



APPROVED

**MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
December 8, 2015
CITY HALL
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California**

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

Commissioners Absent:

Others Present: Eric Filseth

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

I. ROLL CALL CONDUCTED BY: Catherine Bourquin

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS:

Chair Reckdahl: Does anyone have any changes?

Daren Anderson: I just had one comment on the agenda. It had been my intent to bring a discussion item under Capital Improvement Projects, and I missed the window. I apologize. While I'll have a brief presentation this evening, the discussion will have to wait until the January meeting. I'll return at that time, and we can ask our questions and have a thoughtful discussion on the topic.

Chair Reckdahl: There's no way to make it a discussion item at this point?

Rob de Geus: I think we can discuss it but just more limited. It is an ad hoc committee, and it's an ad hoc committee update. We would have preferred to have it listed specifically on the agenda. The ad hoc committee has met, and we've had some discussion. Unfortunately, it wasn't posted that way. We just want to be sensitive to that. Some limited discussion, a broader discussion in January which is fine with the timeline, we believe.



Chair Reckdahl: I don't think there's going to be any deep conversations about it. If people have questions, we want them to be able to ask questions.

III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Chair Reckdahl: I have no speaker cards, so we'll move on.

IV. BUSINESS:

1. Welcome New Commissioners.

Chair Reckdahl: The first piece of business is Welcome New Commissioners. Did you want to say something?

Rob de Geus: I'll say something. I'll introduce myself first of all. I'm Rob de Geus; I'm the director of Community Services. We have three commissions within Community Services. The Parks and Rec Commission is one of them. We have the Public Art Commission, and we have the Human Relations Commission. I have a favorite; no, I don't really. I've been with the Parks and Rec Commission for a long time and appreciate what the Commission does and how they support staff in design of parks and policies around parks and recreation. It's extremely helpful to the staff. Welcome aboard and congratulations. I'll also have these guys introduce themselves, because you'll see them a lot. They're at almost every meeting. This is Peter Jensen right here.

Peter Jensen: Peter Jensen, Landscape Architect for the City of Palo Alto. I actually work in a different department than Daren and Rob do; I'm in Public Works, mostly focusing on Capital Improvement Projects of renovation of parkland and City landscape space. You will see me a lot. Along with them, I don't really consider myself the lead of the project because the project is so big, for the Parks Master Plan. That is probably the most important project that the PRC is working on this year as far as its vast size and what it has entailed in it. Nice to have you on the Commission.

Daren Anderson: Good evening. Daren Anderson, I'm with Open Space, Parks and Golf which is with Community Services. I'm fortunate to work closely with the Commission on a lot of projects for many years, and looking forward to doing so with our new Commissioners and this whole Commission going forward.

Catherine Bourquin: I'm Catherin Bourquin. If you need any assistance, please call me. I'm sure you all have my email address and phone number. I've spoken to a few of you. Nice to meet you guys.

APPROVED

Mr. de Geus: Catherine helps us stay organized. She did prepare some binders for the three new Commissioners. It includes some information about protocols and roles of the Commission, the Brown Act around that, how agendas get set up, those types of things. There's a variety of things in there for you. It's a big binder, so you can add things to it. It's going to take a little bit of time to get up to speed on some of the projects, particularly the Parks Master Plan which is not just a Parks Master Plan but it's Parks, Natural Open Space, Trails and Recreation Facilities Master Plan. It hasn't been done in decades; it's a very, very big endeavor. Staff and the Commission has been working on this for well over a year. There's a lot of information to go over. I invite the three new Commissioners to come and meet with myself and some of the staff maybe before the holidays if that works, if not soon after, so we can just talk for some time about some of the big projects that we've been working on, particularly the Parks Master Plan, and help you get caught up. We can also do a tour of facilities or other things if you're interested in doing that.

Chair Reckdahl: When Abbie and I started, you brought us around and showed us the facilities. That was very nice. It helped me get an idea of what we're worried about. There will be a lot of stuff; just ask questions. We can answer them now or answer them later. We will be having a retreat in February usually. There we'll go through all the items, and that will give you a nice overview. Between now and then, you'll be frantically swimming to keep up. February, you'll have a much better idea of what's going on.

Mr. de Geus: Chair Reckdahl, it might be nice to hear from the three new Commissioners and how they did in their interview and why they chose to join the Commission.

Chair Reckdahl: Commissioner Moss, do you want to start?

Commissioner Moss: Sure. I've been a volunteer on a number of different activities, Boy Scouts and AYSO and other activities, Gunn High School Sports Boosters and Gunn Foundation Scholarship. I've always had a little bit of that in my activities, but I have been here for 40 years doing program or business analyst. Also, our family has always enjoyed the open spaces. We go practically every week to one of those three open spaces. We really have a vested interest.

Chair Reckdahl: Commissioner Cribbs.

Commissioner Cribbs: I'm Anne Cribbs, and I am a longtime resident of Palo Alto. My children all went to Palo Alto schools. I worked for the Recreation Department in the mid-'80s and went on to work in Palo Alto. I head up the Bay Area Sports Organizing Committee which seeks to bring national and international sporting events to the San

APPROVED

Francisco Bay Area. Since we're not having the Olympic Games here anytime soon now, I am looking forward to working on the Park and Recreation Commission. I absolutely love sports and believe in the value of sports for children and for adults and for senior citizens, and love Palo Alto as well and think we live in an absolutely great, wonderful place. I'm absolutely so happy to be here, especially when we're starting, at least I feel like we're starting, on this Park Plan. Thank you.

Chair Reckdahl: Commissioner Cowie.

Commissioner Cowie: My name is Jim Cowie. I've lived in Palo Alto for 15 years. For most of those years, I served as a basketball coach for my three daughters who are now too old to have dad coaching them anymore. I feel like I have a lot of free time that I can contribute to the community in other ways. I took on a role with the School District on the Oversight Committee for the bonds a couple of years back and felt like I could do more. Like the other new Commissioners, I'm passionate about open space and recreation opportunities, sports for kids. I am a consistent user of the facilities that we have here in Palo Alto and am excited about the opportunity to help the City do everything it can to preserve what we've got and make what we've got even better.

Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. Speaking of binders, are they going to get copies of the Parks Master Plan binders?

Mr. Jensen: Yes. We'll be working on that, and we'll have that for them at the next meeting or perhaps sooner. Yes, they will.

Chair Reckdahl: Are there any updates for us? We haven't had any updates. My binder's been sitting on the shelf for the last few meetings.

Mr. Jensen: Yes, there are updates to the binder now. I've started to collect those together, and we will add those to the binders next time. There's some updated plans that need to go in there as well as some of the sections that we have material for now that you didn't have before.

Chair Reckdahl: Thank you.

2. Approval of Draft Minutes from the October 27, 2015, Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting.

Approval of the draft October 27, 2015 Minutes was moved by Commissioner Hetterly and seconded by Commissioner Lauing. Passed 4-0, Cowie, Cribbs, Moss abstaining

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

Chair Reckdahl: Peter Jensen, take it away.

Peter Jensen: Good evening, Commissioners. Peter Jensen, Landscape Architect for the City of Palo Alto, here to continue our ongoing discussion of the Parks Master Plan. Tonight we'll be discussing three specific areas, two at length, and then we'll review a plan at the end that was updated. We'll be talking about firstly the evaluation process and the ranking and the scoring of those things as far as our list goes of potential project and program ideas. Then we'll be looking and introducing the list of project and program ideas, which I'll go through in the second phase of this presentation and bring it up on your monitors. We'll talk about how it can be filtered and reviewed in different ways. The final thing, as I alluded to before, we'll be talking about a change to one of the plans in our geographic study. We've added some information to that, most importantly in the brown. If you want to look at it now, sitting in front of you is the City land that's owned which includes parking lots and other things that weren't on the plan before. We'll get into more detail of that as it goes along. First though, I do want to start out with the evaluation process and the criteria and how it's ranked and scored. We're going to go through this process. I have some examples to talk about. Then we'll talk about and have a little discussion about this first thing after that. Then we'll move into the list and have a discussion about that. Without further ado. Just to talk about the purpose of the plan, to bring everyone up to speed and briefly give a description, since we do have some new Commissioners here tonight. The Parks Master Plan, which also includes programming and facilities, has put together the idea to guide decision-making for future development of the parks, trails, open space and recreation system. We have a great park and recreation system now. We want to make sure we have that in the future and, where we can, enhance that, enhancing it in a way based on data collected in the first phase of this project, so we make good decisions and choices when we do decide to use capital funds to enhance or renovate our park and recreation system. This next slide represents the process that we've been moving along to get to the final Parks Master Plan. We are at the criteria and prioritization phase, which you see is getting down closer to the end. Of course, the majority of the first phase of the project was doing site analysis and data collection of our current system as well as a lot of community feedback and input, that went along into this. Just recently over the last few months, we've been working on the framework to develop this list of projects and the way it can be prioritized. The first step of that was creating a list of master principles, which you see here. These principles provide a vision of what Palo Alto would like to see in its park and recreation facilities, programs and its parks. They are drawn from data and analysis and community output from the first phase of the project. I did bring, for everyone who knows what it is and for those of you who don't, the matrix of the opportunity summary that was put together and that basically starts to break down all the data into a matrix that you can start to

APPROVED

understand it a little better. You'll understand what I'm saying by this. If you don't have a project binder, it is very thick and packed with a lot of information. This data matrix was used to compile information as well as to relate back to where that information was from when conclusions are being drawn. From that came the initial principles which was worked on by the Parks and Recreation Commission for a few months to get them where they are now. From our initial Study Session with the Council, actually our second one, one has been added. I don't think we discussed this in the last meeting. Is the word "nature" there? That was felt by the Council as well as members of the community that it should stand alone as its own principle. Another thing developed over the last few months was prioritization criteria. This criteria is what we're going to get in more depth tonight, because this is the meat of how we're going to prioritize our list of projects. In the package, if you've had a chance to look through it, you'll see that most of the pages are this very extensive list of potential project and program ideas. We're at the stage now of how do we rank or score and get a prioritized list of what we want to do here. It's going to be done using these criteria. Again, these criteria were developed with the Commission over the last few months and represent key areas of focus that we want to consider while evaluating the potential projects. That brings us then to recommendations, and that's kind of where we are tonight. We are introducing the list of these recommendations. The final steps in developing the Master Plan involve refining, prioritizing and documenting the recommendations generated throughout the process. A list of potential project and program ideas have been developed for review. This review will go on for the next meeting at least, because the list is so extensive. That is kind of the second part of our topic tonight, the list itself. We want to introduce it tonight, talk about it a little bit, and then give you the time between now and next meeting to have the list and review it. At the next meeting, we'll talk about it more in-depth. This is something else that we've been working on, refining over the last few months, the potential project and program ideas and the steps of prioritization and how they're going to be ranked and scored. This is more a flow diagram of how that will be. We are mostly going to be talking about this center circle here and the filtering of the list and then the prioritization of that. How do we do this? We have our list, and we have all these projects that we want to put together. I'm going to go through a few examples tonight. Each example represents a different, I guess, area of specificity. This one being one that is about a park and renovation to a park. The second example deals with an issue that we've dealt with a lot; that's having a dog park and where that should go and how that is ranked. The third one is an actual one about programs. We'll look at a facility upgrade with a park improvement and then a program improvement. This first one is a connection to Adobe Creek from Mitchell Park. That example comes from the list of projects that we have. What happens here in this sequence of how we got to this point and are going to get through to the criteria to judge this is, first of all, our consultant MIG has put together our list of recommended projects from the opportunities and community feedback. That's where this example comes from. They've composed and compiled a list of that. Staff has taken a look at it over the last month and been reviewing that with them

APPROVED

to get you to the list that we have today. This represents one of those projects from the list. How it got to the list is in the steps, looking at again the matrix and the community feedback that we have received, then applying the principles to the project. The principles give us an understanding of the overall areas of scope or vision that we would like to see involved in all the projects. We would like for each project to fulfill as many of the principles as possible. This initial review goes through, and you can see there's checkmarks next to the ones that were felt were covered by this project. The principles come back later in the project at the end when we actually have a real specific project. We look at this list again and then start to talk about what are the principles that are missing and how can those things be incorporated into the scope of the project to make the project better and more enhanced. That's also based on feasibility. Not all those things, of course, can be done just probably due to budget and costs. They do play a role at the beginning and also, I think, a more important role at the end. The other that's done for each of these projects is it draws again from our matrix. The project team or City Staff will assess the idea based on available data. The opportunity summary describes what the planning team knows about the site. The process uses the same measures the PRC and project team used to develop the opportunity matrix. A sample of the project information is shown in the next slide. For each one of these potential projects, they looked at the areas of the matrix that we have, and it recognizes what's in that matrix for each specific project. It goes through our upper heading which is in the dark green section of this layout. Then it describes in each one how they fulfill that or how they're associated with that specific column. This first sample I'm using because it gets to this point. In Step 3a is where you look at the principle and you look at the data driven from the matrix. At that point, a decision is made if there's enough information to have a real project. In this specific project, where it's calling out to re-establish the natural bank of the stream or a natural area next to the creek itself, that needs a feasibility study. The project that will be first recommended will be to do a feasibility study to see how that can be done. That won't happen to the majority of the projects, but a few of the projects will, so I do want to bring that up as being a step that is considered in the process of this. For our purposes here, the example, we go on to just rank the project. This is where really the conversation tonight is about this. Using the criteria, we've set up a sample scoring card that each project will go through. Each project will be scored in the whole list. Currently our list is 386 projects. It's 143 ideas, but some of those ideas can be applied to different parks, different facilities which gives you the 386 total. All 386 projects will go through this criteria ranking. It's an evaluation set up with numbers in our case. In your packet I put one through five as it being scored. Further discussion after that felt that the zero should be applied to, because some of the projects may not hit one of our criteria. Allowing that to be marked as a zero is something that should have been considered in there. Further discuss too is the point system. That's what we can have further tonight, is a zero through five point system adequate enough to evaluate the projects. There was also some conversation that I had with MIG, the consultant, about using fraction of points too, a half point, a quarter point, to give a varying degree of points. It could eliminate

APPROVED

some of the logjam if you had a bunch that were scored the same. How would we then decipher between those? We can get a more accurate description of that. We'll talk about that a little bit more as we go along. This is the score card that will be used. The consultant is going to go through the list initially and score it. Staff is then going to work with them to review that list. The list will be brought back in the next few months as a ranked, prioritized list that we'll have further discussion about. That's the idea that's recommended right now. Again, we can have discussion on that too and how that is set up. That's basically what we're shooting to do. For this project, you can see the total, if you start, add up to the scores of those things. Again, zero being the lowest and five being the highest. This project scores a 19. That is significant when we get to this end of this, because that's how you start to prioritize this list, ranked upon their score. With the maximum amount of five points, the maximum score a project can get is 25 points. That's the process that we'll go through to rank each of these. This slide starts to talk about the principles. What you have then is your project, going back and looking at what principles were not checked off in the initial review and how we can incorporate those principles into the scope of the project to make it a much better project. I would also say too that for our Parks Master Plan, the scoring and evaluation of projects is going to be more significant because we have a full list of all these projects that we want to have. The same criteria, though, and the scoring is being proposed to be used in the future as well. When new projects pop up, this would be the process that those new projects would also go through to be ranked and scored and judged and set against the list that we're going to generate now. This, I guess, process of evaluation is not just for the Master Plan, but it's for continuous set up or structure of evaluating projects in the future that do come up. The second example is having an off-leash dog park in the north section of the City where we are lacking it now. Again, it goes through and reviews the principles set up with that. I think we all agree that developing more dog parks or a better dog park is definitely a project that's high on the list that we do hear a lot about. This is definitely something that's going to be considered. Again, the consideration that runs through our opportunities matrix would consider these for each of those headings and is the background information for why the project was made a project. This one is then scored. You can see that the question of do we have adequate information, which we didn't have in the last project, we needed a feasibility study for the development of the creek side. For this one we do have enough available information, so we move past that stuff and then go into the judging of its criteria. In this case, the criteria totals to be 17 as the score. Again, you'd go back through and look at the principles that were not checked off and try to develop them into the actual scope of a specific project. Example Number 3 is a program. This has to do with the Boost yoga program, expand the Boost drop-in program beyond the indoor facilities in the system to include programs held on lawns in Palo Alto parks. Yoga is a good program to start with this, but this idea could expand to additional programming types. This is a way to move out of our limited facilities space and have programming in the park that is for drop-ins. These are things that have, again, been cited by the community as well as from the analysis of the data we have of our park

APPROVED

and program system. It's run again through the Master Plan principles. You can see here that health, walkability and balanced are the ones checked for this; there are a few that aren't. Again, this is an example of how that information is tied back to the information from our opportunities matrix and where the information and background information came for making it a project. Going through its scoring system, this one gives us a score of 21. This goes through, again, the principles and reassigning them to the project to enhance the scope. We go through this whole list. We just ranked three as our examples. From that, we get a grand total of points. From those points, you can see that the Boost yoga in the park hits more criteria and ranks higher than the other two projects. What that means is that on the compiled list of prioritized projects that we get, it'll be ranked from the highest scoring to the lowest scoring. That will give us a good, solid foundation of considering those projects. Of course, there will be a scrutinizing by staff as well as the Parks and Rec Commission as well as Council, that will review the list and how it is prioritized and what is on that list. This will establish our initial draft list to review and provide backup data and information that, I think, supports how they are prioritized and ranked. The use of the scoring. It provides an indication for which projects should advance in the budget and capital planning process. The results can be filtered to compare competing projects or program ideas that would utilize the same space and resources. We can talk about how that is done with our bigger list. It provides a clear and defensible ranking system. The process is designed to continue to be used for evaluating new project or program ideas that come up in the future. These are the main, core ideas of developing this evaluation process. For tonight's purposes, I know that you just got the package last week, so your initial review of it. I do also want to continue this discussion at our next meeting as well. This is definitely a very important process in this whole thing. The things that I think staff and the consulting team is looking for as far as information and guidance kind of go along with the next discussion points. Does the point ranking system provide a clear and concise method of prioritizing projects? Does the zero through five point scoring scale for each criteria work for ranking the proposed projects and program? I also added in this one that this would include do we want to use half or quarter points to help broaden the range of scoring. Are the criteria used for the method enough for prioritization? Finally, if the Commission would like to form an ad hoc committee that works with the staff and project team to help develop the list before it comes back to continue the process of discussion of the prioritization, that's something we'll consider tonight.

Chair Reckdahl: How is cost and value going to be worked in here? I see down in the next circle we have some iteration that includes that. Even if it isn't perfect, but it has very low cost and very high value, you think that that should make it percolate up earlier.

Mr. Jensen: That goes along into our potential list. That is going to be—it's not currently now. That's something the consultant is working. There are additional, I guess, columns in our list. One of them being budget or funding. Right now, from our discussion and we

APPROVED

373 can talk about that here in a minute, they're going to do it as a dollar sign. We haven't set
374 what those limits of each dollar sign mean. If it has one dollar sign, meaning that it's less
375 funding to do. If it has two, three, four—I don't know what our range of that's going to
376 be, but we will be considering that as one of the items on the list.

377
378 Chair Reckdahl: That will still be in the prioritization circle?

379
380 Mr. Jensen: Yes.

381
382 Rob de Geus: I was just going to add that there's a lot to take in there. It looked
383 confusing. It's a work in progress. We have to, somewhat like a funnel, get to a
384 prioritization of projects and programs. There's going to be many more, as you see in the
385 list, than we're going to be able to do in a short period of time. How do we do that? This
386 is sort of the process that we're trying to create with you all about that process. I think
387 that's important to say, that it's still a work in progress. The examples that were listed up
388 here was sort of for illustration purposes; they weren't actual point system that we had
389 fully developed. In fact, a point system the way we've been talking about it would need
390 to be a group of stakeholders, the Commission, staff and others, that would all score
391 together to develop sort of an average on those five criteria. I wanted to certainly
392 mention that. The other point I wanted to make was about the dollar amount. This was
393 something that the Commission has discussed before and, I think, intentionally did not
394 want the dollar amount to be a deciding factor of whether a project should be a priority or
395 not a priority. We think it's important that it's on the list so we have an understanding of
396 sort of order of magnitude. Some of these thing are big, particularly expanding the
397 system where we might think about adding parkland, purchasing land. It was a conscious
398 decision not to have cost be a factor there. It's a reality check that we have to deal with
399 but not a factor in terms of prioritization. I wanted to mention that.

400
401 Mr. Jensen: When the list is prioritized, there is a sequencing step that does happen after
402 which does review. That's about the short-term, mid-term and long-term and how these
403 projects all fit into those different areas. Those will consider budget and the cost of the
404 project, will consider how it balances the system. It either balances a specific park so we
405 have passive and active areas or we have a dog park at the north—actually that's the third,
406 geographic distribution that's also considered in that, where you look at how our facilities
407 are broadcast throughout the City. We'd like to have a dog park in the north. Those three
408 things are considered when sequencing when these things will happen in which
409 timeframes. I will open it up for discussion on this topic now.

410
411 Chair Reckdahl: Before we start with the Commissioners, we have one public speaker.
412 Howard Hoffman.

APPROVED

Howard Hoffman: Thank you. Welcome to the new Commissioners. I'm Howard Hoffman, and I represent Palo Alto Dog Owners. We have more than 300 members. The reason I've been coming to a lot of these meetings for a long time is that the City of Palo Alto really is lacking in facilities for dog recreation. We have a dog leash law in Palo Alto; you can get cited and fined for having your dog off leash. Interesting about the yoga versus dog parks, how that just worked out in that example. There's all kinds of commercial places to do yoga all over Palo Alto. I left my yoga class early this evening, after only 30 minutes of the 75-minute class, to be here. I appreciate yoga. I started my yoga in the City yoga program. You can do yoga anywhere, but you can't do recreation in Palo Alto with your dog off leash except in fenced areas. I did take an early look at the Master Plan and where it was going. It's a little hard to decipher at this point; I guess it's still a work in progress. I just want to say that I'm thankful that there are some provisions in there for some new places for dog recreation, but I'm not sure they are enough. The walkable is one thing that our dog owners really like, having places they can walk. Right now, they walk to their local park, and they walk to their local school, and they take a chance of getting a ticket by doing off-leash recreation. We would like legal places so people like me don't have to run from the dog catcher. It's really not a fair situation. In your deliberations, we hope you'll take that into consideration. Thank you very much.

Chair Reckdahl: Thank you, Howard. I think the scoring up there was just an example. I don't think that was meant to be final scoring. It was just an arbitrary example. We do value dog parks, and we will do our best to bake them into the plan.

Mr. de Geus: I wanted to add something, if it's okay, Chair Reckdahl. Howard made me think of it. As we've been thinking about how would we look at something like this when it's all scored, in my view and I'm interested to hear what you think, to have all the projects and programs together with a score and evaluate it that way probably isn't very effective, in my view. I think that having it categorized by the elements, in other words we look at all recreation programs and how well they scored, because I think we want to invest in all of these things in one way or another, open space, trails, recreation programs. There's not a lot of value in yoga classes against dog parks. That wouldn't be a good way to look at it. That's one thing that I think would be important in terms of categorizing the scoring in that way. I thought I'd mention that. Looking forward to hearing your feedback.

Chair Reckdahl: We'll open up for Commissioner questions. Anything?

Commissioner Knopper: Thank you for saying that. That was the first note that I was going to say, how we can subgroup the different categories, programming, nature, land, facilities, buildings, etc. Very helpful. I thought that was a perfect example, the yoga versus dogs. With regard to the money comment, when these projects are eventually plotted out onto the immediate, five-year, ten-year, fifteen-year or hundred-year line,

today's dollar is different than a project that would be ... It's almost impossible to affix a physical dollar amount, because a project today might cost something very different based on the circumstance of whatever is happening when it's being implemented seven years from now. I wanted to say that in particular. I do agree with breaking the score down a little bit. I know it might become a little more cumbersome than five through zero. Where you can have the quarter point, half point, I think that would be very helpful because of just the mass of all the information being discerned. Lastly, how you take all of those points, I guess, is what I'm struggling with. You have a 19.6, how do you then prioritize? There's got to be a subjective thing attached to each project too. For instance, knowing how many people come to the Commission meetings or write letters with regard to a certain subject. That might not have the same value point; it might look lower. In the example, dog parks looked lower than yoga by a four-point margin, but there might be more community interest for dog parks. Do you know what I mean? It just kind of feels like the number can't be the only thing to represent the project. There's a lot of subjectivity. Am I articulating?

Mr. de Geus: Yeah, I completely understand. It is going to be challenging. We have to take in some insights from a number of different angles. The matrix over there is an important part of that. For the new Commissioners, what it really represents is 11 or 12 different sources of information that we went out and sought from the community, focus groups to surveys to intercepts and a variety of other things including staff input and Commission input. That's going to be a very important part of testing projects and programs. Is it something we really heard is a gap, for instance, from the community? Those types of things. We'll have to provide our own sort of perspective as well as staff that are close to this and are working on it all the time, communicating with the public every day and hearing things. Commissioners too who are very close to this and thinking about the park system and recreation. In some cases, as Peter mentioned, we may find that we're short on information. We don't have enough information, and we have to go back out or we have to do a targeted request about a specific project or program to see if we got it right. It's going to be challenging.

Chair Reckdahl: Other questions? Commissioner Lauing.

Commissioner Lauing: Could you get back to the question list that you have for us tonight? I appreciate the presentation which helped on top of the thick packet. I have a number of questions. When we're talking about the prioritization criteria after the areas of focus and the principles, we see how that all fits together. It strikes me that these prioritization criteria might need to be weighted. As we look at what's going on here, filling existing gaps, addressing community preferences and responding to growth, in the ad hoc those were prioritized as more important than leveraging public resources, which is almost an apple pie kind of thing, because we definitely want to do that in all cases. Multiple benefits is a goal, but we also said we can't restrict it to that. It strikes me that

slightly modifying your system, if you wanted to stay with this, then I would suggest that maybe those first three get five and the last two only get two or one and zero. Zero to five and then zero to one or zero to two, so that it's not overwhelming the vote in that case. I'm not enamored with fractions. What these are trying to do is just get order of magnitude valuations as we just said a couple of times here. I don't think that helps, to get it down to the decimal points. I think we need to get that sorted out before we're ready to look at all the different things that have to be decided in terms of the specific projects. The other thing that concerns me about that is the whole thing seems to be a bit tactical rather than big picture with respect to the timeline and with respect to what's most important. You guys know that eventually it has to get very tactical when you're putting in turf fields. I'm glad you raised the timeline issue which was really important to me. This is a 25-year program. If at some point in the future we need three more swimming pools, it's going to get scored a lot differently if we're going to do that in 15 years than if we're going to get it in 2 years. The scoring has to be, I think, within a context of some sort of timeline. We might want to be starting that eventually. I'm not saying we should be here tonight, but eventually we should be coming up with sort of strategic direction over the next 25 years of what do we need. If we feel that lacrosse is overtaking baseball, that's even tactical. If indoor sports are starting to overtake outdoor sports, that ought to be at the frontend of this analysis to give direction to Council about what this scoring means. It's already been kind of referenced, so I'll just put a small point on that. Programming stuff that is prioritized at any score, is very low cost and can be done by staff is not a capital improvement project. If we're going to put up a gymnasium, that might be really important, and whether it gets a lower score or a higher score, it has to do with the longer term. I'm missing the timeline here, and I'm missing kind of a strategic overlay of directionally where do we want to go beyond things that are maybe slightly fuzzy like the principles, valuable but slightly fuzzy. Maybe at some point we have to get, in certain areas, here's what the Commission thinks are sort of the top ten things in parks or recreation or whatever when we get to the end of this. I do think that there is some sort of quantitative value that has to go on this if we're going to benefit 5,000 swimmers versus three dog owners. I particularly use that crazy example. The former might get a little bit more consideration because of the quantitative benefit. Those are sort of my kind of big picture questions. I'm not sure exactly; maybe you guys can tell us why you don't want to do the first prioritization rather than MIG. You know the City; clearly they're going to be giving us input on best practices and trends. Some of the things that are already in here, I'm not even sure actually why they're in here, because they didn't poll very well, like food carts. There are a lot of those things in here. We want to make very sure that we don't do things because we can do them. I'll go back to one of our very important projects, the acreage in the Baylands. To the extent that we can find other ways to just not do anything with that and leave that resource there for the future, that would be good. If it looks like we want more fields and we can put them there, we want to make sure that we're not just scoring more fields really high and we jump right to the Baylands. Just as an example, again, of the judgment that has to go into

the prioritization on the part of staff and others. Those are my kind of overall, general comments.

Chair Reckdahl: Commissioner Hetterly.

Commissioner Hetterly: I agree with all those comments. I like the idea of (inaudible) the rankings by element. Just to start with the principles. The addition of nature, I think that it should have added to it, not just incorporating nature for the benefit of people, but also respecting and enhancing ecosystems. I think that was one of the big pieces Council was trying to get at in adding that. For the criteria, I absolutely think we should weight the first three criteria more than the other criteria. We're serving the community, so if we have identified gaps in our services and clear preferences, those should rank highly. What was the third one? Response to growth. The same thing. I think that's a key part of planning. For existing gaps, I think we have to define that a little more clearly. As it's written here, it says gaps in areas of the City and user groups. I think gaps shouldn't necessarily be limited by geography or demographics. It also has to include unmet needs and preferences. I think there's some overlaps between the gaps and the community preferences piece. For example, gyms is certainly a gap, but the location of it is not really critically important for ranking purposes. It's not like we want to have a gym in south Palo Alto and Midtown and north Palo Alto necessarily. The distribution isn't as important. Community preference, I want to be sure that that reflects not just the prioritization survey but all of the input that we've received from the public. I want to know what the status is of the prioritization challenge and whether the number and nature of ideas that are in here reflect that. When is that going to come back to us?

Chair Reckdahl: Do you know that answer, Peter? Are we still running it? Is it still online?

Mr. Jensen: It's still online. We haven't promoted it in about a month, so nothing has really happened to it. It was in the mid-300s the last time we had. We've been transitioning and getting the Council brought up to speed, so we've just left it there. It is hanging there. The end of January is when we will close that. At the first of January, we will promote it again and spark some more interest to get more voting to happen. That way it will help to feed the criteria of community input; it will also use all the analysis from community input before in that section as well.

Chair Reckdahl: I think that a lot of people do have breaks over the holidays, and they have more time. Promoting it before the holidays may be a good way of getting people who have just been too busy to do it.

Commissioner Hetterly: Moving on to realizing multiple benefits, that criteria. As it's written, it suggests that the multiple benefits we care about are overlap with other City

APPROVED

efforts. I think really the primary multiple benefit we're looking for is multiple community benefits. I think if you wanted, we could maybe add a criteria about overlap with other City efforts, but I don't think they're the same. I think it's apples and oranges, and they shouldn't be together. Do you want comments on the idea list?

Mr. Jensen: I will do those in a second.

Chair Reckdahl: Other Commissioners have any comments or questions?

Commissioner Cowie: I apologize if I cover areas that the Commission has already covered in prior discussions. There are a couple of things that, in my first pass, were not entirely intuitive to me. When we have separate criteria for address community preferences and respond to growth, they both seem to me roughly equivalent to demand. I'm not sure that we don't have a fair amount of redundancy when we score those as separate categories. I'm a little confused by the leverage public resources piece, because I assume the ultimate decision-making body will take into account the return on investment of whatever the project is. That seems like a rough equivalent of ROI, just by the definition. I guess on a related point to that, I understand we're not really intended to factor in cost as a swing either way. It's not intuitive to me why that would be the case. If that's already been debated and settled, fine. I just thought I'd raise that I didn't understand why that would be. In terms of making a recommendation, it seems to me we have to take into account the cost. I think this is related to what Commissioner Lauing said earlier. It seems to me actionability or some rough equivalent of that, which is related to the timeline, how quickly can you get something done, how painlessly can you get something done, ought to be a factor. We ought to take into account, exactly as he said, a longer-term strategy. If there are things that we can do that are not controversial, even if the impact is relatively small, but we can do them quickly for no expense or perhaps even to save money, why wouldn't we just do them? I'm a little concerned that if we literally follow the score card as we have it now, a project like that might come out with a score of 4, but it has no downside and it's free. I'd hate to see that fall to the bottom of the list for years. I just wanted to reiterate the point about—I suppose this factors into the ROI equation as well—I think we need to factor in how many people are going to benefit from the project somewhere in the scoring. That was all I had. Thank you.

Chair Reckdahl: Commissioner Moss.

Commissioner Moss: I agree with many of the comments. We've got like 50 years worth of projects on this list. The timeframe is really a factor. What we prioritize today may not be the same priority we give them in two years or five years from now. It's going to be a moving list, I suspect. The prioritization we give today may change in the future. I don't know how often you're going to come back and revise the priorities, but it's

APPROVED

something to think about. Several people have mentioned the size of the stakeholders groups. You have dozens and dozens of stakeholder groups. Dog owners is just one of them. It would be nice to have an idea of how many people are affected. Also, this is the first time I've seen this list of 370, and obviously I could see more added from my own personal experience. How do we update this list over time and maybe push some new things on and push some old things off? I don't know. I don't want to get into exactly which ones I want to add, but it should be factored in that the list might change. I don't know with the Brown Act how much influence my personal experience will have on this. I guess the purpose of the scoring and the criteria is to minimize that as much as possible, the personal views of us as individuals. It's something I'm curious about. When somebody said that some things could be done for free right now, even if they're lower priority, I think the search area of looking for new parkland, if somebody tomorrow donated something or we could buy a piece of property tomorrow that just came on the market, never been on the market, we might jump on it even though it's lower down on the priority list. The last thing is that you're going to get this list of high priorities and lower priorities and lowest priorities. There may be some juggling among the higher priorities by us. I just want to know how that's going to happen, how that fits in. That's it.

Chair Reckdahl: Peter, do you want to talk at all about changing prioritization? You broke it up into three. We're going to talk about first just the prioritization. What was the middle section that we're talking about?

Mr. Jensen: We're going to talk about the list.

Chair Reckdahl: The list is next?

Mr. Jensen: Yep.

Chair Reckdahl: What's the last?

Mr. Jensen: The last is just a review of this updated plan that we looked at last time, which is not going to take very long.

Chair Reckdahl: Peter, do you want to answer David's question about your thought process about how things are going to be juggled around?

Mr. Jensen: Prioritizing the list is definitely the first step in the process. There definitely will be multiple chances as it comes before different commissions, definitely the Parks and Rec Commission, to have the conversation and a discussion about that and how the projects are evaluated and ranked. That's just going to be a discussion of the projects on the list and getting down into the list and having a constructive discussion about it that

gets us to the point where we all feel comfortable of how the ranking is. We'll take more feedback; we will be requesting further feedback from MIG, our consultant, about that and how they feel that that should be done. If there is other feedback from the Commission of how they would like to structure that, then that's something that is open for discussion as well.

Commissioner Hetterly: Can I just clarify? The rankings are intended to inform but not determine the recommendations. The rankings, whatever that process is, will produce lists and then there will be a follow-on process that imposes the kind of big picture judgment.

Mr. Jensen: Right.

Mr. de Geus: The way I would see this working—it may be specific to David's question—it won't be one ranking exercise and we're done. With one ranking exercise, we'll have a certain picture, but it'll still be fuzzy. We'll take the highest level and have to have another look at all of those. We look at the criteria and say how do we evaluate these higher priorities against the filling of gaps and these other criteria. We might have to go through two or three times before we really get to a recommendation.

Chair Reckdahl: Commissioner Cribbs.

Commissioner Cribbs: I think all my questions have been answered. I think there were some very good comments among all of the Commissioners. A couple of things that are of interest to me and a little bit of concern are the fact that we really want to understand how many groups we're representing and are able to have input into the whole process. Obviously, there's a lot of input and it's been going on for a long time. Secondly, the cost piece. When we talked about the fact that cost wasn't factored into this, I'm really interested in knowing what the cost is before we go very much further on. Not as a limiting factor, but just understanding the opportunities that exist with the cost or if it's something that we can get done for no cost and who our partners might be. Finally, I love the idea of the top priorities and a timeline. I think that's really important for everybody to feel like things are getting accomplished.

Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. I have a couple of comments here. A lot of these are similar to what other people said. I do think there's going to be a lot of apples and oranges when we're comparing these. I do think Rob's point about dividing them up into categories will improve the comparison. Sometimes you just can't compare two things that are drastically different. By definition we want balance, so we want to take things from all the categories. Even if we ranked them on a single category anyway, we wouldn't necessarily just take the top. I'm a little overwhelmed by looking at this list. I agree with David that there's a lot that you could add to it. When I look at it, there's a lot

APPROVED

of things that could be missing. That's going to make it even more imposing. I'm a little worried about being swamped with data and being able to sort through this. That's the process. Another thing that is hard for comparison is, at least in my opinion, we eventually will have to start expanding the system, if the population growth continues the way it is. Putting money aside to fund future expansion does not compare well when you start ranking it, because it doesn't do much for you. If I have only a certain amount of money right now and I want to put some of that aside or build a new building or build a new playground, that immediate effect is going to grade much higher than putting something away for future expansion in 10, 15 years. I don't know how that's going to come out. I suspect that if you ranked all these things, expansion would be at the bottom. If you just blindly rank everything, that means that we're kind of painting ourselves further into the corner than we are right now. We should take that into account as we are scoring these things, that there may be some overriding things that the scoring doesn't reflect. You did say that the scoring is not the end-all and be-all. Community input, I think, is quite high; it should be ranked higher. Some of these people mentioned that they should be weighted. If the community really wants something, then we should be receptive to that if we think it's a good use of resources. Realizing multiple benefits doesn't do a lot for me. If a project does multiple benefits, that to me doesn't mean anything unless it does them well. If something serves this group and serves this group but doesn't do a good job of serving either of those groups, it may not be the best. The thing that's attractive about doing multiple things is you get better value. You build one field and one season you can use for one sport and the next season you can use it for the same sport, so for the same cost you get double the benefit. That's where multiple benefits weigh highly. Just the fact that it has multiple benefits doesn't necessarily mean that it should score highly. It really comes down to value again. If this realize multiple benefits is—by value, I don't necessarily mean just money, I mean also land. In some ways land is more scarce in Palo Alto than money. If we only have a certain area and we can do a lot of things well with that area, that is high value. I still am torn about the way we're prioritizing them and the fact that value comes in fairly late in the process. It's in the process, so I think we can go as is. It still makes me a little nervous that we may end up spending a lot of time looking at things that don't have high value. Eventually when we get down to the second blue circle, in that iteration we may throw things out that looked really fun but didn't have a lot of value. That's part of the prioritization. We're going to do a lot of work regardless, and lot of it's going to get thrown out. I'm not objecting to it; it makes me a little uncomfortable. That's all the comments I have, so let's move on to the—did you want to respond, Rob?

Mr. de Geus: Yeah, because there were a lot of questions and comments. Maybe we can talk a little bit about the questions. I don't know that I caught them all. I can try and talk about the questions a little bit and try and respond to those. I'll just start with the last one on the question of value. I wasn't quite sure what you were saying there, Chair Reckdahl. The criteria is intended to be sort of the highest value of the programs, that fills a gap,

that we know the community wants or is a high community preference. The values are built into that, because that's what we heard from the community. Maybe I just misunderstood what you were trying to say.

Chair Reckdahl: Realize multiple benefits, to me, in itself—you could have something that would be mediocre and have lower scores in the first four, but it does do multiple benefits and you get a five for that. All of a sudden, that's now in the contender where it really should just be a lukewarm idea. If it doesn't do the things that it does well, I don't see why you should be rewarded by doing a lot of things mediocre.

Mr. de Geus: That I completely understand. I like woodworking, and a tool that tries to do three different things usually can't do any of them very well. I totally get that. We could probably reword that. You're right. If it's multiple benefits, it needs to be really multiple community benefits that are of high value. I think that's what I'm hearing.

Chair Reckdahl: When we iterate, I think that will come out. After we do one round of this, we may find out that some of the things that percolate to the top are not what we want percolating to the top, and we'll have to reassess the scoring. Probably the best way to assess whether the scoring is accurate or not is do it and see whether we think the things that are percolating to the top are what we want.

Mr. de Geus: That may be the best way we learn how this works.

Mr. Jensen: That's one of the reasons of having MIG take a first pass at it. It does allow a little bit more expedited process, just because of the manpower that they can put behind getting those numbers together than staff. Staff will definitely be involved in that process of reviewing what they've come up with. I do think that it is a good idea to get them ranked and then start to look at them. That will start to tell us some things about how it's prioritized, how it's being evaluated, and if the rankings are coming out the way we think that they should.

Mr. de Geus: I just wanted to follow up on a couple of other things. Commissioner Cowie mentioned the difference between Criteria 1 and 2, fills existing gaps versus addresses community preferences. I think we did see a distinction between the two, particularly to staff who are very close to the park system, the trail system and even the Commission. We may know of a need that is very specific, but that the community is just not really aware of, because they're more passive users. It would be different than what we heard in community surveys and focus groups, which is really the community preference which came up a lot. That's the difference there. You had mentioned actionability and if it's actionable quickly, should it get a higher score. That's kind of an interesting one. We have to think about that, because it makes a lot of sense to do that, but it has to score high though. Nothing's free, certainly it'll take staff time. Any time

APPROVED

792 staff is working on something, they're not working on something else. If it scored low, it
793 doesn't cost anything but takes staff time, it still may not be worth doing. I think that's
794 important. Commissioner Moss asked about the personal experience versus public
795 benefit. That's a good question. Maybe other Commissioners want to weigh in here. It's
796 a really difficult question, because you were appointed to this Commission in part
797 because of your personal experience, I think, and your history here and your
798 understanding of the parks and recreation system. That has to play a role, and it should.
799 Ultimately, I think, you're trying to find out what is in the public's best interest as a
800 whole. You're applying your experience to that goal. If that helps. It's very difficult to
801 know what is in the public's best interest, as Council Member Filseth can certainly attest
802 to. It's going to be very challenging with 68,000 people in the community. That's the
803 goal. Commissioner Cribbs asked the question about—actually several people mentioned
804 it—how many people are impacted by the particular program or project and shouldn't that
805 be in the criteria. I believe that was the thinking around addresses community
806 preferences and fills existing gaps, at least in there. As we would go through ranking
807 these, that's one of the things that I would be thinking about, how many people are
808 impacted by this, is it filling a significant gap, are people not accessing a program or a
809 park or something. It's interesting having new eyes on this, because maybe that's not as
810 clear as I thought maybe it is. We can look at that again. That's, I think, a really
811 important point. How many people will benefit from investing in that sooner than later is
812 a really important part of the ranking system that should be built in. Do you have
813 anything to add?

814
815 Commissioner Hetterly: I'd like to just add a clarification to Commissioner Cowie. I
816 think that you asked about a redundancy between growth and preferences. Did I hear that
817 wrong?

818
819 Commissioner Cowie: Actually it was the second and third items that I thought were
820 overlapping somewhat.

821
822 Commissioner Hetterly: I think the way we saw it as this was taking shape was
823 preferences was what does the community currently want, what is our unmet need now.
824 Growth was looking at demographic changes and what we expect to happen in the future
825 that your neighbor might not expect to need in the future.

826
827 Commissioner Cowie: It's maybe current demand versus future demand.

828
829 Commissioner Hetterly: yeah.

830
831 Commissioner Cowie: I understand. Thank you. That's a helpful distinction.
832

APPROVED

Commissioner Lauing: Can I just add one other clarification, maybe for the new people? We talk about community input. We have to remember that these are impressions from a few hundred people compared to the 68,000—is that what you just quoted that are in the City? We need to keep reminding ourselves and eventually Council there have been no scientific studies done in any of this gathering. It's good data, but it's essentially subjective data based on those folks that have voted. We can't really apply that to numbers of people that would benefit from X or Y or Z program, but they're valuable indicators. We always have to keep reminding ourselves of that. We can't go to Council and say the community has voted. And the press, the press needs to understand that as well.

Council Member Filseth: I just want to comment on something that Keith said a little while ago. Obviously something that requires a huge amount of resource or money is going to be hard to do. I think if one of the answers that comes out of this effort is we need X, Y, Z thing and it's going to cost \$20 or \$30 million, it's probably going to be a while until we get it. If that is the answer, we need it, then I think this group shouldn't shy away from that. If this group doesn't do that, then the rest of the City will never know. I think it's important that if the answer is we need X, Y, Z facility in Search Area C, then we need to know so we can start planning for it.

Commissioner Lauing: That's why we have to stay at kind of the strategic level as opposed to scoring all these projects which could take a gazillion years and we just have projects scored and we're still leaving out the big picture items.

Male: (inaudible)

Commissioner Lauing: We should do it and justify it and say the whys and the wherefores of that.

Chair Reckdahl: Peter, do you want to go through the table?

Mr. Jensen: Yes. This next section of the presentation is discussing the list of potential project and program ideas. It is long and, as we discussed and has been mentioned a few times, definitely has the opportunity to grow. This is again a draft list looking at the community input as well as the data found in the opportunities matrix. I'd like to go through the actual digital list so we can look at how it is broken and filtered, and then I or Catherine will email you the list in the next few days, and then you'll have the list to go through over the next few weeks before the next meeting.

Mr. de Geus: We're not going through the list. I think we're going to orient to the list.

APPROVED

Mr. Jensen: Right, we're not going to go through the list one-by-one right now. The list is composed and broken into our 12 areas of focus. The list that you got in your package was divided in two different ways. You got two lists that are all the same. One broken down into site-specific and one broken down into the area of focus, so you could see how they were grouped. The original list was just a list composed so there is no ranking of how the list was put together. Projects or ideas that could be spanned through multiple facilities or parks are all grouped together. If we recognize that we need community gardens, then in a section there's three or four different site locations where community gardens could go. The list then has these little pull-down tabs. You can see what's happening over here is this is for each section and we're looking at—I wish I had a closer monitor to see what section that is. Hang on one second. Let me pull this up here. The areas of focus, you can go and check all the boxes of the areas of focus that you wanted to look at. If you wanted to look at one—I cannot see this list up here. There is a way to ... Whatever one that I did select up there, then it regroups it into that. You can start to divide them in separate ways. Each one of these pull-down arrows works the same way for each one of the columns. Each column, of course, has a group of items that you can filter and divide the list to start looking. If you wanted to look at everything that was planned for Rinconada Park, then you could go into the site one. All the parks and facilities are in there, and you can check them out. The easiest way I found to do that is to—right now, they're all selected to show you the full list—click the top box which is blank, they all go blank, and then go through and start checking the ones you want or just the one you want. It's the easiest way to navigate through there. This list has been pared down a little bit. Column 4, the funding or budget needs of each project, is not included in this because that has not been figured out yet. That will become a column in this to be able to go through and filter the ones that cost the most to the ones that cost the least, so we can look at it in that way. It also starts to look at elements themselves that were from the matrix. We have the three main elements: the parks, trails, open space; facilities is the second one; and programs as the third. You can start to group and look at all the programs together at one time. I think we talked about this before in our examples, that it's very difficult to try to weight or judge between yoga and a dog park. This allows you to look at and rank the programs or rank the facility upgrades or enhancements and look at it in that way. It definitely does help a lot to start to break down the list and look at it in these different ways. Yes, when you start to look at the list of 360 ideas, which could become more, it's not the easiest thing to try to decipher. Again, I think what we're looking for is for the Commission to spend the next month looking at the list and coming back to us in January and us talking more about the list, how it's made, what we think is missing on the list, what needs to be added, what different ways that we can filter. Maybe there's more rows or columns that we want to add. This is kind of the homework that we're giving the Commission to do before the next meeting, so we can have a more detailed conversation about this list and what has gone into it.

APPROVED

Chair Reckdahl: One thing that jumped out at me when I looked through is a lot of things were just best practices. When you remodel a park, adding bottle fillers and making it ADA compliant. There's signage, integrate nature, rainwater swales. Would we go in and retrofit any park outside of its remodel period? I would think instead we would want to lump all those characteristics into some guidelines for remodeling and say, "as we go through the five-year process of remodeling parks, look at all these things." Adding rainwater swales, do we really want to rank that against yoga or dog parks? To me, they're apples and oranges again. The best practices kind of muddy this list and make it hard to pull out what you really want to separate, what you want to rank.

Commissioner Lauing: You're not going to go back to Johnson Park which has all these things and do them now if Johnson Park's not up for its normal cycle. Right?

Mr. Jensen: Right.

Commissioner Lauing: I'm not sure why they actually even should be on here, because you know you're going to do those.

Mr. Jensen: We should decipher between the list that we're looking at here is things that are new. There is also a list of things that exist in the parks now or facilities that we have now that are in a schedule to be maintained or renovated, that don't show up on a new list. Things that will continue to keep happening. Yes, if there are things on this list that are prioritized high for, let's say, Johnson Park. It's up in five years from now to do a renovation there, like we did Scott Park and Monroe Park that we're working on now. We would look at including the new items off this list into that scope of work and expanding it to include new as well as upkeep and maintenance items.

Commissioner Lauing: Why are these even listed as projects then? Why wouldn't that just be considerations when the normal cycle comes up for Johnson Park?

Mr. Jensen: Because in our current list of those things that you're mentioning, the water bottle fillers, retaining water on site, those are not in the parks currently, so they're not in a list of a project, they're not in the scope of our projects. These would be new things to consider doing that.

Commissioner Hetterly: They're here so that we can advise about whether or not we want to recommend to Council that those get added to the regular list of things that get considered when you do a (crosstalk).

Commissioner Lauing: When Johnson Park gets done.

APPROVED

956 Daren Anderson: Another way of looking at it could be, you could consider having it be
957 a policy as opposed to a project or a program. The policy would apply, as you said,
958 broadly. The next time you renovate any park, do these five things, whatever they may
959 be.
960

961 Mr. Jensen: I would say too the policies is another list we're going to look at. Of course,
962 it's not going to be as extensive as this list because we aren't going to think up 300
963 policies. It is going to be a list that we'll generate, that we'll be looking at over the next
964 few meetings, that we'll discuss of which ones we do want to recommend as far as going
965 into the Master Plan. That is actually another step from this. It's interesting to note that
966 staff's initial review of the list, we did remove a few things on there that were just direct
967 policy. It didn't really specifically call out a project, but more of an overall policy that we
968 eliminated from the list because again we have to generate another list of actual policies
969 that we want to carry forward.
970

971 Mr. Anderson: I could tack on one thing to the list. This may be helpful as you review
972 them. As you look through all the projects and programs that MIG had pulled together,
973 we thought it would be helpful if you also saw the lists that live elsewhere, that is in our
974 existing capital budget. You'll see that called out as CIP project. These are existing ones.
975 You're not saying, "Where is this? It lives in a separate document. You're going to have
976 to look elsewhere." We added it all to this. The other one is called the—you'll see it
977 down there—IBRC, Infrastructure Blue Ribbon Committee project that may not be in the
978 existing CIP book, may not be in this document, and lives on a second one. This pulls
979 them altogether and gives you one shot to see did we capture everything, are we missing
980 things, or is this right one.
981

982 Commissioner Moss: You have a whole lot of Capital Improvement Projects. Many of
983 them are already in progress. What are you asking us to do about those? They're already
984 being done.
985

986 Mr. Anderson: I think part of it is to help you again see is there a hole. If you weren't
987 savvy to that or aware of what those CIPs are, it could lead you to believe, "Wait a
988 minute. When is this going to happen?" Part of it's to paint the full picture. The second
989 part is some of these CIPs are outlying years. They'll probably need to go through this
990 process. They'll probably need to be prioritized via the Master Plan. Almost to your
991 point when you said, "We create a master list. At some point, don't we renew that?" Just
992 like our CIP process, we do it every year. We plan out five years, but every year we look
993 at it again and everything gets shuffled up. I can't see a way that we wouldn't have to do
994 that with this Master Plan list too. There's a lot more discussion that has to happen
995 around that. I can't envision how you wouldn't continually update it when you've got 386
996 programs and projects.
997

APPROVED

Mr. Jensen: What arises from this list as far as future or new projects go, if we do have a CIP for a specific park and then on this list there's something new that can be considered as well, then that is something that we would consider in the discussion next year with the CIPs. We have X park and from our Parks Master Plan now we see that there's a project or something new that we would like to add to that. Is it feasible as far as budget goes to add it now into that project thing? That will definitely be considered in the projects. Even though they may exist now, we have the opportunity to enhance or expand them depending upon what we find in this list or in the prioritization (inaudible).

Commissioner Hetterly: Do you want comments about the list?

Mr. Jensen: Yes.

Commissioner Hetterly: I think first of all the program descriptions need to be more fully articulated, and they need samples that you provided that were more specific, less vague and include more language about why that's on the list. Is the implication from your examples that you're going to have a similar workup for every single project on this list? None of the items in your examples are actually in here. Are we likely to see things like those? Should we expect to see what you presented on the screen today or is this really what we're working with in terms of rankings and explaining what the projects and programs are? That's my first question.

Mr. Jensen: MIG will go through and compile all the information that ranks the projects. There will not be an individual sheet made for every one that calls out each individual line of the matrix. We're relying on them to put that together and ranking them in that respect.

Commissioner Hetterly: I guess in terms of level of detail, let me use the yoga example. You do have some things in here about expanding Boost, but there are no specifics about what particular parts of Boost. Yoga is not the only program that's offered through Boost, right? Do you want us to be engaging in that level of detail of specific programming or are you wanting us not to do that? Whether we generally want to support expanding Boost or do we want specific areas of Boost, that level of detail would be helpful to have some guidance. Also, I think the locations that are designated for several of these didn't make any sense to me. I would like to see a little more explanation of why those sites were selected. For example, for dog parks you picked—I don't know—five or six locations there. What was it that led MIG to recommend those sites as opposed to other sites? I think that's information that we need to know because it may be that we think a different one should be on the list. There's several places that that comes up. All over this, I'm saying "why" next to the locations. As Commissioner Lauing mentioned, there are also several items in here that received very low rankings from the public when we surveyed them directly about that particular issue. I'm not sure whether

APPROVED

they belong on the list at all. It's not the comprehensive list of every idea that was proposed; it's already gone through a filtering process. It made me concerned that having gone through one filtering process already, there were several items that, in my opinion, should have fallen out based on what we have already learned. I'd like a little more working of the details in that regard. I guess I have several of those. I don't know if it's helpful for you to have me point them out. I could send them in an email. I don't want to take the whole night tonight to go through my particular edits. Also, I think there are several things that need to be added.

Mr. de Geus: Just feedback to Commissioner Hetterly. I had a similar reaction to reading it. There's a lot there. I think most of us did. It still needs quite a bit of work. I would actually describe this list as a rough draft. What we need to do is develop the list so that we can actually rank them. There's not enough information to fully rank. That is what we need from the Commission. It is work to go through it and ask the questions. Some of them are obvious, that we heard that through the outreach process. I get it. Those where you think "I didn't hear that. Where did that come from?" note it and then go to the next one. Go through that kind of process. Things like you need more specificity, you need to understand why that is on there. If there's things that you think ought to be on there and it's not listed anywhere, then add that so that can be evaluated. The idea is by the end of January hopefully we'll have a much better list. It might be smaller but much more specific, that can actually be gone through the process of the ranking that we talked about. By that time, hopefully our ranking process will have tightened and you're more comfortable with and we're more comfortable with.

Commissioner Hetterly: Would you like us to do that individually and send it in to you? Do you want us to cover them all in a Commission meeting? What's your preference?

Mr. de Geus: My preference is to take the time to do it individually, just because it's so long and it does require some real time just to sit with it. We can collect all of that data and then merge it all. Where there's conflict between feedback, we'll highlight that, point that out and then we'll have a discussion about those areas.

Mr. Jensen: I think for ease of collecting that data, I will add a row onto the end that will say "Commissioner remarks." In that you can type whatever you would like into those things. We'll collect them all, submit them to MIG and start to massage and rework the list per those comments.

Commissioner Hetterly: Do it electronically on the ...

Mr. Jensen: Yes, do it electronically on the thing. Type it and then email it either back to Catherine or myself. We'll collect the comments that way initially.

Commissioner Lauing: I'm still not quite with the process here. What is it that you really want? You don't want us to go through all of these and score them, right?

Mr. de Geus: Not score them.

Commissioner Lauing: You want us to go through them and say which ones shouldn't be here or should be here?

Mr. Jensen: You have questions about, yes. Items on the list, if you feel that they shouldn't be there, weren't from information that we thought we'd heard in the past, you're not sure how they got onto the list, those are the questions that we're looking for. If there's things that don't appear on the list, those are the things that we're looking for.

Commissioner Lauing: When you get to a park, it just randomly opened to page 19 which is Hoover and there's 13 things on there. You want comments on those 13 things or do you just want comments on Hoover Park is a good priority for now?

Mr. de Geus: They're all things that we've heard from the public through the variety of outreach that we've done. What we're looking for is for you to look through this list to make sure that it's understandable, that it reflects what you think we heard, if it's a specific enough project or program or is it more of a policy that was suggested. There's some things in here I think that were more like best practice, policy that ought to be withdrawn from a project list and be somewhere else. It's that kind of feedback we need.

Commissioner Lauing: Does that mean that you want to go from a rough draft to a draft before we get it or shall we use what we've got now?

Mr. de Geus: You should use what we've got now, this rough draft, so we can improve it. We're doing the same thing as the Commission.

Chair Reckdahl: Commissioner Cribbs.

Commissioner Cribbs: On an earlier screen there was something about other cities that you had contacted for best practices or ideas. Are you at liberty to talk about which cities those were?

Mr. Jensen: That is actually through the consultant, MIG. One of their areas of focus is Master Plans. There's not many landscape architectural firms that do just Master Plans. They are taking their experience from the Master Planning they do all over the United States, and they do a lot of them, and then applying it to our particular situation and changing it per what they've heard from us. They're looking at that information that they're gathering from other reports that they're doing and applying it to us. The list is

quite long. At some point they did present some samples of Master Plans that they had done for other cities for the Commission to review to get an idea of what that was. That's something that we can talk offline and start to give some examples of that.

Mr. de Geus: I would just add to that. They are in close contact with the National Recreation and Parks Association and the California Recreation and Parks Association. They collect a lot of data from cities, best practices. They're feeding a lot of information to MIG and to staff.

Commissioner Cribbs: I have another really silly question. That wasn't a silly question; this might be a silly question. Are you able to, just from your gut or from your instinct, create a top 20 or 30 list of programs or athletic fields or open space that you think would be great?

Mr. de Geus: Yeah, I think I can do that. I think Daren can and Peter can as well. We're talking with the consultant all the time about this as they bring things forward. We push back all the time and say, "That's not what we're hearing. That's not what the public wants here."

Commissioner Cribbs: I think that would be really interesting to be able to see that. Maybe I'm just the only one, but it just would be interesting to see how that would go against or be compared with this incredibly long, very specific list of things.

Mr. de Geus: I think it's an important piece of input, significant piece of input. We're probably the closest to the park system and the public to some extent. We fully appreciate and recognize that we are limited too in our perspective. We need to hear from a lot of sources, Commission, public, Council and staff as well. I appreciate that.

Mr. Jensen: I think the list goes a step further than just putting the list together, because it does discuss some overarching things, dog parks, community gardens, nature in parks, athletic fields. Those things that we've heard from the community. We have data analysis on it that we've done by looking at our current system, but not really attached or applied to a specific park yet. We have general ideas of things that we'd like to do, but this list starts to recognize the space that we actually can do it in, which I think is one step more accurate than just having the idea.

Chair Reckdahl: When I looked through list, I thought "There's a lot of chaff here." There's a lot of stuff that I've never heard of. Art for dog parks, I don't think any of the dog people are asking for art; I think they're asking for dog parks. I think a lot of this came from MIG, and they have some ideas that they think are good, but I don't necessarily think they're all good. Turf for fields, AYSO, I don't think they want artificial turf on their fields; I think they want grass. They listed a whole bunch of small fields that

APPROVED

are used for AYSO and add artificial turf. I don't think that's something that the public wants. As Jennifer mentioned, I'll compile a list of things that I just don't think should be on the list. You always can cast a net really wide and do a lot of work and sort out the stuff, or you can cast your net smaller. I think we should be casting our net smaller than we have here. That's an iteration. They also mentioned about camping. The camping in Foothills Park, I thought, was a decent program that they've suggested. They also said Arastradero. If I have a tent, can I go into Arastradero and nature?

Mr. Anderson: No, neither Baylands nor Arastradero have camping available.

Chair Reckdahl: Should we be taking that out? There was one line for Baylands and one for Arastradero.

Mr. Anderson: That was in my initial four pages of notes for MIG as well. Their counter was it's a very popular program to learn camping, was their idea. If we expand that to these other areas, it could be very valuable. Almost like a class as opposed to a regular camping set up. It'd be more of a one-time program or class.

Chair Reckdahl: It would be ranger led?

Mr. Anderson: Something like that.

Chair Reckdahl: If a ranger wanted to bring people into Arastradero, is that permitted?

Mr. Anderson: We'd have to change the rules. Right now there's no overnight camping allowed there.

Chair Reckdahl: Even by permit?

Mr. Anderson: Perhaps on a permit basis through the Director's approval, something like that would be permissible.

Chair Reckdahl: Baylands, I don't see any place you'd even want to camp in the Baylands. Maybe if Byxbee was done, then maybe that would have some flat areas where you could camp. Anyway, that was another thing that I looked at and I said, "That doesn't seem to agree with what I think is in the top 100."

Mr. de Geus: That's exactly the kind of feedback we need, so we can cull down this list.

Commissioner Knopper: To Keith's point and other Commissioners' points, some of the lack of detail. You just clarified it's a camp class versus real camping where you'd need real facilities and garbage and bathrooms. Just overall, the first couple of times I looked

at this list, I was like, "I don't understand what I'm looking at." It took me a few minutes to go, "I get it." From a formatting perspective, there just wasn't enough room to give enough detail to make an informed comment. Now I know that I'll just put my comment.

Chair Reckdahl: I mentioned this earlier. After thinking about it, I really think we should have a separate list for best practices or guidelines for remodeling. There we can do the same scoring and same prioritization and say where does swales compare to bird habitat or whatever, and do those on just a generic. Right now, they have all these that list the bird habitat and have all these parks. There's a half page right there. That's why this thing is so thick. I think we're making it harder than it has to be. I think we should break it apart and say guidelines for general remodeling and, if there's some special features that we want to attach to specific parks, have that in this list. We shouldn't have general bottle filling stations on this list. I think that's just too detailed. Those are my comments.

Commissioner Moss: I think it's important to have this master list. Maybe we can shorten it, but have all the original list somewhere safe so that we can refer back to it in the future. If somebody in the public says, "Where is my ... I recommended this; why isn't it on the list," we can point to it.

Chair Reckdahl: Yeah, for reference. I don't think we want to go through and score everything that's on this list, because we'd spend a lot of time that most likely will be wasted.

Mr. de Geus: I complete agree. That's great feedback. Regarding the bird habitat, what we want to see is increasing sort of bird habitat, if that's the topic, at a specific park is recommended because that park has a unique set of qualities and characteristics that it's going to be of value there. If that's the reason, then it should be defined in that way, so that we can (inaudible) it. We gave that feedback to MIG as well.

Mr. Jensen: I think on some of those things, you didn't get a list of 1 through 386. At the end MIG started to pull from the Urban Forest Master Plan and the Comprehensive Plan. You'll see a big block of things that are related to policies or programs that want to be accomplished in the Urban Forest Master Plan that have a reflection on parks. They're in there as well. Some of those are a lot more specific, and they kind of stand out on the list. Just to give you an orientation of that in there.

Chair Reckdahl: Peter, do you want to walk through the maps? Is that the next step?

Mr. Jensen: Yes. MIG had produced this geographic map last time. It is virtually the same map that we looked at before. What the map is, the light blue sections that are in here represent areas of town that don't have an accessible outdoor, open space within a

APPROVED

half mile and a quarter mile depending upon driving and walking. These blue areas are lacking park space or open space. What has been added onto this is the brown sections, which include all property owned by the City. A lot of those are parking lot areas that weren't shown on the plan before. What we'd hoped to find is that in some of these blue areas there would be a distinctive area of brown that the City owns, so we could say that maybe we want to consider changing that parking lot into a park to meet our park requirements there. Unfortunately, as you can see, that doesn't happen, but that is added to it. What mostly this is looking at is if we were ever going to consider purchasing or someone donated land, these would be the main areas that we would concentrate on doing that. They're the areas lacking open park space for the community around them. As you can see, there is an interesting correlation between the areas that are lacking space and schools. It seems to be schools located in some of those areas that are lacking park space. How do we have dialog with the School District in the future to maybe help relieve some of that space? A lot of these schools are already being used as open park space, that we should recognize as being that way. If there is a part of town that doesn't even have a school located in it, maybe that has a higher priority of acquiring parkland to fulfill that need. That's this updated plan, which is now showing all the land owned by the City on it as well in brown. The green is of course parks.

Commissioner Hetterly: Peter, does the City have any substantial easements that would be worth considering for the same purpose? If so, it would be great to have them on the map as well.

Mr. Jensen: I will discuss that with them more. I'm not quite sure how that was highlighted on the plan. I don't think there was anything that was significant. You can see over by Seale Park there's the easement that we looked at before. I'm not quite sure it has a name. Daren, what is it called over there? It's by Greer Park.

Mr. Anderson: (inaudible).

Mr. Jensen: That shows the easement way on there. It would probably be good to update the map to show, maybe in a different color, what the easements are, so they're not just property owned lands. Most of them are just little straight lines that could be a trail. We can work on that.

Chair Reckdahl: There's also that utility, we talked about this before, at Colorado and West Bayshore that may not be easy to convert into parkland but is at least possible. I had one question for Daren. Esther Clark, are there restrictions? If we wanted to put a playground in Esther Park, can we or is that designated open space where you can't put structures on it?

Mr. Anderson: It is designated open space.

Chair Reckdahl: That was one of the things also in the list, doing stuff for Esther Park. It's similar to Arastradero, where you can't put buildings.

Mr. Anderson: I wouldn't quite go that far. I don't think it has the same stipulations as Arastradero necessarily, but the dedication does say to be used for open space purposes. It differs a little bit from urban parks. I think it's a good question, what exactly is appropriate there or not. I think it probably needs some more fleshing out.

Chair Reckdahl: That is one area that is not served by a traditional park. We have Esther Clark; that's a very nice open space. If you want your kids to play in a playground, there's nothing over there.

Commissioner Lauing: Peter, what's the brown on Rinconada? Is that parking lots or the zoo or both?

Mr. Jensen: The zoo and Lucie Stern on the left side of the page, and the Art Center and the library on the other side.

Commissioner Moss: Is the Stanford Industrial Park owned by Stanford and, therefore, we can't do things on it? That whole park to the south of Page Mill is all owned by Stanford, isn't it? All the way to Bol Park and including Gunn High School, which you have there. The light brown is not Palo Alto land or—what's the difference between the white and the brown?

Mr. Jensen: The browns are, I think, School District land.

Commissioner Moss: No, I meant the land that Stanford is lighter brown than the School District. I can see Gunn High School. Stanford land is a different color than the School District. I was thinking that area around the Stanford Industrial Park should be the same color as the rest of Stanford.

Commissioner Hetterly: I think the Stanford Research Park is owned by Palo Alto and leased by Stanford.

Commissioner Moss: I didn't realize that.

Chair Reckdahl: I think the difference is that Stanford owns the Industrial Park; they lease it out to the various companies for a long-year lease, but Stanford actually owns the land still. It's not incorporated. The Industrial Park is part of Palo Alto; it's in the City Limits. The top or whatever, the light tan that's Stanford, that is not part of Palo Alto.

That's not incorporated. I think that's the difference. I think it's correct as is. White is private property still.

Mr. Jensen: The white is representing those things that fall within the boundary of Palo Alto. Even though that land may be owned by Stanford, it's still in our City Limits. The tan color of Stanford is their sole priority of land outside of our City Limits. That's all I have for this evening. I do want to thank the Commission again. Your feedback is really valuable in this process and putting it together. As you can see from tonight, you've provided a lot of feedback that is good, that is going to guide this process and make it a lot better. We do thank you for that. We will be incorporating your comments into the list as we develop the criteria more and talk about it next month. With that, I'll end my presentation for the night.

Commissioner Lauing: One question that was asked, do we want to do an ad hoc committee. We actually have an ad hoc. Are there things on this that we want to talk about in ad hoc before the next meeting? For example, reviewing the scoring system based on comments tonight.

Mr. Jensen: The ad hoc is a—if you'd like to proceed with having an ad hoc, the ad hoc would be focused on the criteria and making sure the scoring and judging and more conversations about that. That ad hoc group can also include the review of the list as well or that could be another ad hoc or we just leave that to the full Commission and just come back again. Up to you and how you want to tackle that. For some things, of course, I think for the criteria and the list itself as well, it would be nice to have an ad hoc group so we can convene and get feedback from the Commission sooner than once a month, which would help move the project along. I also wouldn't mind having just a Parks Master Plan ad hoc that wasn't specifically tied to a certain topic, so we didn't have to keep having new ones over and over again. We'd just have a core group of the Commission working on the project until we're done with it. That's something for you to discuss further, of course. I don't know if Rob has any recommendations on that.

Mr. de Geus: I think we discussed that at the inception of the Master Plan. Because it's such a big and broad scope of a plan, the Commission wasn't comfortable with that. That's what I recall. Rather to have the whole Commission involved because also there's so many elements that need to be worked on, there was enough opportunity for numerous ad hoc committees to work on specific areas that needed additional work. It's just really up to the Commission how you want to handle that.

Commissioner Hetterly: I think we should clarify to the new Commissioners that ad hoc committees, they are not decision-making bodies. They're just trying to take the temperature of the Commission and weigh in as things are being sorted out. Everything that's considered in an ad hoc committee is then presented to the full Commission.

Mr. de Geus: We often do our best work that way. You have a smaller number of Commissioners working with Staff. Something like the criteria, where we can actually discuss different options about scoring, run a couple of programs through to see how it works, and then change language and then staff will write it up and bring it to the full Commission and say, "Here's what the ad hoc came up with, with staff. What do you think?" It just makes for a little more productive Commission meeting, but it does require another meeting outside of the regular monthly meeting. It can be very, very helpful, I find.

Chair Reckdahl: In general, I'd like to avoid it because this is a big thing. At this point, this list is so rough that I think it would be useful for an ad hoc to get one iteration just so we don't waste too many meetings on this. When I look at this and see how far it is from being useful, I think it would be August by the time we're done with this thing. I would be open to having an ad hoc iteration. If we're going to do that, we should do it before the next meeting. As this converges, I think we want the whole Commission to be taking a look at that.

Commissioner Lauing: Even before the list issue, this issue of should there be weighting, should we drop of some of these criteria entirely, should we add quantitative impact on people, that's something we might be able to distill everything that happened here and come back with a recommendation and why, and then have another discussion about it.

Chair Reckdahl: As long as we present it like that, I'd be happy with that. What do you think?

Mr. de Geus: Staff recommendation is actually an ad hoc committee on the process and criteria and scoring and how we would manage that given the information and presentation today. Not an ad hoc committee on the list. I can appreciate what you're saying. I had trouble with it too. When I first took a look at it, I had to go to it like three different times. What helped me was to actually set aside just a couple of hours and go through it. You begin to get a rhythm and go through and add your comments. You can do it in a couple of hours. I would appreciate hearing from all the Commissioners on the list.

Chair Reckdahl: I think all seven should be sending Peter our assessments. When we give those assessments to MIG and they come back ...

Mr. de Geus: I see what you mean.

Chair Reckdahl: ... I think we need another beat on the head with MIG before we have something that's going to be useful for another meeting.

Commissioner Hetterly: It may be worthwhile to wait and see what comes out if everybody submits their comments and then you have another draft. If we see that and find that it still needs substantial work, then we do an ad hoc at that point.

Chair Reckdahl: I'd be happy with that.

Mr. de Geus: That would be good.

Commissioner Moss: How do ad hoc committees work? How many is minimum in an ad hoc committee?

Commissioner Lauing: (crosstalk) one. Max is three.

Chair Reckdahl: Yeah, we can't have a quorum. There's no decision-making being done. Once you have four people, that's part of the Brown Act. I'm sure that they have that in the binders. Once you have four, you can't talk shop unless it's a public meeting. You can have two or three people sit down with staff and go through things and give some feedback to staff, and that's not considered a public meeting. It doesn't require a public meeting.

Commissioner Hetterly: I'll move that we establish an ad hoc committee to work with staff on the process.

Commissioner Lauing: Don't we already have one that we've been working on this exact same process? It already exists. I don't think we have to ...

Female: (inaudible)

Commissioner Lauing: We can reconstitute it if we want to.

Mr. de Geus: I think that's why we brought it up. We know we have new Commissioners. We ought to do that.

Commissioner Knopper: Who was on it? I've lost track.

Chair Reckdahl: It was us three. We didn't lose anyone off of it. We could keep it unless we want to—personally I think it's most efficient to just keep the three of us and do an iteration if needed.

Mr. de Geus: That would be great.

Chair Reckdahl: The new Commissioners are going to be ...

Mr. de Geus: They're going to get their green binder, so they'll have enough to read. The binder is all of the data on the matrix and the background. There will be a lot there.

Commissioner Hetterly: I would be happy to give up my spot if any of the new members would like to participate on the ad hoc. Not because it's a horrible group to work with.

Commissioner Moss: I can do it, if you want. Up to you. If you want to do it, fine. I'm sort of a deer in the headlights right now. If you don't want to do it, I'll do it.

Chair Reckdahl: I think my preference would be to keep Jennifer on it for this next month while you come up to speed. We can reevaluate the assessment. Are you happy staying on it?

Commissioner Hetterly: That's fine.

Chair Reckdahl: I think Jen's history in it would help to be efficient with the iteration if needed. Peter will be sending via email the updated spreadsheet. We'll go through that spreadsheet. Either type your response via text or put them in the comments and mail it back. They will digest that and find out if they get indigestion or not.

Commissioner Moss: Are you going to send us a soft copy of the spreadsheet?

Mr. Jensen: Yeah. I'm going to email you a copy. Usually how I do that—this is another Brown Act thing—I do blind cc you all so you can't reply to all. Replying to all, you're not supposed to do. If that doesn't happen, if you do see a list, just note that you're not supposed to reply to all.

Chair Reckdahl: Reply to all is not a good thing to do.

Mr. de Geus: We'll have to put some type of deadline on that, fairly early, just so we can get it back to MIG so we can merge the list again so we're ready for our January meeting.

Chair Reckdahl: Mail it out and give your requested due date.

Mr. de Geus: We will.

Chair Reckdahl: Any closing questions, comments?

Commissioner Moss: What was that about January 11th? I thought this was every third Thursday.

Mr. Anderson: That's the Council meeting.

Chair Reckdahl: Are we going back to Council on the 11th?

Mr. de Geus: On January 11th we have a Study Session with the City Council on this plan. I hope you all have that on your calendar; it would be great to have Commission presence and participation at that meeting.

Chair Reckdahl: The updated memo, when is that due?

Mr. de Geus: I know it's due to our City Manager by next Wednesday. After all the internal reviews are done, we can get that out to the Commission.

Chair Reckdahl: Do you need any more Commission input to that?

Mr. Jensen: I don't believe so.

Mr. de Geus: I don't think so. We got a lot. We had tried to get a Study Session earlier, a month ago. We were right there with the report and MIG's report and the Commission's input at that time. It's just been on hold really for the new date.

4. Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates.

Chair Reckdahl: The next item is the ad hoc. The first one would be the CIP.

Daren Anderson: Thank you so much. Again, I'm Daren Anderson with Open Space, Parks and Golf. I want to just share with you ...

Chair Reckdahl: Can you give a two-minute introduction of what a CIP is for the new Commissioners?

Mr. Anderson: I'd like to give you just an update about our capital budget. We call them CIPs, Capital Improvement Projects. Typically they're projects that cost \$50,000 or more. They go into a five-year budget cycle. I'll get into some of the examples in just a minute that will help kind of give you context for what they look like, what we've recently accomplished. Then we'll get into a little bit more of what we're looking at going forward. I'd be glad to answer any questions that you have further regarding CIPs. Let me just start with what we have accomplished in 2015. El Camino Park, we had the ribbon cutting today. It was a great, great achievement, finally seeing the completion of that park and reopening it to the public. We actually reopened it on target. We shot for November; we hit November. November 20th was the soft opening. The public came in.

APPROVED

The second the temporary fencing came down, people just started seeping in, enjoying the park which made staff very happy to see that. Of course, the grand opening today. Scott Park, you can see from the photo another ribbon cutting. That was completed and the park reopened to the public on July 30th of the year. We have the new playground, the new picnic area, a basketball court and our City's first bocce ball court. It's up and running and doing really well. We also provided free bocce balls at that site, and they're well used. The Magical Bridge Playground was opened on April 18th, 2015. Hopkins Park was another Capital Improvement Project. This one was opened also in April 2015. This CIP is a little different. The previous ones you've seen were to reconstruct a park. Sometimes they're studies. In this particular example it's a feasibility study looking at the Boardwalk that stems off the Lucy Evans Baylands Interpretive Center. It's been closed for quite some time, because it was in structural poor repair. The feasibility study came back, gave us some information. One piece of the information was if you carry out these, I guess for lack of a better term, low-cost repairs, you can open up the first 200 feet. In the example in the photo, you can see the arrow indicates where our own staff and Rangers went underneath and fixed up what we could and were able to open up that. Great to have that CIP accomplished. This is another example of an accomplished CIP, but this is a different one. It's an ongoing CIP. This one is tennis court resurfacing. You'll see this one when you look at a capital budget book repeats year after year, same monetary value. That's because it's on a cycle of replacement or fixing. In this last fiscal year we redid Hopkins, Terman and Weisshaar. That's in a nutshell some of what we accomplished in 2015. We probably have five other ongoing CIPs. Some of them are for benches, signs and fences. Others for lakes and ponds. Though you don't see one project that you can say, "Look at this. We accomplished this." It's a lot of little pieces here and there. It's also a tremendous amount of staff time that goes into accomplishing those little pieces. Oftentimes they augment or supplement a project like El Camino Park. There was a tremendous amount of funding, but still there were shortfalls or things that were missed. One small example was \$35,000 in trash receptacles and recycling containers. That came out of one of those recurring CIPs; that's where the benches, signs and fences come in. Another park project where we go over budget and there's not enough for a sign, and we lean on one of our ongoing CIPs that does signage. These are projects underway in 2015, not yet completed. Monroe Park is under construction right now. We're looking at early February for completing that. We've got the Byxbee Park Interim Plan. That was a CIP where the plan was completed, but the actual renovations have started but aren't completed yet. We've got about 90 percent of the trails constructed. The area is being hydroseeded right now. The next steps will be constructing the habitat islands, installing the seating areas and putting in the interpretive signage. Stanford-Palo Alto turf replacement is underway right now. We just got the contract signed, and we should be starting construction in a few weeks. It'll be a 45-day construction window for that project. That's replacing the synthetic turf fields at that site. That's what we've accomplished, and now we're looking at this next CIP cycle. We update it every year. I mentioned it's done in five years. This current cycle we're going to be working on is the

APPROVED

FY '17 to FY '21 cycle. Only the first year in that cycle is funded. This FY '17 that we're just kind of finalizing now will be the one that's funded. The rest are more of a plan that says, "In '18 through '21, where do we think we're going to accomplish? What does it look like? What does it cost?" We build that out. Each year, that kind of gets updated. Is that still right for 2018 or do we lack the capacity to implement it? Are there other priorities that supersede it? That's kind of how we re-envision that CIP plan every year. What I'd like to do is just walk you through some of the things that we've highlighted. The following list that you see on your screen, these are proposed projects not in the existing CIP; they're new. Most of them are coming from either the City's—I mentioned the IBRC, Infrastructure Blue Ribbon Committee. Most of these projects are coming from that or some other staff need that we've identified that hasn't been captured yet. It's a new CIP. I'll just briefly cover some of these. In FY '17, we've got a few. The Children's Theatre black box, this is a particular room also known as the Castle Theatre. It needs some repairs. It was never built up to Code; it lacks insulation. To make it work and function properly, it needs a Capital Improvement Project. The Magical Bridge replacement, I'm not referring to the playground but the actual bridge that leads across the creek to the playground is in need of replacement. The Cubberley tennis courts, they're probably one of our poorer conditioned tennis courts. The nice part about this project is it looks like we'll have funds outside of our general fund revenue. There's a special fund for Cubberley that will help fund this particular one. We're looking at a one-year increase to one of those existing, ongoing projects, the trails CIP. Up at Foothills Park there's a trail called Los Trancos that's got some substantial issues that need to be addressed fundamentally, not through some of our existing funding. It's a one-time bump that we're hoping can address that and fix it on a long-term basis. The Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan, this one is already in the plan. It's already in our existing budget for 2017. A comprehensive conservation plan, as backdrop, is to look at the habitat, the wildlife, the vegetation and give a guide to staff that manages, in this case, the Baylands Preserve and say this is how you best take care of this. This is how you prioritize your volunteer efforts and your restoration and where you allow recreation. Just recently, in conversations with other groups and within our department, we thought we should be augmenting that with a few things. We can expand the funding and the scope just slightly to include a Baylands Interpretive Master Plan. While we're looking at all these other elements, it really lends itself to say, "We're looking at your wildlife. We're looking at your vegetation, your recreation." Now is the perfect time to say, "Is the interpretive messaging supporting that? Is it comprehensive? Is it thematic? Are they done piecemeal?" We believe if we just add a little bit of money we could get that done at the same time. Likewise, there's a public arts component. There's a lot of projects happening in and around the Baylands. Just one example is Ming's is going to be used by Mercedes, it will be taken over as a Mercedes dealership. They're obligated to have some piece of public art there. Rather than having it done piecemeal, that Ming's would do a little piece, the golf course would do a little piece, does it make more sense, as we're looking at the entire Baylands, to say let's have a Public Arts Master Plan tied into there

APPROVED

too, just for the Baylands. That's another CIP where we'd ask for some. We also are looking for an ongoing increase into that CIP trails project. Unlike the one-time bump that I mentioned for Los Trancos Trail, this would be an ongoing slight increase to increase the level of service. We've gotten some feedback that the trails and open space haven't been maintained to the standard that the City would like to see. To do so, we need a little extra money. What that would actually look like is the trail contractor that comes out and services those trails does it twice a year now. We'd get a third service out there, so it's be three brushing trail services with that increase. The same for the benches, signs and fences CIP, another kind of ongoing CIP that we'd like to bump up incrementally just a little to help address and keep up with demand. As I mentioned, it gets drawn on often. El Camino Park was a recent example where \$35,000 was sucked off into one project. We'd like to fund an ongoing restroom CIP. This had been in place before, and it was defunded as we started the Master Plan process. Rather than choosing locations for restrooms somewhat arbitrarily, it made sense to defund it, wait until the Master Plan presented a bunch of options. Is it still a priority? In this preliminary phase where we're at with the Master Plan, we clearly see that park restrooms are a very high priority. It made sense to us to go ahead and refund that CIP. We have a couple of ideas for things, but really the Parks Master Plan could help fill that out. What had been done previously was there was \$200,000, I believe, every year or every other year, and you could do a park restroom. Something like that is what we're going to be proposing for park restrooms. In FY '19, we're looking at a Foothills-Arastradero-Esther Clark Comprehensive Conservation Plan much like that Baylands one I mentioned. This would apply to the Foothills, Arastradero and Esther Clark collectively. We envision something like that is going to take about a year and a half. It is demanding. We specifically staggered the Baylands one so it wouldn't overlap with our efforts on this Park Master Plan, because it's so staff intensive. I'm sure each one of these, the Baylands and then this FY '19 Foothills-Arastradero-Esther Clark one, will be similar. Very heavy public outreach, very staff intensive project. FY '20 Foothills Interpretive Center displays, this would hopefully be something that we learn from that aforementioned in the prior year comprehensive conservation plan for that site, where it informs us and tells us what should the interpretive displays be at the Foothills Interpretive Center. This will be a follow-up CIP to fund that and implement it. In FY '21, we looked at Foothills Park irrigation. This is one where it's reached the end of its lifespan. It's slated out for 25 years; it was 25 years ago from that date that it was previously installed. This CIP would fund its replacement. Likewise ...

Chair Reckdahl: This is irrigation for the meadow or is this elsewhere in the park?

Mr. Anderson: No. The only irrigated spots we've got in Foothills are the upper and lower turf. This is near the entrance and down in front of the Interpretive Center, about 15 acres of turf. With that also the Sunfish Island Bridge replacement. This is the little island in Boronda. The bridge is antiquated and needs to be replaced. Also in FY '21,

APPROVED

Pearson-Arastradero, there was a myriad of items, the fences, the gates, the bridges, were all in this infrastructure backlog listed in 2021. We want to pull them together as one CIP. We'd also like to lump in a seasonal trail improvement element to that Capital Improvement Project. There are a number of trails that are closed every winter, and we believe with minimal upgrades, that is probably rocking and maybe a little reshaping, you wouldn't have to close them as often if at all, if we can do it right. That's some of the things we're looking at. This, is again, a draft; it's not complete. There will be more projects probably. At some point soon, we'll have to kind of filter them down. I didn't mention this yet, but it's also a very competitive year to be proposing projects. The City Council has a number of priorities such as the police building and fire stations that are going to consume a lot of the available funding. At the same time, we feel we've got some important projects that we'd like to move forward and see if we can get them done. The CIP schedule. November and December is typically when staff is pulling these ideas and consulting with our ad hoc committee from the Commission to vet them, make sure we're on track. We recently met with the ad hoc committee with our Commission to discuss these. In mid-December, our CIP submissions are due; we have to put them in. In January, they go through a review committee. The City review committee is predominantly department heads. They help filter down what can make it kind of realistically to the budget. In February, it goes to the City Manager. In early May, it goes to the Planning and Transportation Commission. The Planning and Transportation Commission's role is to make sure that the projects are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. This is typically when we ask a representative or two from the Commission to attend and just kind of listen and observe. Lastly, in May it'll go to the Finance Committee, and in June it would be adopted by the Council. Again, I'll bring this back to the Commission in January as a discussion item, and we can get into some more details. That concludes my presentation.

Chair Reckdahl: Do people have questions either about the process or about the individual projects? Do you want to say anything, Ed?

Commissioner Lauing: No. Keith and I met with Daren and Rob to kick it off, a little bit later than last year, but we'll pick up the pace and get it done. For the new Commissioners, the year '17 starts July 1st of '16.

Chair Reckdahl: The Foothills fire plan, that is in the operating budget now?

Mr. Anderson: That's correct. A former CIP that's been moved to operating.

Chair Reckdahl: The bike bridge, do you have a date of when they're going to start construction?

Mr. Anderson: I don't. I can look into it and get back to you.

Chair Reckdahl: Do you know where we are in the process?

Mr. Anderson: I don't. It's not a Community Services managed project.

Commissioner Knopper: Can I ask a question on an update on a project?

Chair Reckdahl: Sure.

Commissioner Knopper: The hydrologic study at Buckeye Creek on the 7.7 acres, I haven't asked about it in a while. I was just wondering if you could give me some context, where we are.

Mr. Anderson: Great question. It's a high priority for our staff. We've been working closely with Public Works to finalize the scope. The more we started working with the scope, the more we saw we needed to bump it up and make it very robust. We're just finalizing that now. I hope within the next two weeks to have it out to bid. We're anxious to get going, to get a hydrologist firm on and start analyzing this, especially to be timed with El Nino so they can see the impacts of the rain on this creek and how it impacts both Foothills, our shop area and the 7.7 acres.

Commissioner Knopper: A quick follow-up. When they start, how long is their process? How long would it be before you would potentially have results.

Mr. Anderson: I think some of it will depend on the consultation with the hydrologist. Right in the beginning as we go out to bid and they submit their bids, we'll get to see how long they need. I'm not in a position to answer what length of time is enough. Do they need to physically see it, will testimony from prior creek studies be enough? We don't have one on Buckeye Creek proper in Foothills Park; we have studies of adjacent creeks in Arastradero. Is some of that usable? I'm not quite sure. We are hoping that in one calendar year it would be completely done, I'd be back to the Commission to discuss the findings and make a recommendation for Council.

Rob de Geus: I just wanted to add, if you're interested, the City Council is having a special meeting tomorrow evening, a second meeting this week. There is a Study Session on the infrastructure plan update on the IBRC report. As Daren mentioned, there is some really large commitments that have been made and important commitments. The police building is at the top of that list, the fire station, bicycle bridge, bike-pedestrian Master Plan, still Byxbee park and completing that project. There's a lot of demands on the capital budget. I think once we finish the Master Plan, we'll have a much better idea of what we want to include in future five-year plans. There is that staff report that's online. If you're interested, you can attend that meeting tomorrow evening.

Chair Reckdahl: Commissioner Moss.

Commissioner Moss: I heard that there was an urban forest meeting tomorrow. If I go to that, how much input—I guess I can't give any input. Is that correct? I can just listen.

Mr. de Geus: You can always give input as an individual citizen, as long as you make that clear, that it's not input from the body of the Commission.

Commissioner Moss: I've been interested in that all along.

Mr. de Geus: That's something that you would want to state, that this is an individual perspective that I'm sharing. You certainly are able to do that.

Chair Reckdahl: Other ad hocs. Do you want to talk dog parks at all?

Commissioner Hetterly: Yep. I think that was supposed to be on the agenda this month. I don't know why it got bumped. It'll move to next month I guess.

Chair Reckdahl: It got bumped to January.

Commissioner Hetterly: That's all I know.

Mr. Anderson: We're seeking City Manager advice and guidance on a couple of the ad hoc recommendations. We need that input before we can move forward. We'll have that by January, for sure.

Commissioner Hetterly: That'll be as an action item, right?

Mr. Anderson: That could be. I think I'd like to convene one more time with the ad hoc post-meeting with the City Manager and talk that through.

Chair Reckdahl: We're done with ad hocs.

V. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Reckdahl: Rob?

Rob de Geus: I have a few that I would like to share. We had a successful tree lighting event last Friday. I don't know if you had a chance to attend. It's the fifth time we did that at Lytton Plaza. The lights went on, very happy about that. That looks nice. This weekend on Saturday, we're having an event called Frozen, after the movie Frozen still

APPROVED

very popular, at Mitchell Park Community Center and Library, sort of celebrating the first year of being open at that center. The library staff and recreation staff and Children's Theatre have got a whole lot of programs planned for that day. I think 11:00 to 1:00 is when most of the activity happens there. If you're interested in that. We also have a New Year's Senior Brunch for seniors in our community. We've been running that event for many years now. It gets great attendance. We can always use volunteers and help with that. It's on the last day of the year. A countdown that happens at midday. I also wanted to mention tomorrow evening the infrastructure Study Session. There's also another item on the agenda, that is the discussion by Council on the natural environment—I think that's what it's called—element of the Comprehensive Plan. The Council will be reviewing the vision and goals of that particular element. That will then inform the Citizen Advisory Committee that's working on the update to the Comprehensive Plan. That might be of interest to the Commission as well. The last thing I wanted to mention is I've made some decisions on some hiring, which is really exciting. Thank you to Commissioner Lauing who spent a day with us in the interviews. We have a new Assistant Director; she started today. Her name's Kristen O'Kane. She comes from the Santa Clara Water District. Very bright and brings a depth of knowledge in environmental studies I think will be very helpful for our Master Planning process and some of our comprehensive conservation plans that we're invested in making happen. Look forward to introducing her to the Commission. She'll be the key liaison to the Commission going forward. We also hired a Superintendant of Recreation, which is a position that was removed from the budget for a number of years. The Council generously added it back last year, which we're very appreciative of. We've gone through that process and hired someone. Her name is Stephanie Douglas. She comes from Milpitas. A great individual, and I look forward to introducing her to you all as well. That's what I had.

Chair Reckdahl: They both sit over by you?

Mr. de Geus: I'm sorry?

Chair Reckdahl: Their offices are in Lucie Stern?

Mr. de Geus: Kristen O'Kane will be at the Lucie Stern Community Center. Stephanie Douglas will be at the Cubberley Community Center. There's so much going on at Cubberley right now and the future of Cubberley and the Master Planning of that site, we're going to have her stationed there initially.

Commissioner Lauing: You have one more opening still?

Mr. de Geus: There's another promotion that we made. A long time Ranger, Curt Dunn, 28 years, has been promoted to Senior Supervising Ranger for Foothills Park. A terrific

APPROVED

individual. He did outstanding in the interview process. Daren's been mentoring him for some time. It's a thrill to see him step up in that way. He's now a new manager. We now have a vacant Ranger position that we need to fill. Was that what you were referring to?

Commissioner Lauing: I thought you had another supervisor?

Commissioner Hetterly: Superintendant.

Commissioner Lauing: Superintendant, excuse me.

Mr. de Geus: The Superintendant of Parks has been vacant for a year. We finally feel like we have a good pool of candidates for that. We'll be interviewing later this month, hopefully before the end of the calendar year, so we can make some movement on that. Daren would appreciate that. That reminds me there's a lot of recruiting and hiring happening. The Project Safety Net Director position is also in play right now. We've had first interviews. Second interviews are tomorrow. There's three applicants left. It's a long process, largely because there's so many stakeholders involved and need to be part of the process of hiring that person. Those interviews happen tomorrow. The final candidates will meet with Dr. Max McGee from the School District and City Manager Jim Keene. Hopefully we'll have a decision by the end of the calendar year also, if we can.

Chair Reckdahl: I have a couple of things to add. You mentioned the Baylands Boardwalk. A big king tide is coming Christmas. I think the 23rd, 24th, 25th are the big days for the king tide. The Boardwalk will be under water. If you want to see that, that would be ... It's always impressive. I think it's like 10:00 a.m. to noon roughly on those days. A question for Peter. The infant mortality of the items in Magical Bridge. How are they holding up? We have a lot of new items there that we haven't had in parks before.

Peter Jensen: Daren can answer some of this too, because he's been working on it as well. In general, I would say that the playground is actually holding up very, very well for the thousands of users that come to it every week. I think the weakness is that some of the synthetic turf isn't doing as good as we wanted it to. We are looking at different options of repairing or replacing that. Generally though, the equipment is all very good. I think the demand of keeping the area clean, just because of the amount of use, required more attention than was first given to it. In general, I think the playground is doing very, very well. It is holding up very, very well. It's good to see that happening. I will also add that this week the Magical Bridge Playground won a parks design award for its inclusive and cutting edge design for inclusivity. That was very exciting as well.

APPROVED

Mr. de Geus: I'm not sure if I've shared this with the Commission. It's been really interesting opening up this playground, the Magical Bridge Playground. The new Commissioners have been there. It's a universally accessible playground that people of all abilities can play. It's one of the best in the country, so it's getting a lot of attention, not only nationally but internationally. What we've experienced is, one, the maintenance is a big job because it gets so many visitors. There's 150 people there every day or at any time almost. Another thing that we're experiencing is there are so many people there and most of the kids that are playing there are actually able-bodied kids. I spoke to a couple of parents that have kids with disabilities, and they go there and it's overwhelming. They actually can't get access to some of the play equipment. It's really a challenge and a problem. This is a new area and we need to work on it. The Friends of the Magical Bridge who raised the money to build the playground have been tremendous support of the playground and are there a lot and have started an ambassador program where they have actually children learn about people with different abilities. They get T-shirts and a little bit of training. They look out for kids that may need some help or make sure they get access to certain play equipment. There is a programming element to this particular playground that needs attention and focus and some resources. We're working with the Friends to see how we can keep them in play and helping support that playground with a volunteer program or some other thing. Pretty interesting. Great addition to the system, but there's some challenges that we're learning about.

Commissioner Moss: That's our neighborhood park. It's an incredible number of people. Talking to some of the parents who have autistic children, you can't tell that they're autistic. They bring along their siblings who don't have a problem. Having the combination of all those is pretty incredible. It's really amazing.

Chair Reckdahl: I'm always mobbed when I go there. It's very impressive. Let's move on.

Commissioner Hetterly: I have a couple of calendar items, since we got our important dates calendar. I just thought to add on January 11th along with the Master Plan Council Study Session, Council will be reviewing the Community Services and Facilities element of the Comprehensive Plan as revised by the Community Advisory Committee. I guess the last action by the Community Advisory Committee will be next week, December 16th. That's a subcommittee for that element, then Council will review it on January 11th, when I saw it last. January 19th, there is a joint Council session with the Community Advisory Committee for the Comp Plan and Council on the Comprehensive Plan Draft Environmental Impact Review.

Chair Reckdahl: Anything else? Okay.

VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR JANUARY 26, 2016 MEETING

Chair Reckdahl: Next month we have dog parks, either a discussion item or action item, hopefully action item. Commissioner Hetterly and I, after El Camino Park, went over and checked out the area. It does look very promising. It's a slippery slope whenever you start—it's very rough. We don't expect it to be polished, but I think it would be a good learning experience for the City. Dog parks next month.

Commissioner Lauing: The Boardwalk?

Chair Reckdahl: Yeah, Boardwalk is coming in January. Are we coming back with the Master Plan also? We have the Master Plan.

Male: (inaudible).

Chair Reckdahl: Master Plan, dog parks and Boardwalk.

Rob de Geus: I'll have to check in with the Junior Museum and Zoo team to see if they're ready. I suspect they will be.

Chair Reckdahl: We have CIPs also. CIPs and perhaps Junior Museum.

Mr. de Geus: We also generally select the Chair and Vice Chair at the January meeting.

Chair Reckdahl: Are we planning to do the retreat as our regular February meeting or are we going to schedule that between meetings?

Commissioner Lauing: My guess is we're going to have to schedule it separately, because of the workload of the Master Plan.

Chair Reckdahl: We'll talk about then in January. Schedule retreat.

Commissioner Cowie: Could you talk a little bit more about that? So I can get a sense for it and get a sense for what the calendar looks like.

Chair Reckdahl: The retreat usually occurs typically on a Friday morning. Do we go like 9:00 'til noon, something like that? We just get together. It's basically another meeting, but we just get together and not talk about new meetings but talk about planning for the year, talk about what the ad hocs we want, what issues we want to work on. It's an organizational meeting, big picture and it's both the little picture stuff that we do here each week.

APPROVED

Commissioner Cowie: Could we schedule it now? I'm just concerned if we wait 'til late January that it might be challenging to make it work.

Mr. de Geus: We can send out a poll. Friday seemed to work best for most people in the past couple of years, like a Friday morning. Look for a date in February, see what works for most people.

Commissioner Cowie: As long as we do that relatively soon, that would be helpful. As long as I have enough notice, I can probably pull it off. If it's two or three weeks in advance, it might be tricky.

Mr. de Geus: Fair enough.

Chair Reckdahl: Cat is sending out a poll then.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned on motion by Commissioner Hetterly and second by Commissioner Cribbs at 10:00 p.m.