principles, if you wanted to elaborate on that or add another principle in there. We tried to keep it simple with three. I've met with the ARB twice, and we tried to refine it this last go-around. What you have in your report is the latest, which is this right here. We've got innovation; inspire and engage the community with a contemporary design; incorporating creativity, originality, technology and education; that's identifiable as a landmark in the heart of Silicon Valley. The ARB had repeatedly said, "This is the heart of Silicon Valley. This is where innovation is." We tried to incorporate it with that guiding principle. Versatility, you can balance between engineering and art. Efficiency and beauty. The ARB added the last piece there, conforming to the project's construction budget, because this is a challenge when you're going into a design competition. Some of these designs could come in very elaborate, so we want to emphasize this in the principle. Of course sustainability. Palo Alto's known to be conscientious of the environment and being sustainable. We tried to capture that by saying, "Respect the Baylands environment." Recognize the integration with nature. Connects into the Bay. Trails and importance to walkers, bikers, commuters. I think that principle really never got changed by the ARB. This is just something that I worked with staff on. It really needs some feedback from

APPROVED

you. We do have a lot of documentation for the design teams to really put their hands around. We've got these guidelines. It's a lot of text in there. I'm trying to do a high-level guiding principle. This highlights the AIA competition steps. This is Attachment A in your packet. The steps with the AIA is that we're going to hopefully get Council to approve a contract with the AIA California Council, which is a state organization. They're affiliated with all of the local chapters. It's very exciting that we've collaborated with them, because they can reach out to the international, national and local community because they're affiliated with the state. They've got those connections. They're very good at marketing as well. If you look at their website, they do YouTube. They do a lot of different marketing techniques to engage the design community. We're hoping that that's going to translate into an invitation to designers, but it's really a qualification-based process. The last go around with the ARB where Staff has reevaluated this. Initially we were working with the AIA to ask designers to design and construct two bridges in ten years. The ARB thought that was too restrictive. We do want to have a qualification-based competition, because I'm concerned that we have a very tight timeline with the grant funding. We need to have construction documents by the end of 2016. In order to do that, I need to get a lot of approvals through Caltrans and permits. I really was hoping to get some qualifications and the design team to say that they have done a bridge. Now we're saying an engineer or an architect on the team that has designed and constructed a bridge in ten years, instead of the two bridge qualification. That's the latest compromise. When we send out the invitations to the designers, we're asking that they have some qualifications. Of course, they're going to refer to the design guidelines and these guiding principles. Hopefully they'll be inspired by that. Then we would have the AIA California Council select the jury. I don't know who the jury is right now. They're thinking that the jury would attract designers they'd want to be judged by. It's not going to be all architects. It's probably going to be a variety of people. I think that they're the best firm to select those jurors. There's going to be a five-member jury. They will take the qualification-based proposals, and they'll shortlist. What we're proposing right now is they'll shortlist four firms, and we would give them a \$20,000 stipend to develop concepts. That's really where we're going to see the innovative design hopefully in compliance with the guidelines and the principles. These firms will hopefully have some experience with bridge design, but not so restrictive. There's still going to be a lot of innovation and creativity hopefully, that the ideas will conform to our construction budget which is really critical. The jury would select four firms. Those four firms would come back with designs, and then we would have this panel of the ARB and the jury in an open, public meeting weighing in on the designs and commenting. Then the jury would deliberate and then announce the winners. Then the competition would be over. That ranking of design firms based on concepts would go to the City Council. The City Council and the public would have to weigh-in. That's the whole process. I'm sorry it took a long time to explain it. With that, I'd like to turn this over to you. I was hoping to get some feedback on the principles and any other questions you have on the project. I'm here for that.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I have a comment on the guiding design principles, if you want to flip back to the chart there.

Vice Chair Lauing: This is really the focus of the questions that you want, right?

Ms. Ames: Yes.

Commissioner Reckdahl: All three of these are very artistic. I think Number 1 by and large, without a doubt Number 1 should be functionality. A beautiful product that doesn't work is not beautiful. If we have this beautiful bridge that is a landmark, going up and down 101 you see this beautiful bridge going across, but it doesn't do its purpose, then we've wasted our money. We have to worry about the functionality, the ease of use. How easy is it to cross the bridge? Is it wide enough? Is the slope appropriate? Also the access, how easy is it to get onto the bridge and get off the bridge? Especially the safety for the people getting on and off. Right now that Frontage Road is very dangerous on the west side of 101. When you come out of the underpass there, you're stuck on a sidewalk and trying to merge into the traffic. It's not a good angle. If you want to go north from that point, it's very difficult. You're trying to cross the road at a point where the road curves. We have to address the safety of the users and the ease of use. I think that's by far and away Number 1. These are all nice goals to have, but they shouldn't be addressed until we have functionality addressed. I do have other questions, but not on this. Do you want to have more guiding principles first or do you just want to have questions?

Chair Hetterly: Sure, why don't we do guiding principles first, since that's what you want to be sure to get. Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: Elizabeth, I want to thank you for all of your hard work on this. It's been quite an adventure in planning. You've really carried the torch very well through many different obstacles. I appreciate your hard work on this project. My comment on the guiding design principles are that they're good. For the third one, sustainability, I think of it more as a connection to the natural world there. I know the comments that you have after the headline are articulating that. The buzz word sustainability doesn't quite convey natural world enough. Here you're talking about innovation and something that reflects Silicon Valley, which is more of a technical community. That's fine, because that is our community, but it's balanced by an integration into the natural world. I just have an issue with that word sustainability. It's just my single opinion. When we say that all time, I cease to know exactly what it means. Sustainability can mean so many technological things as well. It can also mean sometimes a disruption of nature as we've found with the vote for the anaerobic

APPROVED

composting in Byxbee Park. We basically gave up parkland to that. I think of sustainability as being one kind of movement that is sometimes at odds with conservation and preservation. Again, this is just a single opinion, but I would just throw out using a word that has the idea of natural world in it. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Lauing.

Vice Chair Lauing: Just a comment on my colleagues' comments. I assume part and parcel of this has to be functionality, because it's an engineering project and an architecture project which is thoroughly integrated with engineering and ease of use. I just presumed that was in here. I'm not sure it needs to be called out. I strongly endorse the word contemporary in the discussion about innovation, because there could be a temptation to do a back-to-nature or a retro or "let's make it look natural." I strongly endorse the comments that are here, because this is Silicon Valley 2016, I think you just said, and beyond. It should be a statement of art and architecture for now going forward. I think that's well done. As I saw the second group of things, where it said versatility, it seems like there's some words that aren't here even though the picture shows the versatility of use. I almost want to see a multi-use from biking to running to all kinds of universal access to bird watching. Just like it's an extension of the Baylands. That wasn't called out in the words; although, the picture that you show, the architectural rendering did show that. It's almost multi-use or diversity as well as versatility to show these many things. On the sustainability, there is the comment there about integration and, of course, destination to nature in connection to the Bay trails. There you do talk a little bit about walkers and bikers. I was little bit surprised about the word commuters. That seems like a bypass on the way to the office. If that works, that works. The second one is the one that particularly caught my attention, is that we're not talking about in the words the numbers of uses that are going to be on this bridge. It could be park benches for sitting and holding hands or something. It's just all kinds of uses there. It's not just a destination to get to some other place. It's a thing in and of itself for lots of people. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Knopper.

Commissioner Knopper: I think this is a great project, and I'm really looking forward to it being completed. Thank you for your hard work. I'm just going to echo a couple of things that you've already heard. I'm focusing my comments on this sustainability bullet point. It was already stated that sustainability can mean different things. The word that I had written down before Commissioner Crommie said anything was preservation. It says respect the Baylands environment. We have to preserve the integrity of the Baylands ecosystem. A stronger statement with regard to putting a construction project in a very delicate ecosystem. If we can maybe strengthen the words, so everyone working on this project understands that we're really enhancing the human experience without being detrimental to the flora and the animals. I like the word preservation. The other

APPROVED

comment was recognizing integration with nature. I like the idea of integrating with nature for sure and recognizing that we are going to be putting this project, like I said, in a delicate ecosystem. We need to be mindful of that. It is wordsmithing a little bit, but it's just my opinion. Making sure that those points are made. I liked the idea of it being contemporary and emulating the innovative nature of where we live, where it's artistic and creative and interesting and dynamic with regard to the creative process. That, to me, is fantastic. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Markevitch.

Commissioner Markevitch: Hi. I'm going to go the complete opposite on this. A bike bridge is a great idea. I spoke to the San Jose Transportation Board way back, it had to have been six or seven years ago. That we needed a bike bridge there. I still think that this should be the most simple design, put it in, make it safe, and just get it done. You look at the bike bridges that are currently in San Carlos and Sunnyvale. They have what looks like a staple before it's folded up. It's a bike bridge of very simple design. They managed to work with the constraints of the Caltrans right-of-way over 101, and they got it done and it's a very simple design. I would like to see it go that way. With respect to looking at how much money it costs the City, even if we have grant money, it's still makes a statement of we're serious about watching our costs. Thanks.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Ashlund.

Commissioner Ashlund: A couple of points. After listening to the other Commissioners, I'm thinking that there could ideally be a balance of functionality. Yes, it's assumed but, yes, we should also call it out as well. Balancing the functionality with the invitational or inviting aspect of the design such that it doesn't look too utilitarian, but looks somewhat inviting to bike over as an access point to the environment. The one word that I'm wary of actually is the contemporary design for two reasons. Number one, in a couple of years contemporary easily looks dated and also because it's a bit at odds with the natural environment of the Baylands. That words raises a little bit of concern to me, that it would look out of place instead of inviting into the natural environment there. If that makes sense.

Chair Hetterly: I agree with the earlier comments about representing the diversity of uses. In the versatility section, I would include also education as one of those uses. We are investing in a lot of signage and information plaques, that kind of thing. I also like the idea of including something under that last section that maybe respect the delicate ecosystems of the Baylands environment. Find some ways to emphasize that as others said as well. Keith, you had additional comments?

APPROVED

Commissioner Reckdahl: There was some talk in the packet about Adobe trail that would go from the West Bayshore up to, is that Meadow where the car bridge currently is? Is that a done deal, the Adobe trail or is that subject to approval?

Ms. Ames: Sorry, I didn't bring that up. We are going to include, not in the competition but the project includes this Adobe Creek Reach Trail right here. This came out in the scoping meeting that people did not want to traverse Frontage Road to get to the bike bridge.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I totally agree with that.

Ms. Ames: We added that into the environmental assessment. It's kind of shown here. This is what people really wanted.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Yeah, and it's just going to Meadow there.

Ms. Ames: So that's just a basic paving project. We were not even allowed to put any lighting on the trail. It's almost a trail right now. I mean it's a maintenance road.

Commissioner Reckdahl: But there's no public access for bicycles.

Ms. Ames: Right.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Who owns that?

Ms. Ames: It's the Water District, so we would have to get an easement through there. I think they're open to this idea. We've met with them several times. It's part of the project, and we're going to work with the District to make sure that they still have access for their maintenance purposes. It's going to be open to the public.

Commissioner Reckdahl: And then we would have some ramps that go from that onto Meadow right at that bridge right there?

Ms. Ames: I think there's a gate here and we would have to put some kind of ADA accessible ramps there, like a crosswalk maybe. Are you thinking of a crosswalk here or what do you mean ramps?

Commissioner Reckdahl: There is traffic on that road. There's not as much as there is on Fabian and West Bayshore, but there is traffic there. We'd have to have some way to get the bikes on and off that trail.

Ms. Ames: Oh, from the road.

Commissioner Reckdahl: From that road.

Ms. Ames: Oh, yeah, I see what you're saying. Yeah, so there could be some ramps or something there, yeah.

Commissioner Reckdahl: OK. The other thing that was talked about in here is the slopes. They talked about 4-5 percent grade. What is the percent grade on the Oregon Trail, the Oregon bike bridge? Do you know what that is by chance?

Chair Hetterly: Much steeper.

Ms. Ames: I don't know, but I'm sure it does not meet ADA standards now.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What is the ADA standards for bike bridges, for pedestrian bridges?

Ms. Ames: It's 5 percent. We have a 5 percent grade. I believe it's so many feet, I can't think of it right now. It's so many feet at 5 percent and then we have to have landings at 2 percent. If you're on a walker or in a wheelchair, you have a break, a landing area. That's usually about 4-5 feet wide. There is a little bit of a break with the 5 percent and then it goes into this landing area, and then it goes 5 percent again.

Commissioner Reckdahl: It mentions something about 8 percent grade, maximum 8 percent grade for potential steeper segments. What does that mean?

Ms. Ames: That's a good point. We probably will not put that in there. I think that's extreme. In some cases, there might have to be an 8 percent. We're trying to give the designers the maximum flexibility to come up with a concept. Maybe they come up with something that wraps into the flood basin, in that footprint that we're allowing them to work in. Maybe they come up with something that they'd have to do an 8 percent slope. That 8 percent slope can't go for very long, because that's essentially a small ramp to a seating area. It's just more flexibility for the designers.

Commissioner Reckdahl: OK, that makes sense. What is the philosophy towards people biking versus walking their bikes? Are we intending that this will be designed so they could bike all the way without getting off their bikes or that they would actually have to dismount and walk?

Ms. Ames: Right now we're looking at 18 feet wide, so theoretically they would not have to dismount. It is a little problematic when they're going down the slope at 5 percent. That actually needs to be carefully thought through. I don't believe (inaudible) the

374 bollards or some obstruction, because then the handlebars hit that. There needs to be
375 careful consideration of speed. You've got these people on a bicycle that could
376 essentially race down the ramp.

377
378 Commissioner Reckdahl: Yeah, especially if you have pedestrians on there, bicycles at
379 high speed is an issue. People have bike trailers, and those bollards get in the way and
380 make it much harder. We try to police it so much that we reduce the functionality of the
381 bridge. I would like to see the ability to ride across, but yet have some reasonable speed
382 mitigations. I don't think we should expect people to dismount, because they don't. Even
383 across at Oregon, even at that high slope people still race down there on their bicycles.
384 That's all. Thank you.

385
386 Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Crommie.

387
388 Commissioner Crommie: I had a couple of other points to make. I wanted to talk about
389 the staircases a little bit. I see that they're in their as potential parts of this plan to have
390 staircases. I just wanted to comment that on the west side of the bridge, the staircase
391 where it's proposed, I'm very much in favor of that if it can fit within cost and design.
392 The reason I'm in favor of that is people coming to the bridge by foot from north of the
393 bridge would have a much easier time getting up to it by the staircase, because the ramp
394 goes down pretty far to the south. People on bicycles coming in from the north, that's not
395 a big deal, if you're on a bicycle, to go that extra distance. Given the geometry of the
396 touchdown on the west side, if feasible, I really think the staircase would be appreciated
397 by people. Then it would be also a way to get pedestrians up potentially more safely, so
398 they're not competing with bicycles. There will be a lot of folks coming from the
399 Meadow direction. There's a very high density of development in that neighborhood. I
400 just think it'd be really nice. I'm putting a pitch in for that particular staircase. I'm also
401 really glad that this is growing up hand-in-hand with the Adobe Reach Trail. I've been a
402 huge proponent of that trail from the very beginning, and I'm really glad that's coming
403 online. It's basically opening a gate to generate that, with some safety features and
404 probably some signage so people don't find themselves falling into the creek. I don't
405 know quite how that's handled. That's one thing. As far as on the east side, the staircase,
406 there it's harder for me to visualize it because where you're proposing the staircase would
407 go is pretty close to the end of the bridge. If that's where you're really putting the
408 staircase, it might be a very nice feature. But again, I don't think it has that functionality
409 as far as saving pedestrians time. If you were putting the staircase where it came down
410 closer to the highway before the bend, where it saves time for people trying to just get
411 over, not really into the Baylands, but I presume people are going there to go into the
412 Baylands. I assume you're putting the staircase on the east side, you want it to be down
413 by the overlook and it's part of that whole complex. Until I saw a design, I wouldn't
414 really know but I just want to say on the west side, I think there's that additional
415 functionality. I wanted to ask about how the timing of the closing of the Lefkowitz

APPROVED

Tunnel will work, because I wanted to advocate that that stay open as long as possible through the construction project. Until the overpass goes up, people really use that Lefkowitz Tunnel. How is that going to work?

Ms. Ames: That's a good question. We were actually proposing to close the tunnel during the construction, maybe not for the entire construction. A lot of this construction is going to happen in the summer, because we can't work in the Baylands or the flood area in the winter. It's a very tricky, phased construction project. It does seem problematic to have the tunnel open and construction happening. Right now we're proposing to close it. It's usually complicated to try to work around a construction project, but we did it for the Magical Bridge. It happened that way, so it's possible. When we get further into design, we'd have to look at that closely.

Commissioner Crommie: As a follow-up, this is maybe just a pipe dream. Is there any way to open up the Matadero as an informal crossing during the construction project, or is that too complicated?

Ms. Ames: That would greatly complicate this EIR. The environmental assessment that we're looking at with Caltrans is just focused on this particular location within the dashed area. They're very particular about that. If I branched out and went to another creek location, it would be a whole other study of all these issues.

Commissioner Crommie: As my last follow-up, can we do anything about San Antonio overpass? Is there any way we can leverage the inconvenience this will be causing for probably a year's time on commuters to just having the City evaluate simple safety measures at the San Antonio bridge? I don't use that frequently. I don't know if it's just a simple lining on the road that might help with safety there, just bring it up as a heads-up, just very low cost, simple safety measures. People might go over to using that more frequently. Just throwing an idea out. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: I have a couple of questions or maybe they're comments about the design. In the backup material, there's the Caltrans standards that additional removal of up to 36 eucalyptus trees could be required for that design. I wanted to make sure that the design guidelines that go out to the competitors don't say they all have to come out. They have the opportunity if they have a vision for a design that integrates some of those trees, I would like them to be able to do that rather than count it as a blank slate there. The other thing is on the process. The jury ranks the entries and then votes and then presents to Council. They deliberate, they rank the concepts, and they announce a winner. After that staff presents to City Council. Does that mean that the jury is the exclusive decider of a single winner? Does Council have to accept that winner or is there flexibility there?

APPROVED

Ms. Ames: This is where it can get complicated. The jury would make the recommendation after they hear presentations. There's going to be say four presentations by these firms. There will be a ten-member panel, five jurors and five ARB members. That's what we're proposing right now. That's a lot of panelists. There would be questions back and forth. After all of those presentations are completed, the public can comment on that. That's a really important point. Everybody can come to this meeting, I'm sure there'll be a lot of people at this meeting and a lot of interest. We're hoping to get public comment before and during and even after the competition to incorporate all of that along with the jury recommendations. The jury recommendations are just that. It's a ranking, one through four potentially. The Council and the community can decide what is best for Palo Alto. This Commission has said before that you'd like to see a simple, elegant design, no frills kind of thing. I've also heard people say iconic bridge. It's hard to say unless you see the concepts. It's really hard to determine what's going to rise to the top. With community support, Council will go with whatever the community wants as opposed to what the jury wants.

Chair Hetterly: OK, thank you. Any other comments, questions? All right. Thank you very much.

Ms. Ames: Thank you so much.

3. Comprehensive Plan Update and Discussion on How Best to Coordinate Commission Input.

Chair Hetterly: We also have public comment on this item, which we'll take now. Mark Weiss.

Mark Weiss: Good evening Commission members. What?

Chair Hetterly: Two minutes, if you can keep to 2 minutes, it would be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Mr. Weiss: I'll try. So I've been reviewing the Comp Plan. They charged me \$85 to get my own copy of the Comp Plan. It's a very thick document. I have a loaner copy of the revised proposed Comp Plan thing. I think Mr. de Geus' staff report is a subset with additional comments on the revised Comp Plan thingy. What I'm very specifically talking about is I've talked twice at Planning Commission, once at a scoping meeting, I think, while this Commission was not meeting last month. Fry's, I'm an advocate for a new park in Ventura on the 15-acre Fry's property; although, a lot of people are talking about more dense housing there. Not to steal someone's thunder, but I was thrilled after I was flipping through Rob's report to notice this, I think I can reference it. We are already, according to our Comp Plan, 25 acres behind in our per capita goal. I think it's

APPROVED

known as Comp Plan C-47, formerly known as C-25 on page 17 of this document. We really should be looking for parcels like this to add to our parks inventory. There's a huge pressure, huge incentive for more dense housing, but people should resist this. I'm for parking over housing. I'm for Ventura over Cali Ave. What I mean is somehow I think of Fry's as in the Ventura neighborhood. There was something called the California/Ventura Plan, but it seems to have disappeared into thin air. Now all the maps of the Comp Plan somehow think Fry's is in California Avenue. What about Ventura? Ventura is an under-appreciated neighborhood. The values of the homes there are significantly lagging behind the rest of Palo Alto. I think an investment in a park would raise all the boats there, so to speak. It'd be a wonderful place for a new park. The idea of a Comp Plan, it's our general plan. We have a Comp Plan. We should be renewing our Comp Plan. This talk about different verbs like amending it or changing it, that's almost like they're trying to flush it into the Bay. We spent \$1.7 million for a consultant in Berkeley to basically, by someone's directive, twist the Comp Plan and basically undermine the Comp Plan. We want to renew the Comp Plan. I hope the Commissioners per your hard work already will lean in on this issue and wrestle back from existing leadership, what is the will of the people here? I think for precedent, for example, Greer Park. Greer Park was a drive-in movie. Just as drive-in movies went the way of whatever and was replaced by a park in the '60s. OK, a big box retailer, we'd love to replace them somewhere when Fry's lease runs out. That's a precedent. Well, it's destined for something else there. I'm saying parks not housing. Likewise, someone pointed out Heritage Park. When the Medical Foundation moved, there was a fair amount of discussion. It's a pretty decent park. I think we could have done better there too. Some of the people behind Greer Park and Heritage Park would support a new park in Ventura. Thank you very much.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. You all got a memo by email yesterday, I guess. There was a staff report in the packet. Did you want to run through quick where we stand on the Comp Plan? Then we can get down to the nitty-gritty.

Rob de Geus: Yeah, let's do that. It is an action item with two action items. We're going to focus mostly on action Number 1. I thought just for context I'll take a couple of minutes to talk about the Comp Plan and some of the history. I won't go over the whole staff report. It's the City's overarching planning document representing the community's vision in sections called elements. Some of the Commissioners weren't here the last time we went through the review, so I think this might be helpful just to talk about. It addresses land use, transportation, housing, natural environment, community services, business, and economics. Between 2008 and 2012, the Planning and Transportation Commission and staff reviewed each element and the Commission was involved in two specific elements, community services and facilities element and the natural environment element. While the Planning Commission reviewed each element, the Council decided to take a step back and wanted to do a more in-depth, wide-ranging review of the Comp

APPROVED

Plan. We've talked about this at the Commission meeting. We talked about the Our Palo Alto outreach, intensifying workshops, surveys, forums to get a better sense of what the community would like to see with the Comp Plan. As for the process moving forward, we're currently in the stage called visioning. Council and staff are trying to, and this is mainly the planning staff in the lead on this, frame at a high level alternative futures for land use planning scenarios that the community would like to see studied in an EIR, which will happen with respect to the Comp Plan Update. I don't know how many of the Commissioners have been following the discussion at Council with respect to alternative future scenarios. I think it's fair to say that it hasn't been easy. It's a tough conversation, because there's lots of passion around the Comp Plan. It's probably the most important planning document that the City has and will shape the future of Palo Alto for decades to come. The Council is very interested in getting it right. At the beginning of August, we heard Mark Weiss mention this earlier, there were two meetings where there was a lot of public comment in a four-hour discussion with the City Council about these future scenarios, future planning scenarios. They didn't conclude anything really, other than they wanted a little more time and even more public outreach. It'll come back to the Council sometime in September. So we come to the action items, which Chair Hetterly talked about a little bit at the beginning. It's recommended that the Commission provide high-level feedback to Council on the potential consequences of growth for parks and recreation resources. This is where the draft memo comes into play. We have to thank Chair Hetterly and Vice Chair Lauing for putting in the work over weekends of the last weeks to put a draft together for review this evening. The memo is important, because I think it'll help the City Council as they think about the framework of the Comp Plan and the scope of the EIR that has to be done for the Comp Plan. That's the most pressing item for action. The second item is for the Commission to review again the community services and facilities element and the natural environment element. We have a little more time to do that, but we ought to think about the process for how to review that and what the Commission wants to do in terms of another memo to summarize what was shared with Council in the previous review. Maybe there are more things that the Commission wants to add. That's my summary. Back to you, Chair Hetterly.

Chair Hetterly: Great summary. I think part of how this memo came up was watching the Council's discussion around the various visions. It was really clear that they're focused on the hot issues of the day, overdevelopment, traffic, and parking. We obviously know that the impacts of growth go much farther than traffic and parking for parks and rec. That's what drove our thinking how do we get involved in this and send our message to them. We did meet with our liaison, Greg Schmid, and consulted him about that. He thought it would be very helpful to have that kind of input before they take any action, if they do take any action, in September. That's why we're on this short timeline. Ed and I formed an ad hoc ad hoc to churn something out that you could react to. I would like to go ahead and take that up and maybe focus on the looking forward section on the last page, since those are the key priorities we want Council to keep in

APPROVED

mind as they're giving direction to staff. I'd like to avoid a lot of wordsmithing. To the extent there is wording that you think conveys a different meaning, then I'd like to identify that as well. Commissioner Crommie.

Commissioner Crommie: OK, I guess I can start us off. Thank you so much, Ed and Jennifer, for the hard work on this document, and Rob as well. It's really wonderful that you guys took the time to give us a voice here. It is very important. I really, really appreciate your efforts. I like the document quite a bit. I want to make one very specific comment on page 2, the very bottom paragraph where you talk about new buildings also pose risks to our local species and you talk about bird deaths. I would like to amend it to saying new buildings and new housing. It's not just buildings that pose the risk to the birds; it's also glass windows in houses. If you think it fits in there, I would amend that. The first two sentences, you're basically talking about windows as a place where birds can crash and die. Those windows are in houses and buildings. The third sentence, you're talking about how tall buildings disrupt the flight paths which I think is a separate issue. I just feel like with the first, it would be nice to reflect residential development as well.

Chair Hetterly: So you think the word buildings doesn't convey commercial or residential?

Commissioner Crommie: Because you go into the third sentence and you're saying tall buildings, it smacks of commercial. It doesn't feel to me like it's capturing residential.

Chair Hetterly: OK.

Commissioner Crommie: Moving into the looking forward document. It's really good. I'd like a statement in there that says, "Address the need for more parks." Under Number 2, you're getting at that obliquely. You have this collect and consider data regarding recent growth in both residential and commercial square footage. It's really increased number of people as well. I don't see that reflected in this document, that we're getting more residents and we need more parks. I'd like it to be very clearly stated with very simple language. It might fit under Number 2. If other Commissioners feel strongly, we can give it its own bullet point. If I were to add a Number 4 to this document, I really feel like we need to over and over emphasize conserve habitat, conserve ecosystems. We just can't say that enough on our Commission. Within in the sustainability movement, as far as my awareness of that movement, they're not saying that. We on the Parks and Rec Commission are the spokespeople for that. If other Commissioners agree, I want to make sure it has a very clear bullet point on here, if we can add that on. Thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Markevitch.

APPROVED

Commissioner Markevitch: I'd like to piggy back onto what Commissioner Crommie was saying. You can have a certain amount of square footage in a commercial building and some companies will say, "OK, we have x amount of square footage, and we're going to put ten employees in that square footage." Other companies will come in and say, "We can put 40 employees in that square footage." It needs to be very clearly spelled out that we need to put our feet down when it comes to square footage and how many employees can go in it, and not have companies come in and cram as many people as they can in there. I don't know if it fits in Part 2 or another part of the Comp Plan. It seems to me that's where people and employees in companies are getting away with a lot of squirrely stuff that they haven't been in the past. I also see start-up companies are renting houses in neighborhoods, completely ignoring the business aspects of commercial building. They're using houses for start-ups. We have a number of them in our neighborhood. That also increases it, because you're not counting it in the houses. They can put as many people as they want. It's got to go somewhere. thanks.

Chair Hetterly: Other comments? Commissioner Knopper.

Commissioner Knopper: Hi. Thank you so much for drafting this. I know how much work was put into this. I'm going to avoid wordsmithing. Really, I am. There's just a couple of things that I thought. One, I really like the looking forward. We need an action statement. The document, this memo starts fluffy, for lack of a better word. We need an action statement that it's important we look at all the development impacts keeping in mind that every time we pick up a shovel, move plant life or change natural ecosystems, there are ramifications. As the Parks and Rec Commission, we believe that there are important issues that the City Council has to take into consideration when looking at the overview of issues. I'm not saying write it that way. What I'm saying is we need a strong action statement. Then we spell out you're looking forward, and then break it out. Some of this they've seen before, like in the Urban Forest Report that is very thick with regard to trees in just very strong, clear, concise language. There are some things that are difficult, like that half-mile rule. I know that there are some committee members that have that as a very specific agenda. With regard to the geographic nature of Palo Alto, that's the optimal that we would strive for. I wouldn't want to draw a line in the sand about it. Do you know what I mean? That it's a goal. Help me out.

Vice Chair Lauing: Can I just ask for clarification on exactly what you mean by an action statement? The overall idea here is for Council to be open to taking action as these things come up. It sounds like you're stating that we should be more ...

Commissioner Knopper: Our mission statement, why we're writing this memo. As the Park Committee, we are writing this memo because we feel strongly about as you're reviewing the Comprehensive Plan document that not only do you need to take into

APPROVED

account the hot topic issues of traffic and development, but you have to recognize that there are other impacts that are important. Then you've laid it out. Consider ...

Vice Chair Lauing: So you're tying the looking forward part just earlier up. You're forecasting it earlier up.

Commissioner Knopper: That's right. This is very strong language and it's clear and it's concise. We need to make them aware of why we're writing the memo. Why is it important for ...

Chair Hetterly: I'm reluctant to put the looking forward piece at the beginning, because I do want them to have the context of why these things are important to us before focusing on what these things are. Otherwise, they're going to read the first page and they won't read any more.

Commissioner Knopper: Maybe this is an offline conversation with three of us.

Chair Hetterly: Unfortunately, tonight's the night.

Commissioner Knopper: OK.

Commissioner Crommie: You can strike a compromise here. I think what Abbie's saying is extract something from that just to put in at the very beginning to strengthen the opening sentence or two. (crosstalk)

Commissioner Knopper: (crosstalk) position statement.

Commissioner Reckdahl: In some ways, the subject right there is an action point. Memo regarding the consequence of growth and development.

Commissioner Knopper: No, not in my opinion.

Chair Hetterly: You're saying something like take out that most Palo Altans agree. Start out saying, "Parks and Rec are vital to preserving the quality of life."

Commissioner Knopper: That's right. (crosstalk)

Chair Hetterly: (crosstalk) are not as apparent as traffic and parking. We feel strongly that these direct and indirect consequences should be considered as you move forward with blah, blah.

APPROVED

Commissioner Knopper: Exactly. I wrote one in two seconds. Basically any long range plan that is implemented by the City Council has to concern the long-term health and welfare of all inhabitants of Palo Alto including the humans, animals, and flora of our community. It's important that we look at the developmental impacts, keeping in mind that we impact the environment every time we make a decision to pick up a shovel, move plant life, or change natural ecosystems. Therefore, we believe that the following are important issues for thinking about the long range plan.

Commissioner Markevitch: That's pretty long.

Commissioner Knopper: I know, but it really isn't. I mean it's no less long than this opening statement. The other thing is traffic and parking is a hot topic to the City as a whole. We have to recognize that they have to consider that, obviously. There are my thoughts.

Chair Hetterly: Commissioner Ashlund.

Commissioner Ashlund: A couple of points. I do agree with striking the weaker beginning and beginning straight in with Parks and Rec are vital. That's a great modification there. On the looking forward section, something that I believe Commissioner Crommie mentioned, it's not just about adding square footage, but it's also adding people and residents. I want to be sure we also mention people that not only live here as residents but also people that work here and use the parks and services while they're working here. It says it will affect the number of park users. We can be a little stronger and clearer and say "the increased number of park users" in the Number 2 sentence.

Chair Hetterly: OK.

Commissioner Ashlund: Under Number 3 on Part A, it says, "Alternative park impact fee structures that will increase collections sufficient to expand and maintain inventory." It would be worthwhile to add expand and maintain. So that that doesn't ...

Chair Hetterly: We can't use park impact fees to maintain.

Commissioner Ashlund: That's not possible?

Chair Hetterly: Right.

Commissioner Ashlund: Then I'll go with that, because on Part D you did have maintenance there as well. That's fine. On Part B, monitoring the health of parks in the face of growing demand and use, there are a number of other things we could add besides

APPROVED

parks such as open space, trails. We could also mention air quality, safety, noise, and light pollution as other factors. It's not just the health of the parks. If we were taking a larger environmental view of the impact, those are things that are probably not going to be mentioned if they're not mentioned by us. The last comment on Part C, it's not just growing demographic but also growing and changing demographic groups.

Commissioner Knopper: Can I make one more?

Chair Hetterly: Yeah.

Commissioner Knopper: One more. Health and quality, I like the word impact.

Chair Hetterly: Where are we?

Vice Chair Lauing: Where are we?

Commissioner Knopper: What you titled it, health and quality impact of our ecosystems. Just the way you titled it. Because everything that they do is impacting.

Chair Hetterly: You're talking about health and quality of ...

Vice Chair Lauing: Parks or ecosystems?

Chair Hetterly: I'm lost.

Commissioner Crommie: Subheading.

Commissioner Knopper: Well, you used it almost like a title.

Chair Hetterly: On Page 2, the health and quality of our ecosystems?

Commissioner Knopper: Yeah. If you can inject the word impact into that.

Chair Hetterly: Just it impacts on the health and quality of our ecosystems?

Commissioner Knopper: Yes. And just one last thing. You wrote our small built-out community. I don't think that's reflective of what Palo Alto is now. It's an epicenter of innovation and technology and financial services. We're neighbors with Stanford. That doesn't do us justice. That's in your first line. It does a disservice to ...

Chair Hetterly: The epicenter of innovation and technology doesn't reflect an interaction with parks.

Commissioner Knopper: That statement of small built-out community doesn't take into consideration that we're a world-renowned city. Some people might not like it, but people consider Palo Alto the epicenter of Silicon Valley.

Chair Hetterly: You want us to concede that we're the epicenter of Silicon Valley but nonetheless we have limited space and growth (crosstalk).

Commissioner Knopper: The health and quality of our life in Palo Alto (crosstalk). When I think of small community, I don't think Palo Alto. I think Palo Alto contributes so much to the world, to the greater ...

Chair Hetterly: What does that have to do with the impact on parks and recreation? You just don't want us to characterize ourselves as small and built-out?

Commissioner Knopper: It does because of the people who live here. It does have an impact. The fact that people move here every day, that the City is growing. We are not a small, little city in the middle of nowhere.

Commissioner Markevitch: We're not growing. We're getting more and more built-out. There's a difference.

Commissioner Crommie: You could just say our community.

Commissioner Knopper: The population is growing in Palo Alto.

Commissioner Ashlund: Space is not.

Commissioner Crommie: You could say our built-out community. You can get rid of the word small.

Commissioner Knopper: I don't know what built-out community means. That's all I'm saying.

Chair Hetterly: There's no new land is what that means.

Commissioner Knopper: What?

Chair Hetterly: There's no new land.

Commissioner Knopper: I know that. We are ...

Chair Hetterly: That's what that means.

Commissioner Knopper: Right. I understand that. Later in the document, it talks about increased park and that we're not growing 4 acres annually. I thought that was counter to what you were saying. Is it realistic to think that we can grow our inventory 2.3 percent annually based on the fact that we have a very specific geography? You can't.

Chair Hetterly: I don't think it's realistic that we can do that annually every year. But that's what it would take to meet that goal. It's not impossible to do some. That's really the point of that section.

Vice Chair Lauing: Right. If we do zero in the next 20 years given the growth, then we are up the wrong creek, to use a park analogy.

Commissioner Knopper: I totally agree with that.

Vice Chair Lauing: I know you do.

Commissioner Knopper: They're going to look at these statistics and it's tough. You have to be realistic about what is possible.

Commissioner Crommie: I think what Abbie might be saying is that when we use the word built-out, we work at cross-purposes to what we're trying to say in this document. Is that what you're trying to say? We want to advocate for more parks in the City, and we know there are ways to get more parks. Development is in the eye of the beholder. Development doesn't mean it all has to be urban landscape. It can include park space. We need to envision that we have room for parks. Getting parks is a mindset in part. We're trying to foster this mindset. I don't know if using the word built-out is at cross-purposes to the mindset we're trying to foster in this document. I would only throw out ...

Chair Hetterly: I don't think it's at cross-purposes.

Commissioner Crommie: OK. I don't know if that's what Abbie is saying. Abbie, are you trying to justify that we can't get more parks?

Commissioner Knopper: No, no, no.

Commissioner Crommie: OK, I just want to make sure.

Commissioner Knopper: It's a development issue. If commercial development will continue, the City has to be mindful and require that if certain commercial development happens, park space has to be included in that. It just can't be dense housing without park

APPROVED

and open space available. It hasn't been consistent, which is why a lot of people have been very upset. I agree that that's what we're striving for. It's just my opinion. Obviously, that's why we're all here, because we get to express our opinion. I just think that that statement up front, well you know what I mean. I'm going to stop talking now.

Chair Hetterly: OK. Other comments? Commissioner Ashlund.

Commissioner Ashlund: Just briefly to respond to what Commissioner Knopper was mentioning. It could be perfectly valid to just omit "small built-out" and have "quality of life of our community" and leave it at that. If we want to keep the focus on parks and rec, then the Council is well aware of the size and the whole concept under discussion in the Comp Plan is the quality of built-out. If we just omit that and say, "of our community," that is a possibility I wanted to float. The other thing I forgot to mention on the looking forward on Part C under Number 3, when it mentions "monitor our success in meeting the goals," I might simplify it to keep the focus on monitor the health of local ecosystems and omit "our success in meeting the particular needs." It's wordy and it's not really about monitoring our success. We are more worried about the opposite, that we'd be monitoring failure. If we just omitted "our success in meeting the particular needs" and replaced it with "the health of local ecosystems," it would be more clear and to the point.

Chair Hetterly: I think it's easier to define quality measures to monitor the success of what we do to try to meet the needs of the ecosystems than it is to monitor the health of the ecosystems as a City. I mean that not in the sense of we don't care about the health of the ecosystems, but what kinds of quality measures might you use to monitor the health of the ecosystems. That seems like something there's a lot of experts out there who already have, actually there aren't either. That was the problem we had with the Urban Forest Master Plan. We don't know very well how to do that. We do know a list of ecological issues to consider, vis-à-vis significant development, like lighting, space and water. We do know ways to measure vehicle loads and translate that into pollution. I don't know if we can measure disturbance of habitat. We can quantify noise and lighting. We can quantify the impacts of what we do. It's easier to do than to quantify the health. I'm trying to work through (crosstalk).

Commissioner Ashlund: Yeah. I'm not tied to the word health. What I'm more concerned about is that it sounds the opposite of what we're trying to convey. We want to express concern. By saying we're monitoring our success, it sounds like all's fine. It might also work to say, "to monitor the impact on local ecosystems." I'm wary that it sounds like we're saying, "Oh, everything's wonderful." That's the opposite of what we're trying to convey with the gist of the document, if I understand it correctly.

Chair Hetterly: Other comments?

APPROVED

Vice Chair Lauing: If we wanted to talk about something specifically about parks, it could be pretty simple to put in Number 2 at the end, "increase square footage will affect the number of park users and the inevitable need for more parklands." Then you're tying those two concepts together.

Commissioner Crommie: Yeah. It'd be nice if we can somehow mention people, not just square footage.

Commissioner Ashlund: Users?

Commissioner Crommie: Users.

Commissioner Ashlund: From our (inaudible).

Commissioner Crommie: You're talking about recent growth in our population and residential and commercial square footage. I'm just trying to get in something that conveys that there are more people here.

Vice Chair Lauing: That's in the document, but it's definitely not called out here.

Commissioner Crommie: Yeah, yeah. To do this conserve habitat, I think you can put that under Number 3, one of the A, B, C, or D. Just make sure that when we say monitor the health of parks, we can say "and conservation of ecosystems." We can throw that in here.

Vice Chair Lauing: That'd be good.

Commissioner Crommie: OK.

Chair Hetterly: Yeah, that's good. Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I was very impressed. Ed and Jen. You did a very good job. I read through it and went back and found very few edits. Quite impressed both in the quality of the writing and also the content. You talk about a lot of things. Obviously everyone knows there's a lot of people and not enough land. You also brought up other things like the fact that you have traffic making it hard to get to the park. You have different demographics and also the parking at parks and how Cubberley will affect that. I thought that was very good points. On the looking forward, I had some comments. On 3A, consideration of alternative park fees. I don't think that's strong enough. You made a good argument that we need it, because we're behind, we're not collecting enough money, and the current park impact fees are not sufficient. Consideration says, "Yeah, think about it." We've shown that you do need it. You need additional fees or some way to

maintain quality of parks. Also B and C, you talk about quality measures, but you don't talk about maintaining. We're asking them to measure the quality, but we're not telling them to do something about it.

Chair Hetterly: We're telling them to give us the maintenance money to be able to do that. You think that's not implicit though. We should be specific?

Commissioner Reckdahl: There's two types of funding gaps. One is the maintenance. We see that in the CIP, that we have stuff pushed off every year. The IBRC said you have all this catch-up work, and we haven't been able to do the catch-up work. The maintenance is a big issue, but also just the park acquisition. Park acquisitions are funded by this insufficient impact fees. I'm saying we need to come up with more impact fees or some other types of fees for park acquisitions. We also need out of a different funding source more maintenance. What concerns me is that there is a general tendency for people when there's a problem to hem and haw about it and not take action. In B and C where you talk about measuring these aspects of park health, I would want some statement saying, "maintain a commitment to maintain the quality of the parks." Using these measurements as data to tell us you need to make more park acquisitions, you need to increase maintenance, you need to change programs. It isn't just park; it's recreation too. These additional people and their demographics, you may need to have more senior classes because we have more seniors. We need to measure that, but we also need to maintain a commitment. We just can't measure it and do nothing. We have to make a commitment to action, to maintain the quality. That's all.

Vice Chair Lauing: On your first point, you're saying you could drop the word "consideration of" and leave the rest of it? Because then plan for growth will include alternative park impact fee structures.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I would say, "the need for alternative park." You could delete it. I'm just saying that consideration is too soft. We need to say that's it's almost mandatory. We have a need or a requirement for additional fees. How you want to word that, I don't know.

Chair Hetterly: Ensure that any plan for growth will include alternative park fee, you could even take out "alternative." Will include park impact fee structures that will result in increased collections sufficient to ...

Commissioner Reckdahl: Yes, I like that.

Commissioner Crommie: Do you want to use the word "additional?" We're trying to make the point that we need more. Will include additional park impact fee structure. I'm just trying to ...

Chair Hetterly: Say that again. I'm sorry.

Commissioner Crommie: You need to include the word under 3A "additional." We need additional money. We need additional funding.

Chair Hetterly: Increased collections, that's what additional funding means. That does mean additional funding.

Commissioner Crommie: Oh, at the very end. Yeah, I'd just like to put it up front. People lose it in a second part of the clause.

Chair Hetterly: I see what you're saying.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Yeah, that's a good point.

Commissioner Crommie: Just try to make it more active upfront.

Chair Hetterly: OK. I think we can figure out how to do that. Other comments, questions? All right. Should we run through what I think we have here in terms of the core message? Starting at the beginning, we want to make that first paragraph more action and forceful. Add impacts to the subheadings and maybe connect directly to the to-do items list. In the looking forward section, on Number 2 we want to somehow convey the connection between increased square footage and the number of people both resident and nonresident and the inevitable impacts that will have on our resources.

Vice Chair Lauing: On our need for parkland.

Chair Hetterly: On our need for parkland, that's right. Thank you. Under Number 3, we want to make 3A stronger. Something like, "increased collections through alternative park impact fee structures that will allow us to expand inventory." Something like that. In B, we want to add in "conservation of ecosystems" and "monitoring the health of our parks and conservation of ecosystems." I don't know if everyone wants to add a whole list of open space air quality, safety, noise, light pollution. That gets a little off track from the discussion that went before in the memo. I'm open to advocacy for that, if you want to do that.

Commissioner Ashlund: If possible, we could include it earlier so that this is just the summary.

APPROVED

Chair Hetterly: OK. Let me try to figure out how to do that. Also for C, instead of monitor our success, figure out some other way to phrase that so that it's more directly tied to the ultimate goal which is the health of the ecosystem.

Commissioner Crommie: You can just use the word maybe "to assess." You don't have to specify success. You're analyzing how things are going. You might consider just saying "assess" or "analyze" or "monitor" and delete "our success."

Chair Hetterly: How about something like, "monitor preservation of local ecosystems and services to rapidly growing and changing demographic groups?" Does that work?

Commissioner Crommie: I like that.

Chair Hetterly: What did I just say? Did anybody write that down?

Commissioner Ashlund: Preservation of ecosystems.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. For both B and C, we want to add a second clause saying, "Maintain commitment to maintain the quality of parks" or :to maintain the range of services."

Vice Chair Lauing: Quality is what I heard.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Yeah, maintain the quality. We have those measures. I'm not sure if you want to put them in B and C or at the beginning of 3 right before A.

Chair Hetterly: Oh, OK.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Include and maintain a commitment to maintain quality or something like that.

Chair Hetterly: Yeah, that's good. Then we want to add a bullet point for "address the need for more parks, " a bullet point for "conserve habitat and ecosystems."

Vice Chair Lauing: Wait. I thought we were going to put more parks into 2. I thought we put ecosystems into 3. I thought we decided we don't need additional bullet points.

Chair Hetterly: Yeah, I'm sorry. The ecosystems is an E under 3.

Commissioner Ashlund: Were you going to add (crosstalk).

Vice Chair Lauing: I thought we were going to try to figure out some way

Chair Hetterly: Address the need for more parks is in 2.

Vice Chair Lauing: We're going to try to figure out some way in 2 to talk about the need for more parks because of people, not just square footage.

Chair Hetterly: Right. (crosstalk).

Commissioner Ashlund: Were you going to add habitat as well with ecosystems?

Chair Hetterly: Yeah.

Vice Chair Lauing: Mm-hmm.

Commissioner Ashlund: OK.

Chair Hetterly: We want to encourage them to set a limit of number of employees per square foot. Could that be a parenthetical somehow related to Number 2? Do you think that would work? OK.

Commissioner Markevitch: It dovetails nicely with what Commissioner Crommie said.

Chair Hetterly: Anything else? Anything I left out?

Commissioner Crommie: If Number 2 gets too wordy, you can also do an A and B underneath it.

Chair Hetterly: If there aren't any more comments and everybody can agree to the spirit of those edits, then Ed and I can try to write it up. Hopefully you'll be comfortable with us making those revisions and just sending it forward. Otherwise, we will need to come back again at a special meeting to approve it.

Commissioner Crommie: Do you want a motion?

Vice Chair Lauing: Yes.

Commissioner Crommie: I'd like to move that we accept this memo to City Council with the changes that we discussed tonight.

Commissioner Ashlund: I second the motion.

MOTION: The Parks and Recreation Commission accepts the Memo Regarding Consequences of Growth and Development for Parks and Recreation Interests with revisions made during the meeting for forwarding to City Council.

PASSED 7-0

Chair Hetterly: Then the second action item is what to do about all these elements. I apologize for all the paper we ended up with in here. I think we have two different versions of both elements somehow with the various staff reports. Now you have the whole history of our work on those two elements of the Comp Plan, which hopefully you all have read and will read again and keep fresh in your mind. As far as productive input to Council, they're still really focusing on these high-level vision things and aren't really giving any thought, I imagine, to the details that are represented in this kind of piece. However, they will get there eventually. I think they're really hoping to be able to have the concepts approved and kick off a draft EIR process by the end of the year. The opportunity to get to highlight the nitty-gritty details for us is really between now and then. As the months go by, we may know more about their vision which might affect our thinking about what ought to be included in the policies and programs. Basically what we need is to be paying attention to Council and whatever they decide about the vision and at the same time reviewing the pieces that we had approved earlier, making sure they still represent what we want and how they would fit in under those various concepts. I don't think this is an action item, but I would like to have a brief discussion about how you all think we should move forward with that. We could have an ad hoc. We could have two ad hocs who are charged with bringing it back to us and framing the issues for a fuller discussion.

Vice Chair Lauing: We already did have two ad hocs. They partially still exist if we wanted to go that direction.

Chair Hetterly: We could certainly do that. I would want to invite others to participate if they want to.

Vice Chair Lauing: Sure, absolutely. Or different people. Absolutely.

Commissioner Crommie: I agree. I would like to reconvene the ad hocs just to go over it one more time and keep abreast of what's going on at City Council. We can decide if we need to reconvene the old ones, if other people want to join in, if we need one or two. I agree with that as a point of discussion.

Chair Hetterly: OK. Any other comments, reactions? Why don't we go ahead and do that then? Go with two ad hocs, one for each element. Those folks will be responsible for going through it, coming up with a way to lead a full discussion and what we want to

APPROVED

1167 get out of it for presentation to Council sometime before December and also keeping on
1168 top of what's going on at Council.

1169
1170 Commissioner Crommie: Again, this is all predicated by the fact that City Council is
1171 taking another look. There's a process going on to take another look at this. Whether we
1172 agree with that process or not, it is going on. That's really the reason we need to do it.
1173 We don't need to do a ton of work on this. We have committees that have already dug
1174 into this document, are very familiar with it. If other people want to join in, by all means.

1175
1176 Chair Hetterly: Did you want to say something?

1177
1178 Commissioner Markevitch: I can't remember who was on those committees.

1179
1180 Chair Hetterly: I think the natural environment element was Commissioner Crommie and
1181 myself. The community services was Commissioner Lauing plus Sonny and Daria. Ed's
1182 our only remaining community services guy.

1183
1184 Commissioner Markevitch: I'll jump in.

1185
1186 Chair Hetterly: OK. Do you want to work with Pat? Are you still interested in doing ...

1187
1188 Vice Chair Lauing: Totally fine. If someone new wants to get on to put their eyes on it,
1189 that's OK too. I'm totally fine. The other one was ...

1190
1191 Chair Hetterly: Deirdre and myself.

1192
1193 Vice Chair Lauing: Do you want to stay on that or do you want to be offloaded?

1194
1195 Chair Hetterly: That's fine with me. I'm happy to stay on it, but I'm also happy to
1196 concede it to anyone else who has an interest in it. I don't see anyone jumping up. Why
1197 don't we stick with that for now. Commissioner Crommie and myself for the NEE and
1198 Commissioner Lauing and Commissioner Markevitch for the Community Services piece.

1199
1200 Commissioner Crommie: If people want to provide comments to ad hoc committees, can
1201 they email Catherine any comments for us? If they read this document and want to make
1202 any points or would that come up when we do our presentation.

1203
1204 Chair Hetterly: That would come up when we do our presentation. I'll just stay in
1205 contact with both groups and Rob and try to figure when the timing is best to have a full
1206 discussion about that. It may be September; it may not. Right?

APPROVED

Mr. de Geus: Yeah, I think that's the way to do it. I keep hearing City Council say they really want a lot of public input, not only now but throughout the process. When the EIR gets underway, they're going to have a whole bunch of findings and conclusions and impacts. That's another time where the Commission might want to reconvene. That's probably a year away from now. We should put it on our calendar of things we want to do to really review that. Maybe there's additional comments you want to make at that time to Council.

Chair Hetterly: As part of the formal DEIR?

Mr. de Geus: Yeah.

Chair Hetterly: Good point. All right, if there are no more comments on this topic, let's move on.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Can you give me an overview of the schedule? It says December 31st we have to provide our thoughts on those two areas.

Chair Hetterly: We want to provide our input as soon as possible before December, pending their umbrella vision.

Commissioner Reckdahl: When is the end date for this? When is the whole thing going to be done?

Chair Hetterly: The whole Comp Plan?

Commissioner Reckdahl: Yeah.

Mr. de Geus: December 2015, calendar year. The next six months is about preparing for doing the EIR, a lot of public outreach at this time, this alternative futures discussion which Council is having. Then the first six months of calendar year 2015 will be the EIR process, additional public outreach throughout that time. Then drafting the Comp Plan in the second half of calendar year 2015. The hope is December there would be final draft. A year and a half from now.

Chair Hetterly: The significance of the end of this year is that once they, I think I understand this right, do the draft EIR, then they're more limited in the kinds of changes they can make to the policies and programs moving forward. If there are changes, additions that we want to make sure make it into the final document that gets evaluated, then that should happen before the end of this year.

APPROVED

Vice Chair Lauing: Should we technically just have a quick motion to approve the two ad hocs going forward, since there is one new member?

Chair Hetterly: Sure.

Vice Chair Lauing: You say that and I'll vote for it. I'll move it and somebody has to second it.

Commissioner Crommie: I'll second it.

MOTION: The Parks and Recreation Commission will form two ad hoc committees: Chair Hetterly and Commissioner Crommie to review the Natural Environment Element of the Comprehensive Plan; and Vice Chair Lauing and Commissioner Markevitch to review the Community Services Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

PASSED: 7-0

4. Summary of the Current Capital Improvement Plan.

Rob de Geus: Let me just make some remarks about the CIP plan. The ad hoc committee for CIPs is Vice Chair Lauing and Commissioner Reckdahl. We've met over the last year and several times over the last couple of months. One of the goals that we have is for us to involve the Commission earlier in the process of the annual capital budget in the planning process. Here we are just six weeks after the Council approved the current plan, which is this big thing here, we're getting underway with a discussion with the Commission immediately. That's the right way to go. I'm happy to be doing that. It's not an action item tonight. It's more a discussion item. We have met and we have some thoughts about what could be priorities for what we'll submit in the coming months when the planning really gets underway. By way of background and context, we have a five-year capital improvement plan, but the budget is only set for one year at a time. The other four years are really a plan. The review of the capital improvement plan is structured around public hearings with the Planning and Transportation Commission and the Finance Committee. The Planning and Transportation Commission is tasked with ensuring compliance with the Comp Plan. The Finance Committee reviews all aspects of the budget to make sure it is consistent with Council direction. In the staff report, I share some things about the qualifications of what makes a capital project versus not and also a calendar that shows how we go through the process of the capital plan. I'm not going to go through all that, but I hope you found that informative. We can answer questions about it. We also have a section in the staff report that talks about prioritization criteria for prioritizing capital projects. There's obviously more projects than there is funding. The main thing that I wanted to talk about was the spreadsheet that we created.

APPROVED

It's really intended to be the full picture of the Community Services Department capital plan. This is a big document, the City capital budget. What we're going to do is draw out all the stuff that relates to our department so it's easy to see in one document, fairly easy to see. That spreadsheet, hopefully you've had a chance to look at it, includes four sections. The existing CIPs that have not yet been completed. That's an important section because those CIPs have been part of a prior five-year plan but the time has passed and they're still not completed. You'll notice that there's a lot there that we still need to complete. There's ongoing CIPs which is more maintenance, trail maintenance, other things that we know just come up year after year. There's specific types of CIPs related to that. The third section is the future CIP plan, which is the new plan, Fiscal Year 2015-2019. The last section in that spreadsheet is CIPs that are needs that have been identified but are not included anywhere in the plan yet. That's the structure of that spreadsheet. You may recall the Commission CIP ad hoc committee and the full Commission met in December 2013 to talk about what was going to be submitted for the plan that was approved by Council. A few things were approved; a few not. Boulware Park was approved. The community gardens irrigation replacement was approved. The golf course parking lot was sort of approved. It's in there but not quite how we had imagined. The golf course has a Master Plan that has a vision for the parking lot to have some trees and other things and landscaping. The cost of that is \$600,000 or something like that, and there just wasn't funding to do it. It got included as part of the City's general parking lot replacement plan, which is more of a slurry, seal and restriping, not the full renovation that we had hoped. Things that didn't get added that we had on our priority list were Buckeye Creek hydrology study, additional funding for the Foothills fire management plan, Greer Park and Baylands comprehensive conservation plan. As we start to look forward and think about what we might include for this next year, the ad hoc committee discussed it. They can share their thoughts on it as well. Our current thinking is that, it's those last four that didn't get included in the last time around that we would include again and see if we can get them funded in the Fiscal Year 2016-2020 plan. You can ask questions about why, but we'll get into that in a little bit. There are a few other CIPs that we know are coming and are not yet funded but are important. They're also in this spreadsheet. That includes the Baylands Athletic Center expansion, the 10 1/2 acres that we're adding to the park system. I know that the Commission and Council wants to see something happen there, not too rush it, but they want to see something happen. That's a CIP that we know is coming, but we think the Master Plan is going to help guide that and define what that ought to be. The 7.7 acres at Foothills Park is another CIP that we know will be added at some point. Again, we need more data, more information to really recommend something there. Just a note on the Cubberley items. There were a number of CIPs related to Cubberley that were in the prior plan. They've all been removed from the plan pending negotiations with the school district on the lease for Cubberley. The hope is that a lease can be structured in such a way that we're not paying quite as much to the school district and can take some of those funds and put it back into Cubberley planning and Cubberley infrastructure. That's what I

APPROVED

wanted to say in terms of a summary. I'd invite Commissioner Reckdahl and Vice Chair Lauring to add thoughts about our process.

Vice Chair Lauring: Yeah, I'm happy to start. First of all, last year we started in October and this year we started in July. We can't start much earlier or we'll be on last year's. It took us a couple of years to get here, but that gives us a lot of time to process it in this larger group. The process so far, like last year, has gone really well. A salute to staff, Daren, Rob and Greg. They've been very active, very involved, very responsive for the last meeting which we had to schedule quickly. There's all kinds of things going on here. I just want to point out that the two things we got last year, Boulware Park was Number 3 in our choice and community gardens was Number 1, and golf course was Number 4. We're picking up some of those and putting them on the list for this time. I do think the focus here is what we think are the most important ones going forward, which is that thing under CIP needs identified but not currently in the plan. We can address here either from City staff or ad hoc why we think those are the highest priorities. The other thing that's in the text of the document that Rob wrote and sent out, which is a really good document. We really have to understand the staff limitations on this. They're just only so many folks that can manage projects. Two-thirds of the City staff that can manage these projects for CSD are sitting in this room with Daren and Peter. There's a real constraint there. When you see all this stuff that's going to get done in 2018 on the bigger graph, that's not happening. It's by default. We just can't get that all done. Something there's going to be pushed out. We also discussed the fact that there's no need here in 2014 for us to try to prioritize that right now, because we don't know enough and things will change. We'll come back to that. I just wanted to not over-promise in terms of everything that's on here. Do you want to add anything, Keith?

Commissioner Reckdahl: We'll go with discussion. If people have questions, maybe that'd be a more efficient way of going through it. One of the big problems is that we have a very long list. Our budget is short, so we can't have all of our top picks. We have to take the best of the best, the ones that have the priorities that Rob talked about in the memo. Let's have questions and have a discussion first and we can close up if there's any other points of interest.

Mr. de Geus: One last thing I would add before the questions. This is a work in progress, this spreadsheet. I know there's still a couple of gaps here and there that need to be fixed. The ease of reading could be a little bit better. You can send me your comments, if you have comments, about how it can be improved.

Chair Hetterly: Should we start over here? Commissioner Knopper? Markevitch? Ashlund? Crommie?

APPROVED

Commissioner Crommie: I can start. I'm really thankful for the attention this is getting early on. I think you guys, Ed and Keith and Rob, have done a great job bringing this up for a faster review by us. I wanted to talk about the Lucy Evans boardwalk. I wanted to ask if that is in here. I see something about Baylands Nature Interpretive Center exhibit improvements. I know there is community interest in the boardwalk.

Mr. de Geus: It is in there. It may not be labeled quite right. I think it's on the third page, Baylands, I think it says levee repair. I'm not sure why it says that. It is in the CIP budget for this year, funded at \$500,000 for a feasibility study.

Commissioner Crommie: I'm sorry, where is it? Can you tell me what subheading it's under?

Mr. de Geus: It's under future CIPs FY 2015-2019.

Chair Hetterly: The first item.

Mr. de Geus: The first item.

Commissioner Crommie: Do you see it, Keith?

Mr. de Geus: It's a change from the prior CIP plan which included an estimate for the cost of replacing the boardwalk. That has been stripped out, and just the feasibility study funding is in there now.

Commissioner Crommie: OK, thank you.

Chair Hetterly: Does the levee refer only to the boardwalk or to the levee as well, the path?

Daren Anderson: It's not going to focus on the levee at all. This is looking at the boardwalk, that quarter mile section of wood branching off the Nature Center.

Chair Hetterly: Got you, thanks. Did you have more, Commissioner Crommie?

Commissioner Crommie: No.

Chair Hetterly: OK. I have a couple of questions. That was one of them. Another was the El Camino Park lights. Is that already funded?

Mr. de Geus: It is.

Chair Hetterly: That's why it's not on here. Finally on the future CIPs list, I see Ramos Park improvements, \$175,000 for 2015. I wonder if it doesn't make sense to push that one forward as well pending the Master Plan.

Mr. de Geus: To push it out, you mean? Not do it this year?

Chair Hetterly: Yeah. Rather than do a \$175,000 renovation next year, shouldn't we wait for the Master Plan so we know what renovations should be made?

Mr. Anderson: To be honest, much like we talked earlier about that backlog, it probably would have happened either way. It would have been pushed out. We are backlogged with enough CIPs that just need to be managed and completed. Most likely that will happen and that does make good sense to push it back until we've got the completed Master Plan.

Chair Hetterly: Great. I think you've already answered all my other questions. I also think you guys did a great job. This staff report was really a great description of how the process works that we can keep going back to every year when we've forgotten how it works. Thank you for that.

Mr. de Geus: I'll go through this again and fix a few of the things that I've already noticed. I'll send the spreadsheet out to everybody, so they have a revised copy. If you do get a chance to look at it in-depth, send me your feedback about how it can be improved for readability.

Chair Hetterly: Great. Any other questions, comments? Thank you all. I think you did a great job with the prioritization. Obviously everyone agrees with them, so well done.

Vice Chair Lauing: That's shocking.

5. Recommend to Council a Park Improvement Ordinance for Bowden Park Improvement Project.

Chair Hetterly: This is an action item that came before us at our last meeting, I believe. We went through the various designs.

Rob de Geus: We have Peter Jensen, Landscape Architect, here that's going to lead this one.

Peter Jensen: Commissioners, good evening. How are you? Peter Jensen, Landscape Architect for the City of Palo Alto. This is an item to recommend to approve to Council the Park Improvement Ordinance for Bowden Park. We brought the plan to the

APPROVED

Commission a few months ago. There were a few points made by the Commission that we did revise. The main one was keeping the sand in the playground, where it currently exists. Adding accessible walkways to specific equipment to make the playground ADA accessible, but leaving the majority of the sand in place. There was another question about the area that is closest to California Avenue and the playground and adding more amenities in that area. From our observation of the space, we've noticed that it makes a track or ring around those trees. Kids on scooters or bikes were using that as a racetrack. We did not put any further amenities in that area. There is a bench shown on the plan that's closer to the gate in the corner of California Avenue that could be relocated centrally to make it more useable. Because the bikes and the scooters were using that as a track and our budget being so tight, no further amenities were added to that location. Other than that, the plan itself stays the same. I'll open it up for discussion or questions and allow you to proceed from there.

Vice Chair Lauing: Comments or questions? I actually had just a couple. The last time we talked about that open space that we felt there was something there before and not there anymore. There was a suggestion to put kids' bike racks in there or something. I don't see a change there, not that you're supposed to make every change that we comment on. I just wondered what the answer was about that.

Mr. Jensen: I believe in that area is an existing tree in that spot. That's the spot that's located by the gate.

Vice Chair Lauing: It's a white square and it's just concrete, when I walk through it.

Mr. Jensen: In that location we did not add any further amenities. The budget is tight on this, and we're using everything we've got for furnishings. Nothing else was added.

Vice Chair Lauing: That was another question. Did you decide to scrape and paint or did you decide to replace the benches?

Mr. Jensen: We're going to try to maintain the benches, so we're going to scrape and paint them. They are historical to the site. The park is designed by Royston. It has a designer feel to it.

Vice Chair Lauing: Sounds great.

Daren Anderson: Just to add to that comment. Just as Mr. Jensen pointed out, the funding is short in the CIP to expand for additional amenities like that. That's where we have these other CIPs where we can come in either concurrent with the project or post-project with a little bit of extra money for bike racks and small amenities like that without too much difficulty.

Vice Chair Lauing: OK.

Chair Hetterly: Any other comments or questions? Why don't we get a motion?

Commissioner Reckdahl: I sent Peter a couple of emails about this and he mentioned one of them. On the left there between California and the redwoods, there's really nothing there now. It's totally empty and we're not doing anything there. I view that as a wasted opportunity, but I'd rather have a wasted opportunity than do something stupid. We can add on later with a follow-on CIP and do that area. I'm happy leaving that as-is. The other one was on the far left we have a drinking fountain. I was objecting to the fact that that drinking fountain, if the kids want to bring water to the sand, it's quite a long ways away. Peter said digging that up would be difficult, because it's all concrete. I still would like to see if we could trench around the outside portion of it. That's not concrete. That's just crushed granite or some type of rock. If we could enter closer to that sand and have some type of water supply closer to the sand, I think that would be better. That would be a preference. I don't see that as being mandatory. At least we have water there. That's better than no water. We can add that on in a follow-up CIP. Even though this design isn't a homerun, it fits the bill. I'm happy with it.

Mr. Anderson: Just one additional comment. Some of those won't have to wait for CIPs. We have an irrigation staff that can do work like that. If it is not too onerous or expensive and we're not cutting through asphalt or concrete and there's a portable line that could reach, that is something my staff could probably do. At some point, we'll certainly evaluate that. If we can, we will.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you.

Vice Chair Lauing: I'd like to move adoption of the plan revision.

Commissioner Ashlund: I second.

MOTION: The Parks and Recreation Commission recommends the Council approve the Park Improvement Ordinance for Bowden Park Improvement Project.

PASSED: 7-0

6. Update on the Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Facilities Master Plan.

Rob de Geus: Back to you, Peter. I thought it'd be good to hear from Peter about how MIG is doing in the next stage and phase they're going into. Then to hear from the

Commissioners who helped with the intercept surveys. It was very helpful, and I'm very interested to hear how that went.

Peter Jensen: Peter Jensen again, Landscape Architect for the City of Palo Alto. Again, good evening. Here to discuss and give an update of the Parks Master Plan. Right now the consultant, MIG is wrapping up their initial study and analysis of the park system, which also included the initial public outreach. As Rob touched upon, the intercept groups and the online Mapita survey. They're also looking at the demographic study that they're producing for us. It's looking at demographics and how that relates to our park and recreation system. I'm hoping to have that information as well as the analysis of what they found in the parks to you for the next meeting, so we can review their initial review and analysis of the park system. The next step coming up will be a broader community engagement aspect of the plan, which will be community meetings and the survey. I'm waiting for MIG to let me know when they have enough data to establish those community meeting dates. We're looking at the first of October for those meetings, but I don't have specific dates for you at this time. Like I said, the initial aspect of it focused on the intercept groups, the Mapita. We have the full project website up. I don't know if you've been to the website in the last two weeks. If you saw the old one and you see the new one, I think you'll see it's much broader and more interactive and a much nicer webpage to deal with. I am happy to say that the goal for the Mapita survey was approximately 300 responses. The document here, which Ryan of MIG put together for us on Friday, talks about 330 responses. We have 390 responses as of this afternoon. Over the last few weeks, the number has quickly gone up as we've advertised and promoted that option. People are taking advantage of it. I believe in some of those questions where you supply a few answers, one of the questions has 1,500 responses. It is generating a lot of good information. The consultant really wants to get a good feel of where the community is and what is important to the community by doing this initial outreach, which will then help to construct the community meetings and give them a guideline of what to discuss in those meetings. Our turnout for that has been very good as well as the intercept groups, where we've collected data from over 200 individuals. Those things are moving along and working quite well. The community meetings are the next thing in this line. Again, I will have next month dates for you for those things as well as some of the analysis material for you to review. I will be giving that to Rob to send to you before the meeting, so you'll have time to digest that and we can have a further discussion about that next time. I'm hoping to have a little bit to show you next time, the geographic analysis. I think we talked in the past about having some type of indicator of how many parks you need for a population, how far people should be away from a park. MIG has this robust GIS software that allows them to start looking at the way that people access parks and putting these more detailed plans together that go above and beyond those static figures. They supply a lot of information. There is a little graphic in the package I gave you. Even though it is black and white, you can see where they are, and I'm just going to point out here on it, there are darker areas in the close

proximity of people to parks and their access. The lighter area is 1/2 mile out from those areas. You can see in there that there's pockets of no color, like right in the middle. That's starting to inform us that this section of town does not have more direct access to parkland. These are areas that we would in the future focus on to provide better access to the parks we have or look in these spaces to provide parks. It's a good, clean, easy way to start reviewing the distribution of parks in Palo Alto as well as how people access and use them. We'll be looking at hopefully something from them either next time or the meeting after that of these robust graphics. That's the geographic analysis of the community itself and the relations to park and recreation. That is what is happening now. If Deirdre or Stacey want to say a few things about the intercept groups. I attended two of them. They attended more than I did. Especially at the farmer's market, I thought it was very successful.

Commissioner Ashlund: I also attended two, one at Rinconada Park and one at the California Avenue farmer's market. In general the take-away was it was great to go out into the community. It was really great. Because a lot of the people didn't know the ins and the outs of the City process and hadn't been to a meeting, they were happy to talk about and share their thoughts and opinions. We had residents, people that work here, people that came just to the farmer's market but don't live or work in Palo Alto. My impression of the two I attended, I felt I had a balance of people coming up and saying, "I absolutely love x, y and z," and other people saying, "How can you do x, y and z." I had kind of a love/hate response from some of the people. When it came to putting their dots on the board to indicate which things they valued like recreation or health and exercise or building community, that all seemed really, really positive. We only wrote a few additional comments on the boards of things that weren't represented on the boards to begin with. I did find that the adults that we spoke to had difficulty locating where they live on the map, because the parks were so visible and they think more in terms of street intersections. We really didn't talk to very many parents of young kids who use the parks more. A lot of times they would say, "Oh, we used to use this park, but our kids are grown." But they did talk about the things that they did use, such as the bike trails, recreation on Stanford. They were all very happy to be on California Avenue farmer's market. I think that proximity to the parks, and the view that people appreciate and the fresh air that they appreciate, was something that they expressed even though it wasn't tied to anything specific that we were doing right or doing wrong. I just generally found happy people and a few complaints thrown in there as well. I don't know if Deirdre ...

Commissioner Crommie: I'll just add on. I attended three of them, California Avenue, Cogswell and Rinconada. It was a really positive experience. I'll just echo what Commissioner Ashlund said. People were really happy to interact with us. They told us that they liked the display of the boards, that it was easy to interact with. I think it was inviting and a useful tool. It was a really positive experience. I was always looking toward the demographic groups we were getting, just hoping we were getting a

APPROVED

reasonable distribution of people. I would say at the farmer's market we really achieved that, many different race representations, age, gender, people living in Palo Alto, out of Palo Alto. Cogswell Plaza, we got more of the working population which was really great. I think it was a successful activity. I just feel like it's going to be really interesting to see the data that comes out of it. There are definitely things emerging at each of the sessions. It wasn't just flat. It was a series of questions where people could put dots, colored dots on things that they liked. It was exciting to see some things popping out. I also enjoyed the new ideas. There was a section where people could write in things that weren't represented on the boards. There are definitely things that I had never thought of. I really enjoyed that part of it. Thank you for helping us do these intercepts. It was a great experience.

Mr. Jensen: I will add that the consultant is also preparing the analysis of the intercept groups that I will have for the next meeting as well to share with everyone. Interesting too is the map board, when people put their dot on where they lived and where they worked, it was a good distribution through the entire City. It didn't focus on one general area. I think we got a lot of good feedback from the community as a whole, which I was happy to see.

Chair Hetterly: Any comments from other Commissioners or questions? I have a couple of questions. I am interested in hearing or seeing a summary of how the stakeholder group meetings went. There were two of those. There was one?

Mr. Jensen: Just one.

Chair Hetterly: That happened a while back. I would love to see a summary of how that went and what we heard and from whom. Also we have a survey ad hoc as well. I don't know if any work has begun on that yet. I'm a little anxious that we're not going to weigh in on the content of the surveys until they're already out.

Mr. Jensen: I will be contacting the survey ad hoc, Commissioners Ashlund and Crommie, to set up a meeting to start reviewing. The consultant has prepared the initial survey questions and we can start looking at that. We'll meet with the stakeholder group first and then we'll discuss that either at the next or following meeting with the whole Commission. That is something we will be preparing.

Chair Hetterly: OK, great.

Mr. de Geus: When does the survey go out?

Mr. Jensen: The survey we're looking at now going out in November.

Chair Hetterly: So there's just two months to sort out all the details. OK. Anything else?
Thank you very much, Peter.

7. Parks and Recreation Commission Website Update.

Chair Hetterly: I think we mentioned the last time we updated that when we looked at the agendas and minutes and such on the old site, we found a lot of errors, omissions and inconsistencies. We spent the summer reviewing those and correcting them. I think we're finally in pretty good shape as far as the minutes and the agendas, so that attachments link to the document they say they're linking to and the date is right for the date of meeting. It's consistent. The approved minutes are listed separately from the agenda. That's in great shape. We still have two gateways to the website. You can go through the main City page and click on government. That gets you to the standard, boilerplate boards and commissions page. That is not updated. That's still the old version. If you go in through the Community Services Department webpage and then scroll down to the bottom to boards and commissions, then you can click on Parks and Rec Commission and you come up with this page, which is the one we're working on. It includes a link to all the corrected agendas and minutes and also has some of the changes we talked about last time. Catherine, I think, is still working with the powers that be to get clearance to have both gateways linked to this page, so that we won't have to use the outdated one. I think we're optimistic.

Catherine Bourquin: I did add another link on the original one, which I'll show you.

Chair Hetterly: When you go to the City's main page and you click on government, you can't get to this page. That's a process thing we're trying to sort out. So this is what's on the government page.

Ms. Bourquin: I did add this right here, and it goes back to this.

Chair Hetterly: So there's a link there that can (crosstalk) so that's great. But we're still working on having this be the thing that comes up when they go to Parks and Rec Commission.

Ms. Bourquin: Correct.

Chair Hetterly: In the meantime at least they can find this. We revised the layout a little bit. We put a little message. We don't have a photo. We think we missed our chance to do a group photo today. Maybe next month we can start a little early and walk over to the park, and take a picture in the park. That'd be great. Catherine set up this. It's a beta site to see how it works. I don't know if all the links are active or not.

Ms. Bourquin: Only a few of them.

Chair Hetterly: Do you want to walk us through?

Mr. de Geus: With regards to the photo, I have an idea. You could all be a team at the Moonlight Run and get a picture there. September 5th.

Chair Hetterly: That would be good if we didn't have to run.

Mr. de Geus: There's also a walk, a 5K walk.

Chair Hetterly: I can walk. Walking is good. Do you want to walk through this, Catherine?

Ms. Bourquin: Basically anything that was in italics, which you can't really notice on here, will be links. Long range, golf course, and those types of topics will be links when someone goes in there and clicks on them. I think we state that to the left, in the middle. For instance, here for current information on parks, then this will take us back to the original Commission page through the Clerk's Office, which has all the information on here. With the pictures that were just taken today and your bios will probably be links to your names, where people would just click on them. I think that's how it's going to be set up through the Clerk's Office. Right?

Chair Hetterly: Yep. We just wanted to throw that out to you. That's where we stand. You had in your packet a printout of this page that Catherine has up there. If you have any comments, suggestions, things where we're on the wrong track and you hate this part of it, that'd be helpful to know now. Commissioner Markevitch.

Commissioner Markevitch: It says "in addition we're exploring a pilot program." Farther down it says, "What to do with the 7.7 acres of soon-to-be dedicated." It should be newly dedicated parkland. On the backside of this page regarding when your email becomes public record, the end of that sentence should be "in your correspondence to the Commission" not "to Council." That's the only two changes I had.

Ms. Bourquin: Thank you. It was a copy and paste.

Chair Hetterly: Any other reactions?

Vice Chair Lauing: I think it's really good progress. If you can get any more visuals as opposed to just text as you go forward, that'd be cool.

APPROVED

Chair Hetterly: Yeah, we're going to do the Commission photo. Then it's going to come down to a matter of space, how much we can add in or what we would have to give up. Maybe we'll put that before you all when we get a little closer to a final.

Commissioner Crommie: I just had a question. Where are we going to put correspondence to our Commission? Could we store that anywhere where we could find it again? When people write to our Commission.

Chair Hetterly: That is on our list.

Commissioner Crommie: It's sometimes really nice to go back to letters from the public. Can we cache them anywhere where we can find them again?

Ms. Bourquin: I think we already have something on the other page, which obviously will be linking back under here.

Commissioner Crommie: I'm also having trouble with these multiple pages. It gets confusing to have multiple pages. Some of them are dead-ends. When a member of the public comes, we don't want them to get to a dead-end page that doesn't list our agenda and minutes. Are we eliminating that kind of dead-end?

Chair Hetterly: That's what we're working on right now.

Commissioner Crommie: Where did you say we store things? Where do we store the letters now?

Ms. Bourquin: For instance, right now we would put things under here. We don't have any of the correspondence right now. When we were doing Field Use Policy comments, that's where we put everybody's comments. We would do something like this. We would put all the correspondence related to the topic that they were writing in about. Does that make sense?

Commissioner Crommie: Kind of. I'd like to make a more general cache of everything, not just for the topic. I mean some things fall neatly into topics, but other letters don't. I lose track of these letters. I don't always store every letter, and sometimes I want to go back as a reference and read them again.

Ms. Bourquin: We'll follow the same type of format just like it says right here, that the Council does.

Chair Hetterly: That tells people how to write to us.

Ms. Bourquin: It also states how it will be distributed. If they miss your meeting, it will be in a packet and so forth.

Chair Hetterly: I think what Commissioner Crommie is looking for is a link on the page where we can go and find old emails or communications from the public, that's not necessarily sorted by a particular topic. Like the topic-related ones, we would have a link on this page that connects to the whole list.

Ms. Bourquin: We can do that.

Commissioner Ashlund: We had talked about two different ways. One would be strictly by date order of correspondence and the other would be topic grouped. We have further work to see if that's possible where you can get all correspondence over time related to a particular issue. That's to be resolved.

Commissioner Crommie: Along those lines also, the other thing I think is really critical for us to find is our past recommendations to City Council. As a Commissioner, I sometimes want to refer back to those. We don't do many recommendations; it's a small list. Can we have a place where those are cached?

Ms. Bourquin: Isn't that what we were going to do with the topics.

Chair Hetterly: We were going to put those with the topics. If you were interested in the golf course, you could go to the golf course link and that would include our recommendations and staff reports and the design.

Commissioner Crommie: If they all fall neatly into those categories. I know we made a recommendation long ago on the bicycle/pedestrian bridge. I've been on the Commission quite a number of years, and we've only made four or five of these types of recommendations. It'd be nice just to have them in a grouping that isn't parsed out. You can parse them under a topic, but I think it would be really nice to have a historical document that has those. It shows some of our good work.

Ms. Bourquin: I agree. It can be done.

Chair Hetterly: Any other input? Reactions? Do you have anything you'd like to add, Stacey? Did we cover everything?

Commissioner Ashlund: I think we're good.

Chair Hetterly: We will carry on with this and hopefully have something more to tell you next month.

8. Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates.
i. PARC Outreach/Communication

Vice Chair Lauing: I yield to Daren to kick it off.

Daren Anderson: Good evening. Daren Anderson, Open Space, Parks and Golf. Tonight I brought you a revised draft of our public outreach policy for Community Services Department projects. When we reviewed this several months back, there was a series of reviews and edits that the Commission offered. They are reflected in blue. The other big edit was going to come once I conversed with the chief officer in outreach, Claudia Keith. She at the time was just taking on a social media team. They're now on board and they're working. I sent this revised document to her to review before I came to the Commission tonight. She didn't have a lot of input. She said it looked good. She liked what we were looking at and thought it was all consistent with what the City's doing and the direction the City's going. With one exception and that's a big push that she's using for a social media site called Next Door. She said there's 10,000 households currently using it. She would be very glad for us to use that in our toolbox. When we have projects, that would be one more element that we could push forward. It sounds like a great opportunity for us to do that additional outreach with her assistance. I just checked it out today, so I don't know it really well. I know that you can send it out per specific neighborhood or the City as a whole if you'd like. I'm available to take your edits, additional feedback and continue to tweak this documents as you see fit. It's one of those living ones that we're already implementing in many ways. Of course we've had projects in the past and we'll continue to have them. As we do so, this is best management practices right now for how we do outreach. We're already implementing; it's already our status quo. As I take feedback from you, we'll continue to alter.

Vice Chair Lauing: I'm sorry. I'm speaking because I'm on the ad hoc. I am the ad hoc actually. In any individual circumstance, we can always trump this and do it every 10 feet instead of every 1,000 feet. We can come up with a specific outreach plan for a specific event or situation. This is just the general plan.

Chair Hetterly: Any comments or questions? I have a comment. The thing that I'm most interested in about this is the email opt-in subscription procedure. I'm frankly quite anxious to get that up and running, especially since we should be getting similar data from the Master Plan process that can feed into that. I would like an update on where we stand, what are the next steps, what's our timeline to be able to have a functional opt-in system where we can send people to sign up to get emails about what's going on.

Mr. Anderson: Great question. It's underway. It's part of the Parks Master Plan. Concurrent with their sign up when they start to do their outreach and say, "Who wants to

APPROVED

1877 know about the Master Plan." I asked Ryan Mottau, who is lead on the project, to please
1878 add something in. A statement that said, "If you want to know about ongoing parks
1879 projects, then please put your name and email address down for an opt-in service where
1880 we're going to give you briefings on everything, open space, parks and golf and the
1881 department on the whole." He's gathering that data now. We're piecing it together from
1882 other public meetings. For example, we had one on Byxbee for the interim plan recently.
1883 It was another opportunity where I could take the participants who signed in and
1884 confirmed, "Would you like to be on this opt-in email list?" I heard from nearly
1885 everyone there and they said, "Yes." I'm thinking that's the way it's going to go. It's
1886 going to be one of those living, ever-expanding ones. I think we'll get an outreach effect
1887 where these are key stakeholders who are attending a lot of these and they have a network
1888 of participants who are involved sometimes secondarily or tangentially to some of this
1889 stuff. What I anticipate, much like our neighborhood association, leads will branch out
1890 and send these out to fill in the core of this initial email distribution list.

1891
1892 Chair Hetterly: The second part of that is once we have a list, how do we decide what we
1893 send to that list?

1894
1895 Mr. Anderson: I'm going to start with every CIP project. That would be the beginning.
1896 That was the intent, the hope. Much like this, it's centered around large events and
1897 projects primarily. If there was a big policy decision, those are also additional ideas that
1898 could be used for that email list. I want to be cautious and start slow rather than
1899 bombard. I know from my own experience when I get bombarded, eventually I get
1900 weary and I unsubscribe. I really need this to be a functional one that pulls in
1901 stakeholders so they come and know and we can avoid those situations where people
1902 come after the fact.

1903
1904 Chair Hetterly: I think that would be nice to include in the next revision of this, the
1905 process for how you're going to collect the list and what you're going to do with it.

1906
1907 Vice Chair Lauing: We talked a little bit even in that meeting with Claudia about, not
1908 these words, but essentially editorial content and what was going to be in there and who
1909 was going to be in charge of releasing it. We very quickly got this isn't going to be a
1910 daily newspaper or a weekly thing that's got to fill up three pages. This has to be not
1911 annually, but maybe not even to begin with on a regular schedule. Just to see what the
1912 reaction is for some of the reasons that Daren is suggesting. If it rarely goes out, then
1913 we've not accomplished anything. It's a work in progress and we need to try some things.
1914 We might want to have another meeting on that same subject again, timing, how often,
1915 what's in there, do you need help.

1916
1917 Commissioner Crommie: I'm wondering if we can get some kind of focus group where
1918 you get some people where you start sending this out and you get feedback on it, what

people are finding useful. Can you get a mixture of us and some residents that participate a lot in your subcommittees and maybe get some user feedback on what you're doing?

Mr. Anderson: I can tell you from some existing ones. We do have an email distribution for Friends of Palo Alto Baylands. That's been in place for many years. The feedback is always, "Let us know everything. Let us know everything that you're doing from painting curbs to Master Plan processes." They want to know it all. That's the only feedback I've gotten. I've never heard from any of those participants. That's not a huge list, but I've never heard from anyone that "I don't want to hear that." It's always "Let me know."

Commissioner Crommie: Great.

Chair Hetterly: Any other comments or discussion? Commissioner Ashlund.

Commissioner Ashlund: Mr. Anderson, thank you very much for the edits from last time. It's really well done. One question, under the community meetings, second paragraph after purpose and intent, this is a question about policy. It's phrased as "large or significant community interest projects should have at least one public meeting." I was wondering if the "should" was strong enough. Similarly, two lines down from that, "recommend that a public meeting be held as early as possible." I would suggest, if you agree, to omit the "as possible" and just say "early in the process." Otherwise, it just sounds a little vague.

Mr. Anderson: I can make those two edits. "Should" becomes "will."

Commissioner Ashlund: Great. Thanks. On the reverse side the use of the Next Door system, we get those emails in the Barron Park Neighborhood Association list. We get a digest of what came out on Next Door. I'm wondering why it's listed under social media as opposed to a form of email. That's all I've seen of it. If there is a social media aspect, I haven't seen anything other than the emails.

Mr. Anderson: It was only because Claudia Keith mentioned it was something her social media team had worked on. I thought there was a social media component. You're saying it belongs under email.

Chair Hetterly: I don't think so. I think it does have a social media component in addition to the email function.

Commissioner Ashlund: There might be more. I'll check it out. That's it. Thanks.

Chair Hetterly: Anything else? OK.

ii. Improving Opportunities for Off-Leash Dog Exercise

Chair Hetterly: As Ed predicted, summer schedule chaos set us behind quite a bit. We have had some informative conversations with the Palo Alto dog owners' group and the Menlo Park dog owners' group and some other jurisdictions that have shared-use sites that have been helpful. We have a little more research to do around costs and implementation challenges. Hopefully we can come to you all next month for a discussion about our findings and our proposed next steps. I'll leave it at that. I wanted to let everybody know and send a thank you to Howard Hoffman, the leader of the Palo Alto dog owners' group who's really been working hard to get his constituents to weigh in through the Master Plan process and be explicit about their needs and wants. Hopefully that will be productive. Just to give you all a heads up, as expected there are very few options Citywide that are readily suitable for shared-use. It's unlikely that we'll get a good geographic distribution or that piloting simultaneous sites would get us what we want. We're trying to struggle through that and figure out what we can propose for the Commission to consider. That'll come back next month. That's it for dog parks, unless Abbie or Daren has anything to add. No, OK.

iii. Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates

Chair Hetterly: Any other ad hoc and committee liaison updates? I have just one more. Byxbee Park, the Community Services and Public Works staff and consultants have a stakeholders meeting. They proposed a layout for the trails and habitat on the newly capped Byxbee area. I think they've decided to go with a pilot process to see how it looks and fits together rather than the formal site and design process. You can correct me if I get any of this wrong. They're proposing an interconnected network of trails and habitat islands across the surface with a particular focus on attracting breeding pairs of burrowing owls. The stakeholders that were present were mostly environmental groups. They generally liked the plan. They asked for revisions to the trail network to reduce impacts on wildlife and to add some dead-end viewing locations for birders and such. The consultants are now integrating all that input. We're going to see a plan before the Commission sometime soon. Is that right?

Mr. Anderson: Yes, that's all correct. The only addition to that is during that stakeholder meeting, one of the components of the plan was expanded parking. The stakeholders and staff have recognized for many years that the parking at Byxbee is limited. It's got 20 stalls, but we've added almost 100 acres. That's a significant expansion of open space for an already under-parked area of the preserve. It's a 2,000-acre preserve. There's a little challenge as how we're going to do that as part of an interim plan. We found a little area we thought we could grade out and add 20 stalls. Now we're working with planning to see if that fits in with the interim plan timeframe. We're not quite sure yet. That might end up being a concept that has to go through a full site and design and could take a year

or longer. That's the kind of thing you want to save for the Master Plan. We need to implement this now. We can't wait and leave that significant piece of land on hold while we sit in planning meetings. That one's still up in the air. We're working closely with planning staff to try to figure that out.

Chair Hetterly: Thank you. Yes, Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: We talked last year about possibly having some type of path that went from Byxbee over to the golf course, so people could park at the golf course and walk there. We didn't have the money for that?

Mr. Anderson: It's not part of this scope. The additional environmental work for that kind of thing is pushing the boundaries. You could spend an inordinate amount of time analyzing just the top of Byxbee. That's where the bulk of the focus for this interim plan is.

Commissioner Reckdahl: When you're limited in parking like that, could you make a bulk of those handicapped? How much demand is there for handicapped parking there?

Mr. Anderson: That's a good question. I think there's only one stall of the 20 in the existing parking lot.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I could see some birders who can walk but they can't walk long distances really would want to park close by. Whereas, the able-bodied people can walk an extra half mile. It's not a big deal.

Mr. Anderson: The advantage of the Baylands is there's excellent birding and views and vistas and wildlife experiences in any direction and almost from every parking lot. By virtue of parking by Byxbee doesn't get you any closer to the wetlands or different species of birds than it would if you were parked over by Embarcadero in the T section of the Baylands.

Commissioner Reckdahl: You mentioned that Byxbee was just capped. Was that recently?

Chair Hetterly: In the last couple of years.

Mr. Anderson: To further elaborate on that, there's several phases of Byxbee Park. They were capped at different times. We're just finishing the capping of 2C, the last section. That's currently underway.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What is capping actually? Is it putting clay on the top?

Mr. Anderson: There's different kinds. The oldest capping was 2 feet of clay, 2 feet of soil and that's on Phase 1 of Byxbee which is about 23 acres. It's the part with the art on it. It's been there since the early '90s. The latest iteration, Phase 2C, will have a different style capping that lends itself to a different kind of habitat. The clay cap precludes a lot of types of vegetation and trees to prevent opening of the clay cap. This new style has a much thicker layer of soil that accomplishes the same thing as the clay cap except it's 5-6 feet of engineered soil.

Commissioner Reckdahl: We still won't have trees on there?

Mr. Anderson: It's possible we may have some small ones in certain sections. In addition to that different layer of barrier, we've also mounded some areas. That will allow for trees. The real challenge is irrigating them. The closest irrigation is by the Byxbee restrooms, so getting that water up the hill and down a quarter mile is challenging.. We're looking at different options in this interim plan that we'll bring to you soon.

Vice Chair Lauing: Can I ask a question about one of the ad hocs, the 7.7 acres? What's the next step?

Commissioner Markevitch: I think we were waiting for it to be dedicated. So now that it was, we can sit down with Daren and go over some of the things.

Mr. Anderson: I think the next step is the ad hoc will get together and start looking at time to either connect with MIG and see how this folds into the Master Plan and maybe concurrently a public meeting that we had discussed as a logical next step.

Commissioner Markevitch: I didn't get your last handout.

Mr. Anderson: I have one here. I'll bring it up.

Rob de Geus: I'm glad you brought that up.

Vice Chair Lauing: That's a high visibility issue with Council.

Mr. de Geus: It really is. Daren, you'll have to correct me if I'm wrong about this. I think their hoping to hear something from the Commission by end of this calendar year, which is not a lot of time. It's not an easy topic. It's going to take some real thought for not only the ad hoc but the full Commission. Not to mention of course the public input. I'm keen to see that speed up.

APPROVED

Commissioner Reckdahl: Is the plan that we would have public input as part of this meeting or we'd have a special meeting for this?

Chair Hetterly: I think the ad hoc is supposed to be coming up with a plan for how we're going to do that. We hope to be part of a public meeting. I'm not sure what else is on the table.

Mr. Anderson: Those are the two keys things. We want to expedite the process. We want to involve the public. It just makes good sense to tie it into the Master Plan. To exclude this significant piece of land from a process that's underway just doesn't make sense to me. Maybe there's a way to do it expeditiously. That's the conversation the ad hoc committee, myself, Peter Jensen, and perhaps Ryan from MIG can work out together.

Chair Hetterly: I would suggest that we can't wait for the Master Plan before getting back to Council with some recommendation. A possible tie-in that would be useful is to make sure that they're building in survey questions that get at this specific issue. We will have that data hopefully in the near term. I think the surveys go out in October.

Commissioner Crommie: Maybe not until November. I agree that we need those kinds of questions.

Chair Hetterly: Figure out how they can solicit and we can collect feedback in the short term through the Master Plan process that then can feed into our deliberations here.

Commissioner Ashlund: Who else is on that ad hoc?

Commissioner Markevitch: It's us two.

Chair Hetterly: Anything else on ad hocs?

V. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Commissioner Crommie: I just wanted to announce that the low-cost spay and neuter clinic is back open for animals in town, which I think is really important on issues of feral cats. I'm glad to see that's back up and running again.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I went over to look at Bowden Park for this proposal we talked about earlier. That big green area right along Alma is really not used, that grass area. We're still irrigating that. Could we let that go brown? If you have a grassy area that you don't irrigate and it gets heavy use, then the grass gets damaged. On a low-use area lawn, could you let it go brown?

APPROVED

Daren Anderson: That's a great question. Right now the City's just assembled a drought response team. My irrigation supervisor and I are on that team along with Utilities and Public Works staff. As we looked at our next level response, we've already implemented several initiatives such as turning off water features in our parks. A lot of the water features are off. We've discontinued practices like water grooming, which is the best management practice for cleaning tennis courts. You take a hose and it ties to a special piece of equipment and it spray cleans it. It gets all those pores on the tennis courts clean that otherwise would clog it with dirt and gradually deteriorate. We've abandoned that technique and gone with blowers. Those kinds of things are underway right now. We've also implemented something similar to what you're talking about. We take aesthetic turf, not used for play, warm-up or practice, sod cut it and put down mulch and leave it be. If it lends itself to it, native plantings with drip irrigation. Both great alternatives to irrigating turf. Your question is what about these larger turf areas, can you let it go completely brown? Usually not. The aesthetics of that will draw so many complaints that it's better to cut it out and lay down mulch. Also, you let it go brown and eventually it fills in with weeds. At places like Foothills Park, we've let little segments go, the ground starts to crack and yellow jackets move into those cracks. That is on our tiered response of what we're going to do next.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Do we have an estimate of how much water we're using this year compared to last year?

Mr. Anderson: No, I don't. At the golf course, where we are down to the gallon on how much we're using and really monitor. I was talking to our superintendant who has gone to extraordinary lengths especially in light of the fact that we're closing the golf course, is looking at every possible head. What are the metrics, can we determine how much we saved relative to last year. It's not a good comparison because of the dynamics of the weather, especially a place like the golf course. The metric that we came up with is how many irrigation heads did you have in play to keep the turf green. That's what we started cutting back. I think we reduced 260 different heads. Some of them were full circle heads. Those outer rough areas, we've change the heads from 360 to 180 and let the rough areas go. We've been doing that and we are looking at additional areas. The parks are the next tier, because it will have an impact on the aesthetics. We are highlighting the parks that lend themselves to covering with mulch. When you let it go, taking it back is bigger than just turning a switch. Almost all those valves not in use will jam up, so significant repairs to get the system running again. In addition, you would have to roto-till a brown area, reseed or sod. It's a long and involved process to bring it back.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I grew up in the Midwest where most of the parks were not irrigated. If you went a few weeks without rain, it just browned up. As soon as it rained, it greened back up again. Was it just because there you're talking a month or two as opposed to letting it go dry for six months?

Mr. Anderson: Perhaps. We've been discussing this at length for many years. This isn't new for us. Some areas you can let go and it will regrow with just weeds typically. You can mow the weeds and have a green-looking carpet, but it won't hold up well to play and things like that.

Chair Hetterly: Do you have some things?

Mr. de Geus: Just a couple that I have to bring up, things happening in September. I've mentioned the Moonlight Run. If you haven't been there, you do need to attend that. There's a Brown Act training coming up on September 18. I wonder if we forwarded that out to everybody. Has everybody seen that? It's a one-hour training from 6:00 to 7:00. We can send that out again.

(inaudible)

Mr. de Geus: September 18th.

Commissioner Knopper: Is that mandatory? Every year you have to do it?

Mr. de Geus: It is mandatory. Is it every year or every two years?

Commissioner Knopper: Every two years I thought.

Mr. de Geus: I think it's every two.

Chair Hetterly: (crosstalk)

Commissioner Knopper: (crosstalk) so I don't have to do it.

Mr. de Geus: We will be going back to Council to give them an update on the golf course and how to proceed, because we still don't have our permits at this point. It's getting to the point where we've lost so much good weather for construction that it's going to be really challenging to proceed. That's going to be a significant staff report and discussion with Council that I'll make sure you get the staff report and an update. That's going to be September 8th if you're interested.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Mitchell Park Library, end of September?

Mr. de Geus: End of September, I wish it was then. Staff will likely start moving in by the end of September. The grand opening for the Mitchell Park Library and Community Center will be December 6th, which is a Saturday. It'll be a big celebration all the month

of December. So that's the grand opening, December 6th. Between now and the end of the September, we'll move in all the library staff and all the books.

VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR SEPTEMBER 23, 2014 MEETING

Chair Hetterly: Hopefully we'll have a report back from the 7.7 acres ad hoc on where we are, where we're going, and how fast we can get there. King Plaza, is that coming back to us?

Rob de Geus: Possibly. It's either next month or the following. If it's ready, we'll bring it.

Chair Hetterly: Master Plan update, should we have that as a standing item?

Mr. de Geus: I think so.

Chair Hetterly: Dog parks, we should have a dog park item. Anything else?

Commissioner Knopper: Gardens.

Commissioner Crommie: Gardens should come back.

Vice Chair Lauing: If possible, we should probably try to look at those elements, the two elements before next month.

Chair Hetterly: Yeah. Maybe a report back from the ad hocs on the elements as they currently stand, the Comp Plan elements.

Commissioner Crommie: Oh, yeah. I think that's very good.

Chair Hetterly: I think that's enough.

Commissioner Crommie: I was wondering if at some point we can bring in the sustainability czar to speak to us.

Chair Hetterly: Can you look into that, Rob?

Mr. de Geus: I certainly can. I also thought about bringing in Lacie one of the rec staff to talk about the summer that just passed and all the activities. I thought it might be interesting. Just a short, 10-minute presentation.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned on motion by Commissioner Reckdahl and second by Commissioner Crommie at 9:58 p.m.