



APPROVED

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

**MINUTES  
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING  
January 23, 2018  
CITY HALL  
250 Hamilton Avenue  
Palo Alto, California**

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

15 **Commissioners Absent:** Ryan McCauley

16 **Others Present:**

17 **Staff Present:** Daren Anderson, Catherine Bourquin, Peter Jensen

18 **I. ROLL CALL CONDUCTED BY:** Catherine Bourquin

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

20 Chair Reckdahl: Next is Agenda Changes, Request, and Deletions. I think we're going  
21 to keep everything as is, no changes.

22 **III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

23 Chair Reckdahl: The next—for the public, we like to see you here. One of our charges is  
24 to facilitate communication with the public. You're the public, so we're very glad you're  
25 here. If you want to speak on any topic, whether it's on the agenda or not, you fill out a  
26 speaker card and give it to Catherine. Also, all the handouts are over there. If you do not  
27 have the handouts, please go over and pick them up. We have four speakers. We're  
28 going to start with David Carnahan.

29 David Carnahan: Thank you, Chair Reckdahl and Commissioners. David Carnahan,  
30 Deputy City Clerk. As you are probably well aware, I am here to talk about Board and  
31 Commission recruitment. The Clerk's Office comes out to all Board and Commission  
32 meetings to encourage both our Commissioners to reach out to the community when the  
33 City is recruiting for Boards and Commissions, but also to spread the word with the  
34 public. The City is currently looking to fill one position on the Historic Resources Board,



APPROVED

1 three on the Human Relations Commission, three on the Public Art Commission, and two  
2 on the Utilities Advisory Commission. These are great ways to help impact your  
3 community, influence your community, and help give back and help make Palo Alto  
4 continue being the great place that it is. I'm going to have flyers for each of you. I can't  
5 give all of you homework, but their homework is to reach out to at least two community  
6 members and encourage them to apply. The deadline is March 20th to apply. There is a  
7 residency requirement for a few of these. Several of them including the Public Art  
8 Commission, you're not required to be a Palo Alto resident. I'll leave these for the  
9 Commission. These will be over at the back for members of the public if you're  
10 interested in perhaps volunteering on a Board or Commission yourself or know someone  
11 in the community that you think would be a good fit. Thank you.

12 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you, David. Now, we'll move on. Lynn Kiapela [phonetic]  
13 wants to talk about Hoover dog fence height. Lee Caswell's on deck.

14 Lynn Kiapela: I'm Lynn Kiapela. I have a 10-pound dog, kind of a little Chihuahua. She  
15 can easily jump the fence at Hoover Park. It's 27 inches high. The big dogs just walk  
16 over the fence. She jumps the fence. The benches placed—if I guard the fence so she  
17 can't jump, the benches are placed so that any dog can get up on the bench and just step  
18 over and run through the park, for which we then get tickets. Now, I've been banned  
19 from Hoover Park because she gives the idea to other dogs to jump the fence and chase  
20 squirrels or whatever they see out there. I would appreciate if that would be put on some  
21 kind of maintenance schedule to put that at least to the 3 1/2-4-foot height. It varies  
22 completely around the little dog park. It goes from 27 inches to 34 inches, and it may be  
23 higher somewhere else. I have pictures, and I've actually gone out and measured all over.  
24 That would be very helpful. Maybe I could take her back in the park, and they won't kick  
25 me out again. Thank you.

26 Chair Reckdahl: That is a good suggestion. Daren, what is the height on the new dog  
27 park?

28 Daren Anderson: Five feet.

29 Chair Reckdahl: Five feet. We eventually will be getting all the dog parks up to that  
30 height. We've had this complaint before, and we need to address it. Lee Caswell.

31 Lee Caswell: I'm Lee Caswell. I'm a longtime Palo Alto resident and also a longtime  
32 competitive tennis player as well; although, I'm holding something that looks a little  
33 foreign. This is a pickleball racket. I'd just like to say although I played college tennis,  
34 most recently I've been playing pickleball. I was brought into the sport by my son, who's  
35 18. What's interesting about this as a longtime resident is that all the people here, who  
36 I've played with, I've never met before; although, I've lived in Palo Alto for over 25  
37 years. I met them through pickleball. The way we met was my son and I went down to

1 play. There are two courts that aren't quite pickleball courts down in Mitchell Park.  
2 While we were there, we heard this distinctive sound. It was just heartwarming to go  
3 across and find almost 100 people on Saturday and Sunday mornings going to play. As  
4 we basically looked, what's interesting is it could be because of the sound that people  
5 come over to figure out what the heck is going on over here. You've got all these new  
6 people coming in. It is a community-building experience. We see routinely people  
7 coming in to go say, "What are you doing?" They come in at the end of the courts. Right  
8 now, the courts are not ideal. They are tennis courts that are converted every week.  
9 People slog out a set of basically nets that they build and construct each week. It's a labor  
10 of love, I would say. What you'll find is that you're watching not just all ages play  
11 together. When was the last time you saw a competitive game between an 18-year-old  
12 and an 83-year old? I saw it; it happened there. It's amazing. Between different sexes,  
13 genders. Certainly there are people who are from Palo Alto, some not. It's that building  
14 together that makes Palo Alto great. Thank you very much.

15 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you, Lee. Tom Foladare is up next.

16 Tom Foladare: Good evening. As you can see, we have a pretty large contingent of  
17 pickleball players here tonight. We've decided instead of having everybody speak for 3  
18 minutes that we would just have two of us speak so that everybody can go home and not  
19 be here for breakfast. Several months ago I addressed the Commission on the status of  
20 our group. Tonight I'm going to spend a minute or so just giving you guys an update.  
21 First to start off with some national statistics. Pickleball now has 2.8 million players in  
22 the U.S., and that's growth of about 12% year over year. It continues to grow. We kind  
23 of use that as our benchmark to see if we're doing well and where our growth is. To give  
24 you some of our stats. We ended this year at 350 members. Our growth rate month over  
25 month is 10%, so we're doing fairly well there. We anticipate losing some members  
26 because the courts are becoming oversubscribed. We're finding when people have to wait  
27 more than one game on the bench they tend to leave and not come back as often. We also  
28 anticipate losing some members because other communities around here have started  
29 building dedicated courts. We're now seeing that most of our new members are from  
30 either the Palo Alto area or some of the adjoining communities. We're not seeing people  
31 come over from the East Bay or come down from San Francisco as much. We do believe  
32 that our growth rate is going to be greater than our attrition rate. We think it'll still grow  
33 even though we are declining in some areas. The other issues that came up in the last  
34 meeting was the Board was concerned about participation rate. This is just for last week.  
35 On Monday we had 48 players; on Tuesday we had 44 players; on Wednesday we had 36  
36 players; on Thursday we had 46 players; on Friday we had 20 players; on Saturday 59  
37 players; and on Sunday 92 players. This is using three tennis courts. That's pretty much  
38 it.

1 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. Jenny Chan, you're up next, followed by Margaret  
2 Lawrence.

3 Jenny Chan: Hi. My name's Jenny, and I'm a tennis player. I have occasionally played  
4 pickleball. I do recognize that a pickleball community is growing. However, Mitchell  
5 Park, those three courts are not the right place for it because the tennis community do  
6 need those courts. I was just there tonight at 6:00 p.m. Out of those three courts, two  
7 were taken by tennis player. One was taken by eight pickleball players on one court.  
8 You can see tennis player do need those courts. Last Sunday I was there over the long  
9 weekend. It was 8:30 in the morning. All three courts, two of them were taken by tennis  
10 player, and one was unutilized. There was not one single pickleball player. I do feel that  
11 the City needs to find a win-win situation for both groups and build brand-new pickleball  
12 players [sic] somewhere else but not at Mitchell Park tennis.

13 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you, Jenny. Margaret Lawrence followed by John Park.

14 Margaret Lawrence: Hi. My name is Margaret Lawrence, and I'm a Palo Alto citizen. I  
15 work in Palo Alto as well. I also play tennis at Mitchell Park. Everybody here—I'm just  
16 motivated because everybody wants to do activity. I don't like to see pickleball against  
17 tennis, but I have to say that I've been to the tennis courts many Saturday mornings.  
18 There's nobody playing pickleball. Tonight I was there; I came right off the courts.  
19 Nobody was playing pickleball. I do want to emphasize that the pickleball courts are not  
20 lit, so that could be one of the reasons. I don't think Mitchell Park is a place for  
21 pickleball. I like to hear that the community is growing up pickleball, but it does concern  
22 me that 95 people were on the pickleball courts. Where are they parking? That's a lot of  
23 people on our courts in our community. Ninety-five people from Palo Alto especially are  
24 there; I get concerned about that. I'd like you to consider that. Thank you.

25 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you, Margaret. John Park followed by Tre [phonetic].

26 John Park: Hi. My name is John Park. I'm a 40-year resident of the Bay Area. I am a  
27 tennis player. I'd like to address our point of view. Tennis has been great for me. I've  
28 been playing tennis 35 years. During that time, I've met so many different people from  
29 different professions. In my personal group, we have about 20 tennis players in our  
30 group alone. Of course, we don't all show up at the same time. We may have as low as  
31 two people, up to 20 people. When we come to Mitchell Park to play tennis, two courts  
32 are taken by lessons during the evening. Sometimes you have the pickleball folks taking  
33 one court. Sometimes we have available about two courts. When it gets really crowded,  
34 sometimes in my group we have maybe ten people on one court. We have to alternate.  
35 We're actually kind of a good user of the tennis courts in that we play in the evenings  
36 from 8:00 to 10:00 p.m. We're professionals and students across the Bay Area who come  
37 from very far away. Tennis has been a great opportunity for us professionals who meet.  
38 When we have time available, it's a good time for us to meet and discuss things around

1 our social life and all that. It's an incredible time for us to exercise and get together. We  
2 like the opportunity. Thank you very much.

3 Chair Reckdahl: We're going to move on to Tre.

4 Tre: Hi. My name is Tre. Real quick, I'm the tennis ladder organizer at Mitchell Park.  
5 Obviously, we love to play tennis there. Just a quick history. Since we've been there the  
6 last couple of years, we notice that pickleball people have come and started utilizing  
7 courts 5-7. We're all for you guys. Additionally, you guys had it in a manner where you  
8 tape the courts. Initially, we thought that was very dangerous because we may trip and  
9 fall, but we did not bring it up to the City. We did not make a big deal out of it. We  
10 thought we could share these courts as long as you guys are done, take it off, we're good  
11 to go. Even better now, you guys redrew all the lines. It's a little confusing overall for  
12 tennis players, but we also did not complain. We enjoy the fact that you guys would like  
13 to access these courts at a certain time, and I think that's wonderful. Now, the quick thing  
14 I wanted to mention was let's practice inclusivity here. We're open-minded. We let you  
15 guys do what you needed to do to these tennis courts. The issue of these courts are  
16 underutilized by tennis players, I want to correct that. I have a list. We have a petition  
17 going, and we have more than 112 people that signed up already.

18 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. We're moving onto Kay Carey please.

19 Tre: Please know that there are a lot of people that have—we want you guys to do what  
20 you guys do, but we recommend a better solution than just to get rid of courts 5-7.

21 Chair Reckdahl: Kay, you have—no applause please. We have limited time. Please no  
22 applause. You're wasting our time. Move onto Kay Carey. You have 1 minute please.

23 Kay Carey: Hello. I'm Kay Carey. I'm a 30-year resident of Palo Alto. We also have  
24 our law firm here. I've been past president of the Palo Alto Tennis Club where our big  
25 project was to get the Cubberley courts lit. At that time, we were able to show the City  
26 that there is a serious shortage of lit tennis courts where they're really needed at night.  
27 You might think about lighting Cubberley. With respect to the pickleball court, since  
28 there is such a tremendous shortage of lit tennis courts and they're a precious commodity,  
29 first you should consider who is using the courts. The Palo Alto residents are the  
30 majority members of the Palo Alto Tennis Club. Many residents buy homes here so they  
31 can play tennis. You're talking about local people using courts. The study that was  
32 conducted by the City only measured permits. That is for a different type of tennis use.  
33 That is not the neighbor who comes out with friends and plays on tennis courts. It is  
34 underreporting the usage of tennis players. You should also consider using the area with  
35 the little courts at Mitchell Park. You could maybe convert those to pickleball courts.  
36 You wouldn't have to tear down the handball fence.

1 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you, Kay. We'll move onto Carrie Woollett [phonetic]. No  
2 applause please.

3 Carrie Woollett: I'm a member of the Palo Alto Tennis Club. We play every Tuesday  
4 night. I've been playing for a long time, enjoy the tennis courts. I think there's room for  
5 pickleball too, but I think we need to share it. Right now there's a shortage of lit courts.  
6 There's two courts next to the other courts, the lower number courts, that could be used  
7 for pickleball, but there's no lighting on those. I think there might be some other work  
8 that needs to be done to adjust to pickleball. The main thing is I think there's room for  
9 everybody. Taking away lit courts for tennis, which are at a big, big premium right now,  
10 is not the way to go. I think it's finding another place for pickleball so they can enjoy it  
11 and that both groups can continue to enjoy the sports.

12 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. Thank you for all the input. We do appreciate it. We  
13 understand the pickleball people love pickleball and tennis people love tennis. We have  
14 limited resources here, and we have a lot of work to do to figure how to optimize the use  
15 of these. We are not going to make any knee-jerk decisions. This will probably be a long  
16 and painful process, but we have a lot of work to do to figure out how best to use the  
17 courts. We're going to ask you for more input later on. This is not the last we're going to  
18 talk about this. We have one more speaker, Rulong Zo [phonetic]. Rulong, you have 1  
19 minute.

20 Rulong Zo: Hi. My name is Rulong. I'm a tennis player. We've been using the tennis  
21 court in Mitchell Park for more than a decade. It's always been very crowded and very  
22 limited for usage. We always have some people there. Mainly, we're doing this for our  
23 kids, especially during the afterschool time. I've been asking my kids if there is also a lot  
24 of kids playing pickleball as well. The answer is pretty much no. I haven't seen any  
25 juniors playing pickleball. However, on the tennis side, definitely a lot of time that we all  
26 have kids on the court. You can see parent, and you can see kids play each other. The  
27 resource is very limited. I wanted this committee and also both tennis and the pickleball  
28 community understand each other. We have this tennis court there. We want to share  
29 with the pickleball community. Definitely, we don't like the idea of converting the very  
30 limited tennis resource permanent to pickleball. Basically our kids will suffer. That's all.

31 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you very much. All I'll say is keep your ears tuned. We will  
32 have more on this. It will be a discussion item in future meetings where we will propose  
33 different things, and we'll want more public input. Like I said, we're not going to make  
34 any knee-jerk decisions. We have a lot of work to do to optimize the use of these courts.  
35 Thank you. We'll move on.

#### 36 **IV. DEPARTMENT REPORT**

37 Chair Reckdahl: The next ... Next is Department Report.

APPROVED

1 Mr. Anderson: Good evening. Daren Anderson, Open Space, Parks, and Golf. I've got a  
2 couple of notes to share with you. One is about the Baylands Comprehensive  
3 Conservation Plan. That project is moving on nicely. The next—can you guys hear me  
4 okay? The next community meeting is on February 15th at 6:30-8:00 p.m. at Mitchell  
5 Park Community Center. You're welcome to come to that. We have that same large  
6 group of stakeholders that are attending and participating. It's moving along well. I also  
7 plan on bringing the Commission a report on where we're at with the project as a  
8 discussion item soon. That one on the 15th is 6:30-8:00 p.m. That is February 15th from  
9 6:30-8:00 p.m. at Mitchell Park Community Center. I think I might wait just a second. I  
10 had mentioned we have the upcoming Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan  
11 meeting. I'll bring you more information on that soon. Again, our public meeting  
12 February 15th, 6:30-8:00 p.m. at Mitchell Park Community Center. Still working on the  
13 closed trails at Foothills Park. I know we've talked about that one for a while. The  
14 current status is we're having a dialog back and forth with the Planning Department, the  
15 City's own Planning Department. When we did those original surveys, there was one  
16 plant that wasn't in flower, and we have to do another plant survey to identify that plant.  
17 Sometimes these little sticky things get in the way, but I'm going to do my best to keep  
18 pushing that forward. We'll get that done as soon as possible. The Park Improvement  
19 Ordinance for Peers Park dog park goes to Council on the 29th. Peter Jensen and I are  
20 working on that, putting out the bid almost concurrently. As soon as they approve, the  
21 bid goes out, and we get that whole project moving forward. I'm excited about that. June  
22 29th, Monday, June 29th. I'm sorry, January 29th.

23 Vice Chair Moss: Best case, when would you be able to start development?

24 Mr. Anderson: I think it'll largely be driven by when we get the bids back and get the  
25 contract in place, less so on the—2 weeks after the first reading of the PIO, there's a  
26 second reading, and then there's a 30-day window before you can start construction. It'll  
27 be largely driven by the response from the bidders on the project. We're guessing the  
28 whole process will be about 3 months. Commissioner McDougall had asked if I'd  
29 provide a brief update on the status of the non-native plant called stinkwort. Give me 1  
30 second, and I'll pull up a photo of this. This is what that plant looks like before it  
31 flowers. It's shaped like a little tiny Christmas tree. This is it with its yellow flowers.  
32 Sometimes it'll grow a little bushier, but oftentimes they're like a Christmas tree. You'll  
33 see it all over. It was in the news recently as a big issue with this non-native plant. I'll  
34 give you a little bit of facts and where we stand and what we personally are doing about it  
35 in Palo Alto open space in particular. The scientific name is *Dittrichia graveolens*. I only  
36 say that because there are so many different kinds of stinkworts and stinkweeds.  
37 *Dittrichia* is the word we use most commonly within the industry, with open space staff.  
38 The *Dittrichia* is an invasive weed. It comes from California. It came here in the 1980s.  
39 When I say invasive, what does that mean? It's an invasive non-native. It's native to  
40 southern Europe and northern Africa. It came over here in the '80s probably with nursery

1 stock or maybe even some sort of cattle feed or something. It starts to spread and out-  
2 competes areas. It loves disturbed areas. Any time we've got areas that earth has been  
3 moved—the greatest example is Byxbee Park where all 120 acres were freshly turned  
4 over when we converted it from the landfill to a park and had to bring it back to grade so  
5 it'd drain properly. It just invited in all those kinds of weeds, especially this one. It's also  
6 got very, very resinous plants, so the seeds stick to wheel tires. As vehicles come in like  
7 the landfill that had to get hundreds of thousands of yards of soil to get it to grade  
8 appropriate, all those seeds came in on those tires. That's where we see it, up and down  
9 280 and where vehicles are coming in and to some degree even on bicycle tires or so I'm  
10 told. Why is it a problem? Invasive weeds in general are a problem because they  
11 interfere with our flora and fauna. They displace our native wild plants, our native plants  
12 that so much of our wildlife is dependent upon. They've co-evolved with these species of  
13 plants. As we displace those and get mono-cultures of ones like this Dittrichia, the  
14 stinkwort, they start crowding out all those natives. This is not something our native  
15 wildlife grew up with. It doesn't support our insect population. Consequently, we start  
16 pushing that wildlife out, and it degrades the habitat. That's the big problem. When did  
17 it first arrive in Palo Alto? I found it in 2005 at the Baylands Nature Preserve. I was  
18 working as the Supervising Ranger at the time, and we got an alert from Santa Clara  
19 County saying, "There's this new weed coming out. Keep your eye out." We found it.  
20 It's a longstanding restoration technique that you attack vigorously and aggressively new  
21 invaders because you've got a chance to control them is the concept. We did that. We  
22 devoted everything we had. In those first 2 years, 2005 and 2006, there were times where  
23 we got rid of every plant in the Preserve. The problem is some of these plants will put off  
24 70,000 seeds. If you miss one or they come in on more tires and that kind of thing, you're  
25 in a lot of trouble. Even though we controlled those early years really well, we're  
26 experiencing exponential growth, 300% growth the first year, even more the next year.  
27 In certain years, we do okay on the control. We do work at like Byxbee, where we  
28 regraded that, and invited all these other weeds. Another common question is where is  
29 our stinkwort problem most acute right now. It's at the Baylands, largely at Byxbee Park.  
30 It's tough. A lot of people want to say, "How many acres do you have?" It's difficult  
31 because it's intermixed with so many different other species of weeds and some natives  
32 too. It's hard for me to put an acreage on it. I'm hesitant to because I think it's  
33 misleading. I will say it's a significant problem and something we are still putting our  
34 best effort towards, although not exclusively. What happens a lot is a new weed will  
35 come out or maybe even an older one catches the public attention. Everyone says,  
36 "You've got to drop what you're doing. Everything should be focused on that." That's  
37 not entirely true. Cal-IPC, the California Invasive Plant Council, rates this weed as  
38 moderately invasive. It is a big deal, and we do care, and we are working towards it. I  
39 spoke with one of the Baylands rangers today to say, "Of the amount of work you're  
40 putting towards invasive weeds, how much would you say is towards this particular  
41 one?" She said about 20%. There are a lot of invasive weeds that are either as  
42 concerning or more. A couple of examples are the spartina, the non-native cord grass.



1 You might have heard of this one before. There was an entire team Bay-wide. Federal,  
2 state, local, county agencies all doing whatever they can to go aggressively after this one  
3 weed. It doesn't get the attention perhaps that this one does most recently, but it's a big  
4 deal. It has the potential to clog up your wetlands to the point where there's no shore  
5 birds, no mud flats for them to feed on. It would preclude your clapper rail, your  
6 federally endangered species. That's an example where the entire Bay came together and  
7 worked towards eradicating that. We've made strides, but it's still not done. I guess I say  
8 that in the context of this update to say there are other important weeds too that we focus  
9 on and a myriad of others that I could tell you about. Stinkweed's got the attention right  
10 now, which is good, because we want people to pay attention to the harm that invasive  
11 plants can have on our ecosystems. It's good to know—I just want to temper that with  
12 there's other important ones too that we want to pay attention to and plan.

13 Chair Reckdahl: How does the City attack this? Do we have volunteers or do we pay  
14 consultants at all or contractors?

15 Mr. Anderson: That's a good question. Primarily it's through staff, contractors and  
16 volunteers. We have a significant number of volunteers. For example, we have 8,000  
17 volunteer hours at the Baylands annually, 8,000 volunteer hours. While the staff  
18 contribution in terms of time and hours is much less, oftentimes if we time it right you  
19 can do things like hit it with a tractor mower coming through. This particular weed is  
20 difficult. If you don't time it just right, all you'll do is get it to grow much shorter and  
21 flower at like a 3-4 inch height rather than it's normal 1 1/2-2 foot, which makes it very  
22 difficult to eradicate with that technique. Most commonly, it's hand weeding. That's  
23 where you get those advantages of bringing in a group of 50 people with a guided expert,  
24 either a ranger or maybe someone from our partner organizations. Grassroots and Save  
25 the Bay are our two main organizations that facilitate those programs and are  
26 instrumental really in the control that we have achieved. I'll say this too; this is  
27 something you'll not hear very often. You'll hear, "Yes, we've got to get rid of it. We've  
28 got to pull it." The problem is there's typically weed succession. This is growing in a  
29 disturbed site typically, where we haven't had natives or it's been turned over or vehicles  
30 have gone through or something to that effect. When you pull it, you've disturbed the  
31 soil even more, especially if you've gotten in and dug it out for any reason. All that does  
32 is encourage the next weed to come in. If it's not stinkwort, it's going to be another  
33 invasive weed taking its place, unless you do what we do. We have two nurseries in both  
34 Foothills, and one at the Baylands. We grow 10,000 plants a year in that Baylands  
35 facility to plant in the Baylands. What we do is as we pull out those weeds, we end up  
36 replanting. The ultimate defense to this kind of thing is to have a dense, healthy stand of  
37 native vegetation where it can't get a hold. That's the real long-term solution. Endlessly  
38 pulling it and only having the next weed come in, perhaps the same weed come in the  
39 next year, is not a very successful restoration technique in my opinion. I did it for a  
40 decade at the Baylands and got to see what happened. Restoration is slow, and that's kind

1 of frustrating, especially when you look at Byxbee where we've got 120 acres of land.  
2 Dittrichia is probably spread out and mixed over a third of it. It's a really, really  
3 significant infestation. We're going to keep working on it. We're going to keep using  
4 new techniques. The latest we're looking at is a more aggressive agricultural steamer, no  
5 herbicide, no hand pulling. You drive over it with superhot water and cook this thing.  
6 Looking at techniques like that, continuing with our volunteers, continuing with our  
7 experts at Save the Bay and Grassroots to target this, and hopefully learning more from  
8 our neighboring agencies too. That's kind of the status of the stinkwort. Any questions  
9 on that, that I can help answer for anybody? That concludes the report.

10 Commissioner McDougall: I just want to say thank you for being so responsive.

11 Mr. Anderson: That concludes the Department—yes, sir.

12 Vice Chair Moss: I have one other subject, and that is the tennis versus pickleball. Is it  
13 possible for you to get a group together from both of those groups to privately, like you  
14 did with the Rinconada pool—that was so successful the way you worked out a  
15 compromise—and then come back to us in a month or ...

16 Commissioner Greenfield: Actually the ad hoc has been working with Daren and with  
17 Adam on this already.

18 Mr. Anderson: Good suggestion. That's often the success (crosstalk).

19 Chair Reckdahl: Who's in the ad hoc? You?

20 Commissioner Greenfield: And Anne and Don.

21 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. We'll move on.

22 **V. BUSINESS:**

23 **1. Approval of Draft Minutes from the December 19, 2017 Parks and**  
24 **Recreation Commission meeting.**

25 Approval of the draft December 19, 2017 Minutes was moved by Commissioner  
26 McDougall and seconded by Vice Chair Moss. Passed 6-0 McCauley absent

27 **2. Election of Chair for 2018**

28 Chair Reckdahl: Next is election of Chair for next year. Let me first give a quick  
29 description of what the Chair actually does. Each month, we get together—it's usually  
30 virtual—get the agenda and figure out not only what needs to be done but also can we fit  
31 it in the meeting and then pass that out. We work with Kristen on developing that agenda

**APPROVED**

1 each month. The Chair runs the meeting each month and also represents the Commission  
2 at the Council if needed. The Chair and the Vice Chair together organize the retreat  
3 every year. There's a yearly meeting where the Vice Chair and the Chair meet with the  
4 Mayor and Vice Mayor and just talk about priorities and just exchange thoughts. Finally,  
5 that Council study session that we usually have about once a year. Those are the  
6 responsibilities of the Chair. I've enjoyed being the Chair. I would prefer not to do it  
7 next year. I encourage others to volunteer. I was nervous when we had all this turnover  
8 last year that we'd be able to get some leadership. I think the new people have come up  
9 and ramped up very quickly and become very useful. I'm confident that we can find  
10 someone who will be not only a good Chair but will have different ideas and have new  
11 things to talk about and a new outlook on things. Do we have any nominations for Chair?

12 **NOMINATION**

13 Commissioner Greenfield: I'd like to nominate Don to be the Chair. Besides our current  
14 Chair, he has the most Commission experience having come from the Library  
15 Commission. I think he's been very solid and steady in the past year on the Parks and  
16 Rec Commission. I've enjoyed working with him, and I'd encourage him to accept the  
17 nomination.

18 Chair Reckdahl: Don, do you accept the nomination?

19 Commissioner McDougall: It's very flattering. Thank you, Jeff. I do accept the  
20 nomination. I think this is an important committee, and I'd like to continue to do as much  
21 as I can. Thank you. Yes, I will.

22 Chair Reckdahl: David, do you ... Any other nominations? Failing that, fill out the  
23 votes for ...

24 Catherine Bourquin: You can just circle. I had a copying problem there.

25 Chair Reckdahl: Just circle the name.

26 **VOTE**

27 Ms. Bourquin: Six for Commissioner McDougall. [McCauley absent]

28 Commissioner Cribbs: Could I just, as one of the Commissioners, say how much I have  
29 appreciated your being the Chair and your steady guidance and all the work you've put  
30 into this. I just wanted to thank you very much, Keith.

31 Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you. I enjoyed it. Like I said, I was nervous about this  
32 Commission, but I've been very happy. It's been a very productive year, and I appreciate

1 all the work you guys do. It's good to have good Commissioners. The Council did a  
2 good job selecting some very high caliber candidates. Thank you.

3 Chair McDougall: I only accept this position with the assumption that I can trust you to  
4 help me as I need help. Thank you, Keith. You've done a great job.

5 Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you.

6 Chair McDougall: The other thing I'd like to do, before we get started, just to make  
7 sure—Chinese New Year's coming up, and it'll be the year of I'm not sure what. I'd like  
8 to declare this the year of the stinkwort for the Board.

9 **3. Election of Vice Chair for 2018**

10 Chair McDougall: I guess we should now have nominations for Vice Chair. Do I have  
11 any nominations for Vice Chair? David.

12 **NOMINATION**

13 Vice Chair Moss: I nominate Jeff Greenfield. He's been on a number of subcommittees  
14 and has been another steady influence. His growing leadership is really good. I  
15 recommend him.

16 Chair McDougall: Are there any other nominations? Do we have a ballot for this or  
17 shall we use a show of hands?

18 Ms. Bourquin: There were two ballots.

19 Chair McDougall: I do have a ballot. If you would then please fill out your ballot. I  
20 guess first I should make sure—Jeff, are you happy to accept this nomination?

21 Commissioner Greenfield: Thank you for the kind words, David. I do accept the  
22 nomination. I would be honored to support Don and the rest of the Commission in this  
23 regard. Thank you.

24 Chair McDougall: Thanks, Jeff.

25 **VOTE**

26 Ms. Bourquin: Six for Commissioner Greenfield. [McCauley absent]

27 Chair McDougall: Congratulations, Jeff.

28 Vice Chair Greenfield: Thank you. Now, we can move on with the agenda. Jeff, I  
29 understand you'd like to leave.

1 Vice Chair Greenfield: Yes, I have some family business to tend to. Thank you.

2 Chair McDougall: Thank you for being here.

3 [Vice Chair Greenfield left the meeting.]

4 **4. Update on Buckeye Creek Hydrology Study and Recommendation to Council**

5 Chair McDougall: The next item, Item Number 4, we have the update on the Buckeye  
6 Creek hydrology study. I would like to note to staff and to members that there are five  
7 items with some of them saying half an hour. If we take half an hour for everyone of  
8 these, we'll be here at 11:00. I'm sure we're willing to do that. I'm not sure we're willing  
9 to do that to you. We'll try and be careful with our response to your reports.

10 Mr. Anderson: Thank you. Daren Anderson, Open Space, Parks, and Golf. I'll try to  
11 keep my presentation brief and pithy as well. I'd like to introduce Megha Bansal. She's a  
12 Public Works Engineer. Thank you for being here, Megha. Curt Dunn, Supervising  
13 Ranger at Foothills Park. Tonight we're here as an action item. We are recommending  
14 that the Commission recommend to Council three things. One is to receive the Buckeye  
15 Creek hydrology report, which was attached to your staff report. To direct staff to  
16 explore outside funding opportunities to implement the Wildhorse Valley and grade-  
17 control structure portions of the plan. I'll explain that in more detail as we get on. Lastly,  
18 to direct staff to add \$150,000 to the capital plan in FY '22 for design and permitting for  
19 replacing the grade-control structures and pedestrian bridge. It's been a while since we've  
20 discussed this, and we might have some people in the audience who aren't as familiar.  
21 I'm going to start with orientation to the site and where we're at, discuss the key problem  
22 that we sought to address through this hydrology study, discuss the key findings of the  
23 recommendation of the study, and then explain the rationale behind the staff  
24 recommendation. It's helpful to look at this in terms of three areas. Boronda Lake is up  
25 here. As we look at this area that I'm highlighting with the cursor, this is Wildhorse  
26 Valley. Towle Camp is near it. In the middle next to the Interpretive Center is Las  
27 Trampas Valley. Over here, circled in yellow, is the 7.7-acre area. This is a vantage  
28 point looking up Wildhorse Valley towards Towle Camp. The creek is on our left, over  
29 here. Over here, we've got a natural grassy area with a few trees. The important aspect  
30 of this photo is to highlight that this is the utility corridor that I've mentioned a few times  
31 in previous meetings. It's really important because it calls to part of the recommendation.  
32 Why we have it is protecting this utility corridor, where we've got water, we've got sewer,  
33 we've got electric, phone, all running right along the edge of a failing creek that's got an  
34 erosion problem. Does that make sense?

35 Commissioner Reckdahl: That's connecting Page Mill to the Interpretive Center?

36 Mr. Anderson: Perhaps my colleagues, Curt, can explain in a little more detail.

1 Curt Dunn: The main utility besides electric is water. There's a little over 3 million  
2 gallons of stored water from this point going up the hill towards Monte Bello plus the  
3 service for the telephone, fiber connection, and the sewer. It's that extra water that comes  
4 in handy for our residents during the daytime, high demand.

5 Commissioner Reckdahl: Is this just going through the park?

6 Mr. Dunn: Yes, it does.

7 Commissioner Reckdahl: It's not that the park uses any of this. It just happens to be a ...

8 Mr. Dunn: We use a fraction of it.

9 Mr. Anderson: A small part. This is Las Trampas Valley. We're looking from the  
10 perspective of the maintenance shop towards the Interpretive Center. The Interpretive  
11 Center would be up to your left. Again, the creek was long ago in the 1940s pushed off  
12 to the side of this valley, when historically it probably went right down the middle. It's  
13 off into this right, vegetated tree area. This is a shot looking at the 7.7-acre area. The  
14 creek wraps around that tree area to the right offscreen and then eventually follows the  
15 cursor and leaves the property. That's the creek spot. The problem that we sought to  
16 address through this study was this historic issue of erosion, down-cutting, and  
17 sedimentation problem, which really started in the 1940s when the creek was  
18 straightened. It was channelized to make room for agriculture. During heavy storms,  
19 what would happen is the water flows down, causing the creek to down-cut, causing  
20 erosion, and sending that sediment downstream to various locations, most poignantly at  
21 the 7.7-acre parcel. It can lead to flooding and obstructing downstream culverts, some  
22 private properties. This problem does date back to the 1940s. That's an important part,  
23 and I'll also importantly point out that in the '70s they tried again to fix certain parts  
24 because the problem started to exacerbate with these grade-control structures that I'll  
25 show you in a moment. The deepest section, in the mid-1970s the creek was 7.4 feet  
26 below grade. If we fast forward to current day, it's about 20-22 feet, a dramatic increase  
27 in down-cutting, which of course leads to the creek collapsing in different areas and a  
28 litany of other problems.

29 Commissioner Reckdahl: What year was that?

30 Mr. Anderson: Mid-'70s when it was measured at 7.4. I should also point out this  
31 pedestrian bridge. We reference it in our recommendation as part of what we're calling  
32 for. The footings on either side, because of that erosion, will soon be exposed and  
33 compromise the stability of that bridge. It'll have to be replaced probably along the same  
34 timeframe as those grade-control structures, which I'll show you photos of again. Some  
35 are in that 5-10-year span is the best guess. Again, more photos of the erosion and deep  
36 down-cutting. Here's a shot where the water's flowing. This is where we get to the

1 gabions and the grade-control structures. The gabions are those wire-enclosed areas  
2 where you've got the rock inside, intended to stabilize the levee or the creek side. I've got  
3 a few photos of these. Here are some wood styles. These are all in the '70s to '80s that  
4 these were put in. You could specially see in this photo where the water is starting to  
5 defeat it and creep around the edge. That was the problem that we've identified. The  
6 solution was we hired a consultant. We hired ENGEO to study the hydrology and give us  
7 recommendations on what we're going to do to fix this erosion problem. We held  
8 community meetings to make sure that the stakeholders and park users were part of this  
9 solution in contributing ideas. We met with the regulatory agencies to get their feedback  
10 and understand (a) what they'd recommend and (b) what they'll permit, which is a really  
11 important thing to be looking at early on rather than at the end of the process. The key  
12 takeaway from those meetings with the regulatory agencies was that they as much as  
13 possible want to see creeks realigned to their historical alignment. That means, if you  
14 come in with a heavily engineered solution that pushes the creek to the side, it's going to  
15 run into problems. During the ad hoc discussions, we said how much could a regulatory  
16 agency really enforce their will upon the City into doing what they're asking. I only look  
17 at recent examples. We look at the golf course that ran into multiyear delays because the  
18 Water District had big problems with not having enough creek and flooding protection  
19 into the golf course. They wanted us to look endlessly at different opportunities. No  
20 matter how much we studied it, it wasn't enough. We're talking about year delays. I say  
21 that in the context of it's important to be considering their perspective early on in the  
22 design process. Using all this feedback from the stakeholders and those agencies, the  
23 consultant developed what we called a preferred alternative design to resolve the creek's  
24 problems. It's really broken down into three core areas. You've got this upper reach in  
25 Wildhorse Valley. The key solution there was to create a new creek channel. The old  
26 creek channel would remain in place; although, the grade-control structures would be  
27 retrofitted. The new creek channel would flow through that open valley. That grass  
28 valley that we talked about would now be a meandering creek. This middle area, Las  
29 Trampas Valley, would be a little different solution. Look at the next slide. This area in  
30 blue on top is what we currently have, a very channelized, narrow spot. What we would  
31 get is—if we did this section, you would widen it out. You're basically just scraping out  
32 the dirt, creating a wide floodplain where this creek could now slow down the water flow  
33 and stretch out over this bigger area. The solution to that one would take up about half of  
34 that turf in front of the Interpretive Center, the element of the Las Trampas section.  
35 Here's a little blow-up on the upper right of that Las Trampas Valley and what it would  
36 look like and where it would stretch. The 7.7-acre solution was much the same in that  
37 we'd just broaden and widen out that floodplain and create an area for the creek to flow  
38 out. I don't want to belabor that too much because ultimately those two didn't fall into the  
39 staff recommendations. I'll get to that in just a second of why. That full remediation,  
40 which the consultant had looked at and said, "This is going to solve by large your erosion  
41 and sedimentation problems if you did all of those." He also included options to look at  
42 segments of that recommendation or portions of it. I want to discuss that a little bit and



APPROVED

1 some of the options. The first option is the City could take no action, which is basically  
2 status quo since the 1980s. If we did that, what would happen is those grade-control  
3 structures would fail in about 5-10 years, and we'll have compromised utilities and our  
4 hands would be forced to do something. Taking no action is really not viable in my  
5 opinion. The other option, the second option, that we were looking at was you could at a  
6 minimum just do those grade-control structures. About eight of them are in that upper  
7 stretch in Wildhorse Valley and about two in Las Trampas and about two in the 7.7-acre  
8 area approximately. If you did that project, if you came in and just retrofitted that with a  
9 more naturalized grade control, typically larger, natural boulders and that kind of thing  
10 and widened it slightly, very slightly, it would cost you \$1.57 million, and that would  
11 include replacing that pedestrian bridge, which is going to have to be spanned at a  
12 slightly greater length. The third option that we talked about in the report is that you  
13 could split this into components, and ultimately that's where the staff recommendations  
14 fell at. Where we came to with the direction is please ask staff—direct Council to ask  
15 staff to explore outside funding to implement that Wildhorse Valley plan. You can see  
16 that on the screen right here. This is a blow-up of that new creek channel as well as the  
17 grade-control structures. This would be all the grade-control structures through the span  
18 of the creek all getting retrofitted. The second part of the recommendation is to add  
19 \$150,000 to the capital plan in FY '22 for design and permitting just to do the grade-  
20 control structures. The rationale behind that second piece is, if for some reason we  
21 weren't able to get that outside funding, you've got this fallback plan so at a minimum  
22 we're not left high and dry without a plan, without a design to address the most critical  
23 infrastructure, which are those existing grade-control structures. There were several key  
24 factors that led the ad hoc and staff to make this recommendation. One of the most  
25 salient is this \$50 million capital budget gap that we currently have in the City, which  
26 makes implementing almost any of these recommendations aspirational at a very best.  
27 The City Manager was very forthright with me saying, "This is going to be exceedingly  
28 difficult. You better be very clear with the Commission. Let them know this is  
29 something the City just can't afford." We have to impress upon this recommendation that  
30 it really is outside funding that we're going to have to get to implement this piece of it, to  
31 do the Wildhorse Valley and those grade-control structures. Another part of the rationale  
32 is this upper stretch you see highlighted is the most significant portion in terms of that  
33 erosion and sedimentation solution. At some points we wrestled with the contractor  
34 saying it could be as high as 60, but we think conservatively 50 is the right number.  
35 About 50% of your problems get addressed with this improvement. Another significant  
36 factor that we looked at was how the construction of these improvements, Wildhorse  
37 Valley and the grade-control structures, relative to doing the whole remediation, that is, if  
38 we were to do 7.7, Las Trampas Valley, and the Wildhorse Valley, all of them, the  
39 disruption is so much less if we do this one. The impacts are still there. We'd still be  
40 impacting trails that are in this valley. We'd still be impacting the Towle Camp. Trucks  
41 will be leaving the park. Those are all impacts that are real. They would affect wildlife  
42 to some degree to that are using that area. It'd affect those trailheads, and they'd affect



APPROVED

1 the visitor experience. We don't want to minimize that, but it'd be much less than all the  
2 additional work that would happen if we were also doing the 7.7 acres and Las Trampas  
3 Valley. We also thought if more erosion and sediment control is needed in the future, we  
4 could use this opportunity, having implemented just this one in Wildhorse Valley, to  
5 learn from that experience, evaluate how successful it is and see if we truly need a lot  
6 more control or if this might suffice. Lastly, the other reason behind that  
7 recommendation especially the part about adding on the \$150,000 to address those grade  
8 control structures is they will fail in the next 5-10 years. We've got to do something. I  
9 just want to be a good steward of the land and have a plan to be prepared for that kind of  
10 thing rather than be reacting. The approximate cost for what we're recommending—that's  
11 the Wildhorse Valley and the grade-control structures and that pedestrian bridge—is \$3.7  
12 million. I should point out if we were to implement that, there would still be some  
13 erosion and there would still be some sedimentation we'd have to deal with. We know  
14 that. We think it might be manageable. That concludes staff recommendation with the  
15 exception of I'll turn it over to my colleagues to see if you have anything else you wanted  
16 to add and then also to the ad hoc if there's anything you'd like to share.

17 Chair McDougall: Anything else you want to add? Does anybody on the ad hoc?  
18 David? I was on the ad hoc. The first thing I want to do is compliment the whole team  
19 for the amount of work that went into this. I think it's incredibly complicated. The  
20 number of times we sat in Daren's office and said, "Should we go for nine? Should we go  
21 for three? Should we go for five plus one? How about we go for two?" It was really  
22 quite interesting. I do think in the end we've come to the right conclusion. A couple of  
23 comments that came out of what I heard tonight and I didn't think of as we heard it  
24 before. You describe the 7-foot going to 22 feet. That's not really in all sections; it's only  
25 in the valley section. I think you should make that clear so that we don't deliver the  
26 wrong message. The other thing I point out in my notes as I wrote this is we talk about  
27 the fact that those utilities are running through our park. We're not using much of the  
28 utilities. I think we need to make it clear who's at risk. It's sort of amorphous about is it  
29 some other community or is it Palo Alto. The same thing with who's at risk downstream.  
30 Is that in Palo Alto or is that in fact not Palo Alto and is a residence? I think we just need  
31 to make sure we know who we're protecting. Everything else, you've been so responsive  
32 to all our comments along that I really couldn't say anything else. I'm willing to turn it  
33 over to David. Do you have comments?

34 Commissioner Moss: Yeah, a couple of things. Going back to what you just said about  
35 who are we protecting, it is important to know if we're subject to legal action if we don't  
36 do these things, especially downstream. Could we—by controlling the Wildhorse  
37 Canyon alone, we're going to still get some sediment into the 7.7 acres. If we have to  
38 close that because of the sediment or flatten it before people can go out there, we're  
39 saving things downstream. The worst case is that Wildhorse Canyon improvements  
40 improve it enough, but there's still going to be some sedimentation in the 7.7 acres. If we



1 let it go, let that happen, will that be enough to protect downstream from undue  
2 sedimentation?

3 Mr. Anderson: That's a good question. The answer is no, we couldn't just let the  
4 deposition of the 7.7 go. What happens is it'll clog that creek channel in that area, and the  
5 water will overflow and pool all over or you'll have a big blowout and will send a  
6 massive amount of debris down. What we have done historically over many, many years  
7 is take that debris out. You'll see in some photos that I think I've shared there have been  
8 piles on the side. We take it out; it's either spread onsite. In the past sometimes, the  
9 private owner, Mr. John Arrillaga, would take that away and use it somewhere else or  
10 off-haul it for us. Other times it's used and kept in the park elsewhere. We'll have to  
11 come up with a plan for getting rid of that material long term. I don't think it would shut  
12 down the 7.7-acre area. We come in only two times a year where we've got to take out  
13 that material, and we can move it offsite. It would impact that open site for part of the  
14 day.

15 Commissioner Moss: The cost of doing that should be incorporated into our final budget  
16 because you're going to have to pay that if you don't do the Wildhorse. Even if you do do  
17 the Wildhorse, you'll still have to do some of that. We're saving money. We don't have  
18 to do that as much by doing the Wildhorse. When you do the budgeting, you have to take  
19 that into consideration. What about also lawsuits? If we don't do the Wildhorse, will we  
20 be opening ourselves up to lawsuits further downstream?

21 Mr. Anderson: Good question. I don't have the answer. I'll have to do some more  
22 research on that.

23 Commissioner Moss: I think the Council wants to know what is the impact if we don't do  
24 it and as much financial risk. I think that speaks volumes. The other thing I was going to  
25 mention I've forgot. That's all.

26 Chair McDougall: Does anybody else have any comments? Keith?

27 Commissioner Reckdahl: Yeah, I have some.

28 Commissioner Cribbs: I do too.

29 Commissioner Reckdahl: I agree with David. When you have these costs, it's not really  
30 fair because it looks like it's zero cost for doing nothing. There is going to be huge costs  
31 if we do nothing. We really have to estimate how much maintenance we'd have to do due  
32 to the various impacts. For example, when you go from the doing nothing to doing  
33 Number 2, there should be less maintenance on Number 2 than there would be for  
34 Number 1. That will flatten the curve and make it look like this is not as expensive as it  
35 is.

APPROVED

1 Mr. Anderson: Could I chime in on that? The reason why you don't see that reflected  
2 here is it's currently all captured with existing staff. This is Curt and his team that are  
3 addressing those piles. Historically, it was done by that caretaker. Right now, we have  
4 not incurred those costs. It's all addressed with existing budget, existing staff allocations  
5 for the most part.

6 Chair McDougall: Mr. Reckdahl is your suggestion that there is risk that they might have  
7 to do incur those costs in the future?

8 Commissioner Reckdahl: (inaudible)

9 Chair McDougall: I think that's what both Mr. Moss and Mr. Reckdahl are saying. You  
10 might want to identify what the risk is. Even if you want to say it's nothing today  
11 because the ranger does it for us, there's a risk that ...

12 Commissioner Reckdahl: Yeah. Like I said last time, it's not like we're saving money.  
13 We're just delaying the spending of the money. By spending the money upfront, we do it  
14 on our timetable. If we just wait, we do it on Mother Nature's timetable. Mother Nature  
15 always does things in a more expensive timetable. I'd be very careful about making it  
16 look like doing nothing is the cheapest option. I don't think doing nothing is the cheapest  
17 option. Doing some work in Wildhorse Valley is probably the cheapest option. That  
18 brings me to Wildhorse Valley. If we do Wildhorse Valley and it meanders, we'll be  
19 doing two things. We'll be doing one thing for sure; we'll be reducing the amount of  
20 sediment that gets pulled out of Wildhorse Valley.

21 Mr. Anderson: That's correct.

22 Commissioner Reckdahl: Will we also be slowing down the flow?

23 Mr. Anderson: Yes.

24 Commissioner Reckdahl: When it hits Las Trampas, it'll be going at a slower rate, which  
25 hopefully should slow down the erosion in the rest of the park.

26 Mr. Anderson: That's correct. You would also have new grade-control structures, which  
27 I believe will be the kind that slow flow too.

28 Commissioner Reckdahl: Those would be in the right-hand side or that would be after  
29 the merger?

30 Mr. Anderson: In the existing creek channel, this would still get maybe 40% flow off this  
31 hill. Of the total flow in this area, a much smaller percentage hits the existing channel,  
32 kind of sloping down this way. All those would be new in those grade-control structures  
33 here. There would be more downstream as well.

APPROVED

1 Commissioner Reckdahl: To me, that's a big win. By doing work at this one spot—  
2 because we have limited money, if can only do money in one spot, by doing it here we  
3 achieve two things. We not only decrease the amount of sediment that we pull out of that  
4 portion, but we also slow down the water, which means that we have less erosion  
5 downstream. We have to really sell that. It otherwise looks like we're just addressing  
6 part of the problem, but we really are addressing a big chunk of the problem. Even in our  
7 wildest dreams, we don't have the money to do the whole thing. I think this is the sale  
8 that we have to make, that this will not solve the problem but this will do a lot to help the  
9 problem. This is meandering. How do we enforce that? I'm always very nervous that we  
10 have the meandering creek, and then 5 years later it's just channelized just like we have  
11 right now.

12 Mr. Anderson: Traditionally, if you let a creek do its own thing, it will not channelize  
13 itself. It does just the opposite. It wants to meander all along its path of least resistance.  
14 Why we had channelized is only because we forced it that way. Opening this up  
15 narrowed it and constricted it intentionally off to the right in the 1940s. By having these  
16 more gradual slopes that we're going to install in this valley here, it should do just the  
17 opposite where it's got room and flexibility to meander.

18 Commissioner Reckdahl: We're confident if we set it up to meander, it will meander?

19 Mr. Anderson: Yes, I believe that's the best understanding we got from our consultant,  
20 who's done this kind of work.

21 Commissioner Reckdahl: At these corners, will we have rocks there that to prevent that  
22 from just being eroded away? I see the curves. As that water hits the corner, there has to  
23 be something there to force it around the corner, and that's going to get eaten away as the  
24 water comes through.

25 Mr. Anderson: Yes. It would be engineered to slow it down. They intentionally put  
26 snags in there. There's all sorts of natural engineering that goes in behind these to ensure  
27 a healthy creek corridor.

28 Commissioner Reckdahl: That's all my comments. Thank you, Daren.

29 Mr. Anderson: Thanks.

30 Commissioner Cribbs: My comments were just a couple about money. First, I wanted to  
31 compliment you all three on the work you've done because it's really great. It was good  
32 to hear it all. I agree with you about the cost of doing nothing because there is a cost now  
33 for the staff to be doing what you're doing. If we could know that cost per year, I think  
34 that would be helpful to have that. Second of all, Daren, with the staff recommendation,  
35 what you're asking us to recommend to the Council, what's the price tag again?

1 Mr. Anderson: It's asking for outside funding for that.

2 Commissioner Cribbs: Right. Outside funding, what's the price tag?

3 Mr. Anderson: We would have to go seek it, and it would be \$3.7 million.

4 Commissioner Cribbs: I heard that, but then I had heard nine and ten. I missed a meeting  
5 last time.

6 Mr. Anderson: Let me clarify. The \$9.7 million is the full remediation; all three areas  
7 would be included. This one is just the grade-control structures in Wildhorse Valley.  
8 That comes to \$3.7 million. Separately, there's that \$150,000. If, for example, we were  
9 to get the money to do the outside funding, we wouldn't use that. We wouldn't need it. If  
10 for some reason we don't, then we'll go ahead and use that \$150,000 to hire a consultant  
11 to do the actual construction design to put in those new grade-control structures.

12 Commissioner Cribbs: Do you have somebody that you know about, either internally in  
13 the City, who seeks grants from national groups and federal groups or do we have to hire  
14 somebody to do that? If we do, should we think about doing that?

15 Mr. Anderson: That's a good question. We do not have a dedicated grant writer for  
16 Community Services. We do have some staff that have some skills and experience, and  
17 we've used them before. Hiring one is another option to consider. Sometimes we do that  
18 ...

19 Commissioner Cribbs: Under contract?

20 Mr. Anderson: Under contract, yeah. A one-time grant writer for a project is  
21 conceivable and possible. Sometimes, we can do that through existing budget too to  
22 explore those.

23 Commissioner Cribbs: We'll certainly talk about it in the funding ad hoc. We have such  
24 great environmental groups in the area including Post and other people, that it would be  
25 great to take advantage of some of the things that they've learned over the years, that  
26 they've raised so much money to support open space.

27 Commissioner Moss: One other comment on that.

28 Chair McDougall: Let Jeff, and then I'll circle back.

29 Commissioner LaMere: One, I think this is a great idea that needs to get done. I would  
30 echo the Chair's sentiments about the utility corridor. It doesn't seem like this is optional.  
31 If the utility corridor is going to fail, then something needs to be done. I would imagine,  
32 if this were a utility corridor within the City, people would be finding ways to get this

1 done. I think it's extremely important from that fact. To underscore that in a presentation  
2 to the City Council would be important. The last question I have is about funding. One  
3 is what do we think the likelihood of us getting some of these grants is. Secondly, what  
4 is the likelihood of getting an offset that you had mentioned with the wetlands and what  
5 is that process?

6 Mr. Anderson: Good question. Absent this improvement, this new creek channel, if we  
7 were just seeking funding for the grade-control structures, I'd say it's unlikely that you  
8 would be able to grants for that. When you're creating new creek and new habitat, that's  
9 the exact kind of thing people are looking for, for two purposes, one to fund via grant,  
10 two to sell mitigation credits. There's an option. When we had originally looked at doing  
11 the entire project earlier on, the consultant had said, "It's feasible, it's possible, that you  
12 could be looking at \$1 million in rights that you could sell to other projects that are  
13 impacting wetlands or riparian areas." They would buy your credit basically. This is a  
14 third of the new created habitat, so I'm imagining maybe somewhere around a third of  
15 that price perhaps—I'm not sure—could be obtained through that. Maybe that's the  
16 matching money for the grant that we could apply for. Again, these are kind of  
17 speculative. I'm not an expert in that. I'd have to do some more research, which we will  
18 do. Most of the grants I'm familiar with require some type of matching money. Perhaps  
19 ours could come from some mitigation credits, but I have to do more.

20 Chair McDougall: David.

21 Commissioner Moss: I got in the mail this week a notice that Midpeninsula Open Space  
22 Preserve was going to put on the market \$50 million worth of green bonds for protecting  
23 and restoring the Bay. I was wondering if this fits what you're talking about; the  
24 improving of the habitat and the creek habitat would fit that kind of money.

25 Chair McDougall: Excuse me, Daren, before you answer that. I would suggest that the  
26 funding committee that we have embrace some of these thoughts that are really good. I  
27 don't think any of thoughts change what our conclusion should be tonight relative to what  
28 we're being asked, if that's okay. Go ahead, Keith.

29 Commissioner Reckdahl: Whose utilities are these? Are these City of Palo Alto utilities?

30 Mr. Anderson: Yes, they are. We are and will be asking the Utilities Department to see  
31 if they could fund some elements, especially the grade-control structures in Wildhorse  
32 Valley. They might be able to argue that the other portions don't really pertain to them.  
33 They might be able to contribute something to that. We've got an email in, and we  
34 haven't had that sit-down yet.

35 Commissioner Reckdahl: When you present this to Council, that would be important that  
36 this is our utilities.

1 Chair McDougall: Go ahead, David.

2 Commissioner Moss: The bridge in Las Trampas—do you think just doing the  
3 Wildhorse Canyon will still require us to move or replace the bridge in Las Trampas?

4 Mr. Anderson: Yes.

5 Commissioner Moss: Is that included in the \$3.7 million?

6 Mr. Anderson: Yes.

7 Chair McDougall: If there are no other questions, I would suggest that we proceed with  
8 the action item here. I believe I need a motion to these three recommendations that we  
9 have here; that staff recommends that the Parks and Rec Commission recommend that  
10 Council receive the Buckeye Creek hydrology report; direct staff to explore outside  
11 funding opportunities; and direct staff to add \$150,000 to the capital plan. Does anybody  
12 have any modifications or suggestions relative to those three before we entertain a  
13 motion?

14 Commissioner Reckdahl: What is year '22?

15 Mr. Anderson: Fiscal year '22. It starts July 1, 2021.

16 Commissioner Reckdahl: Why would we put it out that far?

17 Mr. Anderson: It was the first time that our person that manages the capital fund thought  
18 we could get it in.

19 Commissioner Reckdahl: (inaudible)

20 Commissioner Cribbs: Can we try to accelerate that?

21 Mr. Anderson: I could certainly try; I could certainly ask. Even if it goes in, in '22, since  
22 every new year is re-budgeted, if there's something that's really a hot topic and something  
23 that's critical, you can always petition to move it forward. That's happened many times.

24 Chair McDougall: From what I've heard, one thing I would question is whether for  
25 Number 2 there, direct staff to explore outside funding—I'm not so sure that I wouldn't  
26 recommend to staff that they contract with somebody to do that. Without insulting staff  
27 and in fact complimenting staff, it seems to me that you're in over your heads with all the  
28 things that you're trying to do anyway. To spend your time selling this, I would  
29 encourage that explicitly say that we encourage you to use an outside contractor for that.

1 Mr. Anderson: I completely agree. The only hesitation is the funding to hire one. It's  
2 possible we could scrape that amongst existing funding.

3 Chair McDougall: If the Commission is encouraging you to, you might have an  
4 advantage to talk to the City Manager or something, saying "Those darn Commissioners  
5 told me to do this." The comment about how soon can it be and does it have to be '22, I  
6 would like this to say "as early as possible and no later than '22." Adding some urgency  
7 to what we're trying to do would make sense. Without detailing that out, could I have a  
8 motion including those two modifications to what we have here?

9 **MOTION** [See McDougall's comments above]

10 Commissioner Reckdahl: I so move.

11 Chair McDougall: Do I have a second?

12 Commissioner Cribbs: I second.

13 Chair McDougall: Everybody in favor say aye. Everybody that dissents. Thank you.  
14 This passed with those modifications. I would like to thank all three of you for your time  
15 and the effort on all of this. I expect the whole Commission to show up with their  
16 paddleball rackets or whatever might be appropriate, their hiking sticks or whatever it  
17 will be, at Council when you present this.

18 **Motion passed 5-0** McCauley and Greenfield absent

19 Mr. Anderson: Thank you so much, and thanks to the ad hoc who contributed so much.

20 Commissioner Moss: When will this go to Council?

21 Mr. Anderson: I'm not sure yet. I'll get a date and let you know at the next Commission  
22 meeting for sure.

23 Commissioner Cribbs: It won't be before the next Commission meeting?

24 Mr. Anderson: No, it will not. I don't have the date yet.

25 **5. Recommendation to Council to Open the 7.7 Acres**

26 Chair McDougall: Next is the famous 7.7 acres. In fact, I think we should just simply  
27 refer to it as "the 7.7." I'm not sure that the "acres" is needed. It doesn't seem necessary  
28 any more. Curt, I would invite you to come and sit at the table with us.

29 Mr. Anderson: I was wondering when we'd make that transition and drop that qualifier.  
30 Soon it'll just be called Foothills Park.

1 Chair McDougall: Exactly.

2 Mr. Anderson: Again, Daren Anderson, Open Space, Parks, and Golf, and my colleague  
3 Curt Dunn, Supervising Ranger at Foothills Park. This is another action item relating to  
4 allowing public access to the 7.7 acres of parkland in Foothills. What we're asking the  
5 Commission to do is to recommend that Council direct staff to open the 7.7-acre parcel at  
6 Foothills to public access, assumes the necessary security fencing for the plant nursery  
7 and for the 7-foot culvert is in place, and to direct staff to engage the community and the  
8 Commission to finalize a recommendation for Council on how to use the 7.7-acre parcel.  
9 I want to real quickly go through the background. This parcel was given to the City in  
10 1981 by the Lee family. They had retained the property until 1996, when it reverted to  
11 the City. From '96 to 2006, the adjacent property owner, Mr. Arrillaga, had leased the  
12 land and utilized it for that period up until 2005. It sat basically idle from that time until  
13 now. In August 2014, Council passed an ordinance dedicating it as parkland and had  
14 given direction to the Commission to facilitate the development of ideas on how to use  
15 that land. In 2014, staff led tours for the facility, did a public outreach meeting to collect  
16 feedback. In 2015, Council directed and approved the Commission and staff  
17 recommendation basically saying do the Buckeye Creek study first. The rationale behind  
18 that was perhaps this creek fix might affect how we use the 7.7 acres, so resolve that first  
19 and then open it up and figure out how to use it. When Council dedicated it as parkland,  
20 several Council Members expressed an interest in opening it to the public as soon as  
21 possible. They kept saying, "If we're looking at how to use it, how are they supposed to  
22 do it behind a fence and give you input on what to use it for?" We tried the tours, which  
23 were very poorly attended. We just couldn't get the number of people out there. They  
24 didn't show or the times were too limited. Part of the reason behind this recommendation  
25 is we've completed Council's directive to do the Buckeye Creek study. The  
26 recommendation that we're putting forward does not interfere with the use of it. They  
27 had originally said open it as soon as you can, and that's our recommendation here today,  
28 that the study is complete. While the study included that option for doing an  
29 improvement on that land, again, that's not part of our recommendation moving forward  
30 to Council regarding Buckeye Creek. The adjacent landowner, we've been briefing them  
31 for quite some time. I should once again show you the photos. The yellow line marks  
32 the boundary of those 7.7 acres. The blue line is Buckeye Creek, which flows through it.  
33 There's an orange line that goes from the maintenance shop right through the property.  
34 That's an emergency egress and access route that travels right through onto Los Trancos  
35 Road. That has to be maintained. Then, the shop just outside is where our staff works.  
36 The Oak Grove picnic area just outside as well. Part of our recommendation is that we  
37 recognize the fact that any further development of the 7.7 acres is expected to require  
38 additional funding that we don't currently have. What we will do is the park staff would  
39 open it up now. The ad hoc committee and staff would just continue to collect feedback  
40 and work with the community to develop plans for how we might use that when the  
41 funding is available. While there aren't any amenities on that land, you could see how



1 close the Oak Grove picnic area is where you've got seating, you've got parking, you've  
2 got restrooms, and you've got a drinking fountain all within a very short walk. The point  
3 of that was if they were coming in and exploring the 7.7 acres, to get to those amenities is  
4 not very far if you come in and walk it. The neighboring property owner has already put  
5 in his fencing. The fencing that's left to be done is by the Acterra nursery and by the—  
6 I'm sorry, Grassroots nursery—and by this culvert that's towards the end of the property.  
7 It's that 7-foot—I think I've got a photo. This is the fence that we would take down and  
8 allow people in. This is the open flat area of the 7.7 acres. This is Buckeye Creek  
9 flowing through. That's that sediment pile I spoke about earlier, Commissioner Moss,  
10 that we would move out and remove. That would be the cost that you talked about that  
11 we'll qualify. If we're talking about removing that from the park and not just kind of  
12 making do and spreading it out, there is a cost, a rather significant one. Off-hauling  
13 material is expensive. We'll qualify that and include it in the report that goes to Council.

14 Commissioner Reckdahl: Do we have a backhoe (inaudible)?

15 Mr. Anderson: We borrow them. We do not have an open space one. Some of the  
16 cost—I think my colleague was saying, so-so we do it. We don't do it all because we  
17 lack some of that equipment. We would be asking Public Works to drive up. Again, that  
18 was a service that was once provided by that landowner who has a caretaker with a  
19 backhoe, who would come in and do this for us. Now that's it's open parkland or will be  
20 soon, something he no longer does. We would be reliant on renting one or leaning on a  
21 contractor or Public Works (crosstalk).

22 Commissioner Reckdahl: Does Public Works do it for free or do we have to ...

23 Mr. Anderson: Yeah, they typically would help us. It's possible.

24 Chair McDougall: Actually, we'd probably have to rent one, and they're really expensive.

25 Mr. Anderson: This is that 7-foot diameter culvert. There's a steep embankment off to  
26 the left of this picture where the 7.7 acres stops and comes down this edge. This is the  
27 area that we would also have to fence and secure to keep people out.

28 Commissioner Moss: You're going to have a fence that'll protect—people will not be  
29 able to come up from there or go down into there.

30 Mr. Anderson: Yeah, it would stop them. Eventually, we'll probably add one, but we  
31 don't have a design for it yet that would cover the actual hole itself. What we'll start with,  
32 however, is some fencing on the sort of levee edge. As the 7.7 stops, you've got that deep  
33 decline; we'd stop them right there with some fencing and signage that says stay out. As  
34 I looked at other spots—we were debating this internally quite a bit. As I look at other  
35 spots in Foothills, we said, "That's steep, and somebody could get in the hole." I've got a

1 number of similar areas all throughout open space that we don't have any fencing on, we  
2 don't have signage on. It's just understood people aren't going to go down into the flood  
3 basin and crawl into the tide gate where you can get trapped. It's never happened, and I  
4 don't think we need to go overboard on putting up so much fencing or so much protection  
5 for something that's never going to happen.

6 Commissioner Reckdahl: There are trails on steep (crosstalk) if you fall off that you're  
7 dead.

8 Mr. Anderson: I think we can do it with the appropriate amount of aesthetically pleasing  
9 fencing that looks right, stops people, and educates them to stay out. That's our game  
10 plan.

11 Commissioner Moss: It won't inhibit stuff from going down there. If you dam it up,  
12 that's going to be a problem.

13 Mr. Anderson: We're going to have to figure that out too. If we eventually block it,  
14 doing it in such a way where it helps the problem rather than adds to it.

15 Commissioner Moss: What about access from the neighborhood into Foothills Park  
16 along that?

17 Mr. Anderson: That's something we've talked about for a long time. There have been a  
18 lot of requests over the year, can people come up that Los Trancos Road. Unfortunately,  
19 it passes through private property. We've talked to the property owner; they are not  
20 interested in opening that up because it brings you literally right in front of their front  
21 yard and back yard. They weren't willing to entertain that. I guess the next steps and  
22 timeline is that staff would share this recommendation concurrent with the Buckeye  
23 Creek recommendation to Council. It would go as a package much like it is to you  
24 tonight. Anything else to add from you, Curt?

25 Mr. Dunn: The only thing is that that creek, the 7-foot culvert. The underground section  
26 is on private property. It outflows into another section of private property that's co-  
27 owned by many families. Beyond that one, then it goes near the roadway at Los Trancos  
28 Road. Currently, I don't think there's access on either side of it.

29 Commissioner Moss: That was my question, whether people could walk up Los Trancos  
30 Road and come into the park that way. It sounds really convoluted.

31 Chair McDougall: Anne, do you have a question?

32 Commissioner Cribbs: Yes, I do. The only cost in here as it goes to Council is \$25,000  
33 and then ...

1 Mr. Anderson: Approximately.

2 Commissioner Cribbs: Approximately, yeah. And then the cost of your guys who are  
3 now doing whatever little they are able to do. You've just extended your workload. Am I  
4 right?

5 Mr. Anderson: You raise a good point because now we've got a part of the park that was  
6 always closed. It's remote. We've talked about this in the ad hoc, what does it mean for  
7 the rangers. They've got to get back there and make sure people aren't up to no good  
8 because you are isolated, you are at a place where you could do bad things. We don't  
9 anticipate this is going to be a real heavily used spot. You do have a nursery that's on  
10 occasion staffed by the Grassroots people. There are some eyes back there, but we would  
11 need ranger staff to swing by. Luckily, our base of operations is right there, so I don't  
12 think it's too unreasonable. I don't think it will be an undue burden.

13 Commissioner Cribbs: Seven acres is a lot. In the report, I think it would be good to  
14 mention the fact that our staff has expanded their responsibility because of the 7 acres.

15 Mr. Anderson: Will do.

16 Commissioner Cribbs: Thank you.

17 Chair McDougall: In the ad hoc, we talked a lot about that, to look at that from both  
18 sides. I think there is a risk associated with opening this up in terms of visibility and  
19 whatnot, exactly your point. The other thing we talked about is that we keep talking  
20 about 7.7 acres, but there's really no more than an acre here. So much of this is on that  
21 very steep hill behind. One of the recommendations the ad hoc made was why don't we  
22 just connect it to the rest of the park because you can extend a hiking path up through  
23 there. Wouldn't that be neat? The consultant came back and said it was way too  
24 dangerous. If you think other places are dangerous, that was even more dangerous to put  
25 a hiking trail. It's only really an acre, maybe an acre and a half of flatland that we're ...  
26 That doesn't decrease the amount of risk because of the hidden nature of the area. Are  
27 there any other questions or comments at this point?

28 Commissioner Reckdahl: The only question I would have is—right now I see two  
29 options. Basically do minimal, which we're recommending. The other is if we had a lot  
30 of money, we would go through and do what the whole consultant said and make the  
31 stream meander. Is there any other options other than those?

32 Mr. Anderson: I think so. I think part of that outreach process will be what other  
33 amenities, should we be adding some restoration. This is a fairly unrestored site. You've  
34 got 5 feet of overburden, which is really poor material that came out of the adjacent  
35 quarries long ago. It's poor soil. You could do a lot of restoration on that site. It kind of

1 calls out for it. You could add other amenities if someone wanted some benches or some  
2 seating areas. There are other options. When we did our original outreach, some of them  
3 were on the high end. There was a grouping of recreation-related recommendations, dog  
4 park, BMX tracks, camping, group picnic areas, those kind of things were all ...

5 Commissioner Reckdahl: A pavilion.

6 Mr. Anderson: A meeting pavilion area, a place for outdoor education. That kind of fit  
7 into the family of recreation. There was a separate camp that said you could also be  
8 looking at restoration. This could be a good place for kids to study science and look at  
9 maybe getting neighboring universities to come out and experiment with plots on what  
10 kind of restoration works best. It could also just be through our partnership with  
11 Grassroots, where they start working in there. There was also these restoration ideas too.  
12 I think we reach out to the community again. The only qualifier is we don't have an  
13 enormous amount of money sitting there for huge investments in this area. It'd have to be  
14 something we could do over time and that's realistic or maybe there's outside funding.

15 Commissioner Cribbs: Did we get costs for that yet, those ideas?

16 Mr. Anderson: No. None of them were explored. We stopped at ...

17 Commissioner Cribbs: It would be pretty cool to get the cost for those kinds of things.  
18 I'm sure there's some interest from people. That's an ad hoc thing too.

19 Chair McDougall: The ad hoc went through that, and the answer is yes. What we're  
20 trying to do here is be responsive to opening up the 7.7 acres. The question that I had  
21 asked Daren and then I backed off on but I'm going to go back to is I would like us to be  
22 saying that we are opening it temporarily as-is to evaluate—to give people the  
23 opportunity to see it, and then we might come back and then do exactly what  
24 Commissioner Cribbs is talking about. You may want to say, to tell them, what the  
25 possibilities are that have been talked about. If you don't tell them that, they'll tell you  
26 that. I think you might be better to put that in your grasp to start off with, that these are  
27 the possibilities. We don't have the money, so we're opening it up so we can have more  
28 discussion, so we can—but here are the things that your Commission has participated in  
29 discussion. I think that would help. Remind them that it's only an acre and a half. Jeff,  
30 do you have any comments? Are you okay? I'd like to see if we could get a motion for  
31 the two items that are here, to open the 7.7 acres as soon as possible. I would suggest that  
32 what we need to add in there is a cost range. You've said maybe \$35,000, but I'd like us  
33 to say \$25,000-\$50,000 or something so that we could add an extra barbed wire on top of  
34 some fence or something if you had to. I would think that that cost needs to be in there. I  
35 think we're not temporarily opening it, so we need a better word. We're not temporarily  
36 opening it to close it again; we're temporarily opening it as-is, and then we'll see whether

1 it stays as-is or if something else happens to it. I think that should be explicit. I'd like to  
2 recommend that that be explicit in the motion. Is that fair?

3 Mr. Anderson: Yes.

4 Chair McDougall: Can I get a motion on that effect?

5 **MOTION** [See McDougall's comments above]

6 Commissioner Reckdahl: I so move.

7 Commissioner Cribbs: I second.

8 Chair McDougall: All in favor. Daren, thank you again.

9 **Motion passed 5-0** McCauley and Greenfield absent

10 Mr. Anderson: Thanks very much.

11 Chair McDougall: Even though it's only the 7 acres, it was as hairy a discussion because  
12 of where it came from and because of the neighbor. Those backhoes are really, really,  
13 really expensive.

14 Commissioner Cribbs: You can borrow one from a neighbor like a cup of sugar.

15 Chair McDougall: Anne, you can't borrow those anywhere. Ranger Curt, thank you for  
16 attending.

17 **6. Cubberley Turf Field Temporary Lighting Plan**

18 Chair McDougall: The next item on the agenda, the Cubberley temporary lighting. I'd  
19 like to invite Adam Howard to join us at the table, as they say. He can be in the room  
20 when it happened.

21 Adam Howard: Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you for having me this evening.  
22 It's getting late. We're here tonight to ask the Commission to accept a temporary lighting  
23 proposal given to us by the Palo Alto Soccer Club. We're going to just go over a little,  
24 brief background and then touch on some of the points in the proposal. I did print out  
25 more just so I'd make sure you guys have the most up-to-date. There are some for the  
26 public. This might be the exact same one you've got, but I just wanted to be sure of that.  
27 I'm going to invite Neal Aronson up from Palo Alto Soccer Club to join me.

28 Chair McDougall: Welcome Neal.

APPROVED

1 Mr. Howard: As Daren pulls this up, just a quick background here. During winter  
2 months—we're really talking December through March during daylight savings—we  
3 have a real shortage of available lit fields. The City of Palo Alto has three. They are  
4 booked Monday through Friday and weekends, but we're really talking Monday through  
5 Friday, 4:00 p.m.-10:00 p.m. solid. There is no available extra space. When Palo Alto  
6 Soccer Club suggested this proposal, we thought it was something we should look into.  
7 It does allow for some additional space to be used during those winter times. The  
8 proposal we're talking about is specifically—we're asking February 19-March 11, so it's  
9 actually less than a month. We thought it was a good way to see if this would work and  
10 then move forward. Excuse me, it's February 12-March 11.

11 Neal Aronson: Good evening, everybody. Thank you for your time again. As we've  
12 discussed before, we're looking for some temporary time. This would be a trial period to  
13 see if it works, to see if we're able to conduct these additional field sessions without any  
14 undue disruption, I guess, to the community. As Adam was saying, we're talking about  
15 the 12th to March 11th or as soon as the Council, I guess, can approve it if that's  
16 necessary. I'm still unclear if that's necessary, and I guess it is. The timing would be  
17 effectively when we start to lose the light, which is still in the 5:00 hour. We would end  
18 practices at 8:15 with a hard stop, lights off at 8:30. The system that we're proposing is a  
19 trailer light structure provided by a vendor called DC Solar Solutions. They're based in  
20 Venetia. It's a hybrid solar battery/diesel system. We don't really expect it to use the  
21 diesel generator at all. We have talked to them recently on the basis of a couple of  
22 suggestions that came up with regard to specifically a max time if the generator would  
23 run at all. We can enforce that. I think I suggested 4 hours a week max. We really don't  
24 think it's going to require any diesel at all. To Commissioner Moss's suggestion  
25 regarding one particular corner of the field, I think it's the southwest corner that's the  
26 most shaded part of the field. If that particular unit wasn't getting enough light, we would  
27 rotate them around. That's not difficult to do; the vendor volunteered to do that for us. I  
28 think they're pretty confident that it's not going to be a problem. These solar panels don't  
29 require direct sunlight. Just ambient sunlight should be plenty. Unfortunately, based on  
30 the winter we're having today, probably if this continues, we're not going to have any  
31 problems. Hopefully we'll get some rain. Assuming they run on solar battery, there's  
32 very little noise, in fact zero noise and zero exhaust. That would be the perfect scenario.  
33 What we're initially proposing is that we would put four units out there on each corner.  
34 We've adjusted the alignment of the field based on our last conversation with the  
35 Commission. If necessary, we could put two additional ones out there. Instead of putting  
36 them on the corner and the diagonal right along the track, we've moved them onto the turf  
37 completely. Again, they would probably have plywood or some kind of base underneath  
38 them, so that we're not creating any indentations in the turf. This shouldn't create any  
39 problems for either play or track users. The two additional units, if needed, would be  
40 placed on the field between the track and the sideline. There is enough spacing in there;  
41 I've measured it out. It shouldn't be a problem. If we were to go with those extra units,



APPROVED

1 we of course would create some additional safety bumpers or padding if needed so as not  
2 to interrupt field play. You've seen this slide before. They're LED lights. Based on my  
3 research and the research of the vendor, LED is a non-glare light. The neighborhood  
4 association came back with some comments that we wanted to address. One of them was  
5 is it a non-glare light. As I understand it, LED lights by definition are non-glare lights.  
6 That's what I found when I googled it, if we believe what we read on the internet. The  
7 sound of the generator is pretty quiet, 68 decibels at 23 feet. I couldn't find a sample of  
8 that. The rest is self-explanatory. One of the questions that the community association  
9 came up with is drop-off and parking along Nelson. This was one that has created a  
10 number of comments. We had a good conversation with Jeff Kmetec. Jeff is the  
11 neighborhood association president and ironically a Palo Alto Soccer Club parent. We  
12 have a very good relationship with Jeff. Jeff was very helpful. He identified that the  
13 Nelson drop-off is a critical issue. What we believe we can do as a club is enforce a no  
14 drop-off rule for teams that are practicing at this hour. I put a yellow bar or section up  
15 there along the access to Nelson. What we would propose is that for the first week or two  
16 and as long as necessary—hopefully parents will get the message—of these sessions, we  
17 would have coaches out there and just say, "No, sorry. You've got to drive all the way  
18 around." If we run into problems, we can take additional steps like barring kids from  
19 playing in games and so forth and so on. Hopefully, it won't get to that. We have some  
20 steps that we can enforce to make sure parents don't do this. That's a change that we've  
21 made to our proposal today. Again, the units are very secure and safe, so we don't expect  
22 any vandalism. They are monitored 24 hours a day. We can provide, if necessary, the  
23 phone number to probably somebody in the club or to the 24-hour notice if we need to, if  
24 there are any complaints from neighbors. Now that they're off the track completely, there  
25 probably won't be much issue with coning off the track or anything like that. I think we  
26 covered all that stuff. We appreciate your consideration.

27 Mr. Howard: I'll jump in here. We put public outreach—we had a meeting scheduled for  
28 the 17th; it wasn't very well attended. We later found out that the postcards I'd sent out  
29 took over 2 weeks to arrive, so they came the Friday after the meeting was scheduled. I  
30 really wanted to apologize to the members of the public. It was not something done  
31 intentionally. We are looking to get as much in put as we can. I have emailed both  
32 neighborhood associations. I actually went door to door with the postcard and  
33 information to try to (a) extend my apologies for the mail mishap and (b) make sure  
34 they're aware. I did say that I will give them another opportunity to come speak to me  
35 directly on the 25th, which is Thursday. I think that will be a part of my regular outreach  
36 during this trial period, making sure we're not hearing complaints, making sure we're  
37 addressing any issues that come up, and making sure that afterwards they have another  
38 opportunity to provide us with feedback to really let us know how this went, if there were  
39 any major concerns. Palo Alto Soccer and the City really, really, want to be good  
40 neighbors on this project. We think it's a good thing for youth soccer, but we want to  
41 make sure we're being good to the neighbors. We're very open to that. This next meeting



APPROVED

1 will be a part of that, but it's the commitment that we will continue to communicate  
2 through the entire process to make sure we're being good neighbors in this. That's the  
3 information we have. I'll open it up to questions.

4 Chair McDougall: Any questions? Commissioner Jeff please.

5 Commissioner LaMere: This project to me is an extremely important project to do our  
6 best with what we've proposed in terms of looking at the drop-off and looking at how  
7 these lights are going to work. One of the reasons I think it's so important is that we have  
8 fast-tracked it essentially, which is fairly unusual for us to be able to do. To be able to  
9 accomplish something so quickly and to see how it's going to work is really important for  
10 it to be where nobody gets dropped off at Nelson. This is a project that, if it works,  
11 maybe we are able to do lighting again next winter or maybe we're able to identify even  
12 other fields around Palo Alto that could use lighting that can increase field use. We know  
13 how the lack of field space, especially in the evenings in winter, is. I think it's really,  
14 really important that we do everything that we're trying to do and that we say we're going  
15 to do with this project because, if it can be successful, it can be a great model going  
16 forward. I think that's extremely important and also an extremely exciting opportunity.  
17 A quick question about the liability insurance and the liability if someone does get hurt  
18 on the lights if it's outside soccer practice, if it's someone from the community that is  
19 there. Is the City responsible? Is it solely Palo Alto Soccer Club and their insurance?  
20 What's the liability if something happens to someone or something happens to the lights?

21 Mr. Howard: The lighting company provides insurance for the time period that the lights  
22 will be out there. It'll cover the lights as long as they're there. Even if it were to happen  
23 off practice time, the company takes care of that with their insurance.

24 Commissioner LaMere: That takes care if someone gets hurt with the lights? Is that  
25 what you're ...

26 Mr. Howard: Right, safety and the maintenance of the lights.

27 Commissioner LaMere: In terms of have we looked at—is there a study or anything  
28 where we've looked at other fields that are high-use fields and could use lights in the  
29 future? Is that something that we think about as a recreation department?

30 Mr. Howard: We do, and Daren might want to speak to this. Really the only fields that  
31 can handle the additional play is turf, so this is really the only turf field in Palo Alto that's  
32 not lit. It'd be the only one we'd consider lighting because a grass field couldn't handle  
33 the additional play.

34 Commissioner LaMere: Thank you.

1 Chair McDougall: Go ahead, David.

2 Commissioner Moss: Thank you very much for addressing all the issues that we brought  
3 up last time. I'm really happy with the answers. To his point about other turf fields, it  
4 may turn out that we convert some of the grass fields to turf over time, if this works out.  
5 Also, I wonder whether the School District, Gunn and Paly and Terman, has fields that  
6 we can use at night or is it just our parks.

7 Mr. Howard: Gunn and Paly both have lit turf fields. Again, the City does not have  
8 access to those fields even at night, the high schools. The middle schools we do, but  
9 again none of those fields are turf.

10 Chair McDougall: Keith.

11 Commissioner Reckdahl: As I mentioned last time, I love the concept of a trial period. If  
12 it doesn't work out, we haven't invested anything permanent. I see this as a no-lose  
13 situation. I'm really glad that you're enforcing the no drop-off at Nelson; that was a big  
14 concern for the neighbors. I don't want you to discourage walking or biking through  
15 Nelson because people can bike to the soccer. We want to encourage that, in fact. If they  
16 want to go through Nelson from a bike transit standpoint, Nelson is much better than  
17 Middlefield. I don't want to discourage that. I was very glad that you got the lights off  
18 the track. I was worried about people using the off-hours. I even got familiar with your  
19 practices. Do your practices use the whole field or will those four corners suffice for  
20 your drills that you're doing?

21 Mr. Aronson: Practices typically don't use the entire field. Most often they're just drills  
22 and so forth. We'll set up smaller—they're called bow nets, if you will. They're  
23 temporary stick goals. It also depends how many teams we try to get out there. We're  
24 envisioning probably three teams practicing at one time. If we have two or three slots,  
25 depending on how long they are—either 1 1/2-hour or 1-hour slots. We're not sure yet;  
26 we haven't worked out all those details. The goal would be to get three teams two or  
27 three times during that period. They would obviously be focused on the areas that have  
28 the light. Based on our recent experience in Mayfield, you can still practice where there's  
29 less light, but it just makes it a little more complicated.

30 Commissioner Reckdahl: Have you done a trial by bringing lights out to these  
31 (crosstalk)?

32 Mr. Aronson: We haven't. We were going to try to do that, but we ran out of time.

33 Commissioner Reckdahl: I'd like to see does it light enough of the field, but also is there  
34 any glare that bounces off the field.

1 Mr. Aronson: These lights are positionable. If you look at the image of the actual  
2 structure, you can move the lights and point them exactly where you want to. Again,  
3 LEDs don't necessarily have the same kind of pollution, as we understand it, that a  
4 halogen or a sodium light might.

5 Commissioner Reckdahl: I don't see any visors on that.

6 Mr. Aronson: It's hard to see in there. I haven't seen the actual structure up close and  
7 personal. My understanding is they are directional and there is a little bit of a cone, I  
8 guess you could say.

9 Commissioner Moss: To make sure that it's on the field, not into somebody's back yard.

10 Mr. Aronson: That's right. Again, these lights—that could be something that, if  
11 somebody wanted to mess with it, they could maybe get a stick or a broomstick and try to  
12 move the light around. We'd want to make sure we could adjust this and so forth. They  
13 are, I think, 20 feet up. My sense is it would be a hard thing to adjust if you were trying  
14 to mess with it.

15 Commissioner Reckdahl: You're saying if you're trying to adjust it?

16 Mr. Aronson: If somebody were trying to vandalize it.

17 Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm not worried about that. I would encourage you—you're  
18 talking February. What was the date?

19 Mr. Aronson: February 12th, which is a Monday.

20 Commissioner Reckdahl: If that's when you start using it, when will you have your trial?

21 Mr. Aronson: The trial period would start February 12th and run to basically the day of  
22 daylight savings time.

23 Commissioner Reckdahl: You're not going to move the lights up there a couple of nights  
24 ahead of time?

25 Chair McDougall: Keith, we agreed that a trial period—this was a short enough trial  
26 period that having a trial period for the trial period—in the ad hoc meeting we addressed  
27 this. We came to the conclusion that the risk is—by the way, if after 2 days—they start  
28 on the 12th, and on Valentine's Day we've already concluded that it's a nuisance, then the  
29 trial stops. I don't think we need the trial before the trial.

30 Commissioner Reckdahl: I was just worried about them, not so much for the neighbors  
31 but for you to set up the lights and point them where you want them.

1 Mr. Aronson: I think the first night will be a figure-it-out ...

2 Commissioner Reckdahl: A trial by fire.

3 Mr. Aronson: Trial by fire, right. We'll get out there, and we'll probably have the  
4 technician from the lighting company out there as well. We'll set it up and adjust them as  
5 needed that first day.

6 Commissioner Reckdahl: You've set it up with the neighbors? If there's problems, they'll  
7 call Adam or ...

8 Mr. Howard: Yep, they have my contact information.

9 Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm very happy with this. I think it has a lot of potential and  
10 very limited downside. I would encourage it.

11 Chair McDougall: There was a debate within the ad hoc. We wanted to give them  
12 David's phone number, but ...

13 Commissioner Reckdahl: They'll be calling David regardless.

14 Chair McDougall: Anne, last but not least.

15 Commissioner Cribbs: Thank you. I appreciate that. That's okay. I just wanted to say  
16 that I'm really happy to see where this has evolved. Adam, you've done a great job  
17 working not only with the ad hoc but with your staff and Palo Alto Soccer Club. Kudos  
18 to you guys for bringing it to the City and actually being so, I think, very understanding  
19 about the needs of the neighbors and certainly respect for what they're thinking about. I  
20 don't see how we're going to have anything but good stuff coming out of this. We're  
21 certainly going to learn a lot. Could you just tell me two things. It says here Monday  
22 through Thursday. There's no Friday use, is that what I'm reading?

23 Mr. Aronson: Typically, we don't have practices on Friday. The teams are often given a  
24 break because of games on Saturdays and Sundays.

25 Commissioner Cribbs: What is your percentage of girls versus boys in Palo Alto Soccer?

26 Mr. Aronson: I'm going to wing this, so this is from memory. We have about 1,000 kids  
27 in the club. It's pretty darn close to 50/50. I think we have of the 70, 75 teams, 30 are  
28 girls and the other 40, 45 are boys. It's pretty close. On the younger end, girls are  
29 coming on strong. It's wonderful to see that the girls' teams are as many and more  
30 enthusiastic than the boys' teams at the younger ages.

1 Commissioner Cribbs: Good. Thank you very much for that. That will not make me ask  
2 the last question, which is I'm assuming the girls are going to get us the lighting?

3 Mr. Aronson: Absolutely.

4 Commissioner Cribbs: Good. Thank you very much.

5 Chair McDougall: Let me go back to the opening. Daren, this is a recommendation. The  
6 question is can the Commission approve this and you go off and do it or does this have to  
7 go to Council? That would determine what kind of motion or whether we need a motion.

8 Mr. Anderson: That's right. Adam, you've had discussion with the City Manager on this.

9 Mr. Howard: Kristen O'Kane, the Assistant Director, says that if you guys accept it,  
10 they'll go to Council on an informational item.

11 Commissioner Reckdahl: There's no PIO.

12 Chair McDougall: Before we entertain a motion, the topic here has been the temporary  
13 lighting on the Cubberley turf field. I would like to recommend that what we have been  
14 considering is a trial of short-term lighting for Cubberley turf field and track. That  
15 should be the topic that we're addressing if everybody understands that structure. Can I  
16 have a motion that we instruct staff to take this as an information item to City Council  
17 and that we the Commission is approving this cooperation with the Palo Alto Soccer  
18 Club?

19 **MOTION** [See McDougall's comments above]

20 Commissioner LaMere: I move.

21 Chair McDougall: Can I have a second?

22 Commissioner Reckdahl: I second.

23 Chair McDougall: Everybody in favor say aye. Anybody opposed. Thank you for the  
24 effort we've put into this. I would like to echo what Jeff said. It's exciting to have this  
25 addressed quickly and cooperatively like this. Thank you for the efforts you've put into  
26 the trial of short-term lighting for the Cubberley turf field and track.

27 **Motion passed 5-0** McCauley and Greenfield absent

28 **7. Baylands Boardwalk Improvements**

29 Chair McDougall: The next topic—I'll let Meghan get set up—is the Baylands  
30 Boardwalk improvement. I'll turn it over to Meghan. I have that right, don't I, Meghan?



1 Megha Bansal: Megha.

2 Chair McDougall: I'll ask Megha to introduce the other two please.

3 Ms. Bansal: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Megha Bansal with Public  
4 Works Department. I would like to introduce our team here tonight. Elizabeth Ames is  
5 the project manager, and John Aiken from Community Services Department and our  
6 environmental consultant, John Hesler, from DJ Powers. We are here tonight to provide  
7 you an informational update on the Baylands Boardwalk project. This was a follow-up  
8 item from our previous meeting with you for Park Improvement Ordinance  
9 recommendation in September. Our overview tonight. We'll give a brief overview of the  
10 project elements. Then, we will provide further clarification to your comments and  
11 concerns that were discussed in September meeting as well as we'll provide an update on  
12 CEQA comments, ARB comments, some design updates, status update on regulatory  
13 permits. Then, John will provide an overview of the interpretive signage program in the  
14 Baylands, particularly to the Boardwalk project. Then, we will wrap up with schedule  
15 and next steps. This is the big picture of the project. I will not go into details of the  
16 design elements as we have discussed them several times in previous meetings. The big  
17 picture is this project replaces the existing Boardwalk with a new accessible Boardwalk  
18 on the same alignment. Everything will be new, new decking, piles and supports,  
19 amenities. We will have four new overlooks and one observation platform. I would like  
20 to start with one of your main concerns from September meeting. The Commission was  
21 concerned that the proposed higher Boardwalk will not give the users the same  
22 experience as the existing Boardwalk. I would like to reiterate the regulatory  
23 requirements by BCDC, Bay Area Conservation and Development Commission. The  
24 project is in the BCDC jurisdiction; therefore, we need a permit from BCDC to build this  
25 Boardwalk. BCDC's policy is that the proposed project should meet FEMA 100-year  
26 flood elevation, which is 11.1 feet elevation, and it should be resilient to mid-century sea  
27 level rise prediction, which is 2 feet for the area. If you add these two components, it  
28 takes us to 13.11 feet. With consultation with BCDC, we decided that we should be  
29 using 13 1/2 feet elevation for the Boardwalk deck, which would match the newly  
30 renovated Interpretive Center deck as well as the observation platform. I also have a  
31 graphic view of the proposed Boardwalk height with respect to the existing Boardwalk.  
32 As you can see on this graphic, the existing Boardwalk is about 2.1 feet higher than the  
33 original ground elevation. The proposed Boardwalk will be 5.7 feet higher than the  
34 existing ground. It incorporates the BCDC criteria, which is FEMA 100-year flood  
35 elevation as well as 2-foot sea level rise. That takes us to—basically the proposed  
36 Boardwalk is roughly 3 1/2 feet higher than the existing Boardwalk. I would also like to  
37 point out that when we first initiated our discussion with BCDC, we proposed a deck  
38 height of 11.5 feet, but BCDC rejected it. They asked us to use 13 1/2 feet to meet their  
39 requirements. We believe that if we go back to BCDC to reduce the Boardwalk deck  
40 height, first of all the project will not be permissible [sic]. There will be significant delays

APPROVED

1 in the project. All the permit applications have been submitted. It would reset the permit  
2 process as well as the CEQA document has been adopted. It would require major updates  
3 to the CEQA document. The other comment from the Commission was if we can provide  
4 closer access to marsh by providing stair down to the marshland. Again, this does not  
5 meet BCDC policies and their requirements as well as it would not provide equal access  
6 per ADA standards. BCDC required us to prepare a shade study when we first initiated  
7 the discussion with them. It would require further evaluation to assess impact on  
8 vegetation growth under the wider section of the structure. Again, it would mean  
9 potential updates to the approved CEQA document and delays on the project. Another  
10 main comment from the Commission was we added raptor-deterrent rollers. There is a  
11 sample here. We added raptor-deterrent rollers that would be attached on top of the  
12 railing. The Commission was concerned that if someone hold onto these rollers, they will  
13 be slipping hazards. This was added to the design based on U.S. Fish and Wildlife  
14 Services' input. We really cannot remove it from the design. Based on your input in the  
15 previous meeting, we are adding handrail on both sides of the Boardwalk.

16 Chair McDougall: That makes sense. That's great.

17 Ms. Bansal: Again, CEQA update. CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted,  
18 and a Notice of Determination was filed in November of last year. We only received one  
19 comment from the Santa Clara Valley Water District during CEQA circulation. That was  
20 for routine inspection for spill prevention during construction. This would be added to  
21 the contractor's contract; this requirement will be added. There were no other CEQA  
22 comments. ARB recommended approval of the project in October unanimously;  
23 however, they provided some suggestions. Most of the suggestions were related to  
24 design details, refining the details. Some of them were deck staining was not preferred  
25 because it is a huge long-term maintenance issue. If you remember, one of the samples  
26 here shows all board elements will be stained in this gray color per Palo Alto Baylands  
27 Guidelines. The Guidelines require that if you stain, then you have to stain in this color,  
28 but it is not a requirement. We have decided not to stain only the deck. The railings will  
29 still be stained to provide some protection, but the deck will not be stained. However, we  
30 will do clear staining to prevent any damage due to foot traffic. They also wanted us to  
31 specify types and grades of redwood that we will do. They wanted us to explore  
32 alternatives to Alaskan yellow cedars. ARB also suggested installing handrail, which we  
33 are doing. Their recommendation was to use stainless steel fasteners if possible because  
34 of the marsh environment. The design update based on your comments and ARB  
35 comments. We are adding wooden handrail on both sides of the Boardwalk. The deck  
36 will be clear stained to provide some protection, and stainless steel fasteners will be  
37 included as add alternate in the bid. Regulatory permits. We have the top three, U.S.  
38 Army Corps, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and BCDC, permits. These are the  
39 three permits required for the project. We have submitted applications for all three in  
40 September and October of last year. John Hesler, do you have anything to add? John's

1 group is following up with these agencies on a regular basis. John, do you have  
2 something to add to it?

3 John Hesler: Yeah. Good evening, Commissioners. I'll just add on that once the  
4 applications are submitted in this permit process, one of the key things is to keep dogging  
5 the staff of these agencies. Otherwise, things have a habit of getting delayed. Our goal  
6 on the team—we've heard loud and clear from the community and everybody—is to get  
7 this rebuilt ASAP. The other restriction we have is—because of the Ridgway rail  
8 restrictions out there, we can only construct from September 1 'til the end of January.  
9 That's our window when we're allowed out there. That means backing up. We're pulling  
10 out all the stops to get all those permits in hand this spring so you guys can go out to bid  
11 and then construct starting in September. Right now, it's looking very hopeful. You can  
12 never be 100% with these agencies. Everything we've heard so far is that they're  
13 supportive of the project.

14 Chair McDougall: And good luck.

15 Ms. Bansal: Quickly on schedule and next steps before John Aiken will provide update  
16 on the interpretive signage. After our meeting with the Commission in September, we  
17 went to ARB, and ARB approved the project. CEQA was adopted in November. Our  
18 next step is to go to Council for review and approval of the Park Improvement Ordinance.  
19 All applications were submitted in September and October of last year. We are very  
20 hopeful, like John said, to get our permits soon so we can start construction in September.  
21 With that, I turn it over to John for Boardwalk signage plan.

22 John Aiken: Good evening, Commissioners. John Aiken from Community Services.  
23 The Boardwalk signage plan is part of a larger plan that looks at adding signage to trails  
24 that connect the Cooley Landing Education Center in East Palo Alto to Lucy Evans  
25 Nature Center, which is about 2 1/2 miles of trails. That came out of really two things.  
26 One is we started to look at the need for interpretation on the Boardwalk as part of this  
27 project. At the time, we were also teaching at Cooley Landing, and we realized that that  
28 underserved community didn't have enough signage on that part of the trail and that there  
29 were a lot of people utilizing that area and a fair amount of crossover back and forth. We  
30 came up with this broader context for the signage. It also includes the Interpretive Center  
31 deck. The examples you'll see tonight are actually designs from that Interpretive Center  
32 deck. They're in the style that will be out on the Boardwalk. This is a washed out slide  
33 that's actually showing the plan of the Boardwalk. The Lucy Evans Nature Center is to  
34 the left, and mid-Boardwalk is to the right. There are a number of types of interpretive  
35 signage that we're doing because we have interpretive programs where educators are  
36 going out. They stand next to a guidepost essentially to do education programs. For the  
37 public, there are both signs and interpretive elements. There are the rest of them out  
38 there. They're really organized along those four out-pouchings of the Boardwalk and

APPROVED

1 then the overlook at the end; that's where they're clustered. Here are some examples.  
2 We're trying to build them into the railings so that the actual signage fits into the top bar  
3 of the actual railings and doesn't stick above it and block people's view. This is an  
4 example of a sign that has an illustration. We're using a number of different types of  
5 media because people have all kinds of learning styles. We're trying to cover those  
6 learning styles. The next one shows an example of the test with a photograph. The next  
7 one shows a text with a bronze casting, a tactile element to be able to feel, in this case,  
8 the differences between the three types of saltmarsh plants that live out there. That same  
9 interactive casting or tactile thing may be used in other ways, not just with the signage.  
10 We may install those as standalone signs. We're also looking at interactive elements,  
11 things that move and engage people in different ways. This is a railing-mounted  
12 sediment wheel. You essentially spin it, and the sediments that are in there go into  
13 solution. You see how long it takes the sediment to drop out of solution. If you have a  
14 couple of these side by side with different sediments, it helps people understand how the  
15 marsh is built over time by some sediments are moved more quickly than other  
16 sediments. Other interactive elements include sliders, things that change the nature of the  
17 sign when you move it back and forth. You can see what's going on at high tide versus  
18 low tide in this example. I think this is our last example, a below-railing-mounted cross-  
19 section of the marsh, where you could see the types of life that live below you in the mud.  
20 These are all conceptual designs. We still need to go through a design process, and we'll  
21 come back with further refined designs as we move forward. This project is also not  
22 funded; we're seeking funding. We've got a grant into the State of California; they just  
23 came out and did an inspection last week. We're feeling positive about that, but it's a  
24 very competitive grant process. With that, we're ready for questions.

25 Chair McDougall: Elizabeth, did you have anything to add?

26 Elizabeth Ames: Thank you, Commissioners. We really appreciate all the input that  
27 you've provided to us. We had a community meeting in May of last year. I'm sure  
28 everybody's anxious to see this happen. What we're trying to do is get the permits in  
29 spring instead of summer, like it says on the slide, and then go out to bid after we get the  
30 permits and then try to order the materials ahead of time because the yellow Alaskan  
31 cedar has a lead time. We're really going to be breaking ground on September 1st. This  
32 is our ultimate goal. We really appreciate you helping us expedite this process. If you  
33 have any questions, we're ready for you.

34 Chair McDougall: This time around, I'd like to give Anne the opportunity to go first.

35 Commissioner Cribbs: I only have one small question. John, what state agency did you  
36 apply for this particular grant?

37 Mr. Aiken: It's the Resources Agency. It's an outdoor education grant.

1 Commissioner Cribbs: Thank you very much.

2 Chair McDougall: Mr. Reckdahl. You were sitting beside a red light there. Use either  
3 on, use them both.

4 Commissioner Reckdahl: This one's broken. If I use both, it'll be the same if I just use  
5 this one. I still don't understand the height. It says the Boardwalk is designed to be  
6 resilient to accommodate projected sea level rise. There's no electricity here. There's  
7 nothing that's going to be damaged by exposure to water. Even if you do have a high tide  
8 and this gets wet, I don't understand why that would not be considered resilient. It's not  
9 going to break.

10 Mr. Hesler: If the BCDC policies are aimed at everything along the Bay that is subject to  
11 inundation, they would theoretically be usable even during a sea level/high tide event.  
12 Now, I know why you're looking at me that way. It kind of ignores the fact that in many  
13 of these cases—this is true in a lot of projects we've worked on—they're asking for the  
14 new facility to be up very high, but you could never get to it in one of those events unless  
15 you had a boat, and everything else is going to be under water. Their rationale, their  
16 logic is that, yes, that may be true, but we have to start somewhere. We're going to be  
17 working over many years and decades toward having as many facilities as possible not  
18 subject to inundation.

19 Commissioner Reckdahl: They're talking about like a one in a million thing. All these  
20 things have to stack up. We'll be under water for 15 minutes, and then the tide will come  
21 down. It just seems like we're over-engineering.

22 Mr. Hesler: As Megha said, when we first went to BCDC, we had a whole tidal study  
23 done by our hydrologist. We presented them with all of the data, and they rejected it.  
24 They came back to us on the team and told us they wanted it at the same height as the  
25 new deck on the renovated Interpretive Center.

26 Commissioner Reckdahl: Do they understand that this is not a transit boardwalk, but  
27 purely an observational boardwalk?

28 Mr. Hesler: Yes.

29 Commissioner Reckdahl: It just makes no sense to me.

30 Mr. Anderson: If I could add just a note. I had the privilege of taking care of that  
31 Boardwalk while it was limping along for the last 18 years or so. That meant all the  
32 nails, the screws that had rotted out because they were inundated. All the low areas that  
33 did receive—not the whole Boardwalk would get inundated with the high tides; even at  
34 king tides, there were only portions. Those that did, the wood had rotted quicker, and all

1 the metal fixtures, both under and top, that affix the Boardwalk planks had all rotted out.  
2 What I had was bowing boards and hazards left and right. There's a maintenance  
3 advantage of having it elevated above that tidal influence, where you're not going to have  
4 those materials, both the wood and the metal, rotting out at an advanced rate.

5 Commissioner Reckdahl: If we go back to Slide 5. Aren't we going to have metal down  
6 here? It'd be different if all the metal was just up here, but there's going to be metal  
7 through the whole building.

8 Mr. Anderson: There will still be some (crosstalk).

9 Ms. Bansal: There will still be (inaudible). If you look at this graphic, the existing  
10 Boardwalk height—the 100-year flood elevation is higher than that. What we presented  
11 to BCDC initially was 11.5 feet of deck height, which was based on 100-year flood, and  
12 they wanted us to add 2 feet of sea level rise.

13 Commissioner Reckdahl: It just has to be resilient to it.

14 Chair McDougall: Can I interrupt briefly? I happen to agree. The 100-year flood—half  
15 of Palo Alto is going to be under water, so nobody's going to be out there walking on this  
16 thing. The only context in which it's interesting to have this conversation as opposed to  
17 just shake our heads is if we're going to say this thing is so high and so ugly at 13 feet in  
18 the air, we'd rather not have it. If that's the conversation we want to get into, then we  
19 should declare that conversation and have it. Otherwise, I'm not sure we're helping  
20 ourselves or—I'm just trying to create a context.

21 Commissioner Reckdahl: If we can lower it by 2 feet, we'd get a better product. We'd  
22 still have something that's resilient. We're painting ourselves in the corner of having a  
23 sub-optimal design.

24 Chair McDougall: Let me add that what staff is telling us—I would add to my  
25 conversation of we'd rather not have it or, in fact, we'd rather wait another year, at least  
26 another year. I'm willing to trust that they've done the work that we're not going to  
27 change the height. John.

28 Mr. Hesler: If I may. I totally understand where you're coming from. The issue with  
29 BCDC is there's no magic number. They want us to do everything that's practical. Had  
30 we from Day 1 come to them and said, "We want to set it at X feet because the geologic  
31 studies or the structural issues are precluding something heavier or taller," they would  
32 have been fine with that. The issue, though, is in this case from their perspective—we  
33 didn't have any data either—there was no reason for us not to agree to the 13.5, especially  
34 since the deck on the Interpretive Center was that.

1 Commissioner Reckdahl: That's apples and oranges. The purpose of the deck on the  
2 Interpretive Center is one thing, and the Boardwalk is to get down into the pickleweed.

3 Mr. Hesler: I understand. From their perspective, given the predictions and the data that  
4 we had given them, they wanted the 13.5. We were faced with a dilemma. If we had  
5 said, "No, we're not going to do it," we weren't able to give them any rationale like  
6 geologic constraints or engineering constraints.

7 Commissioner Reckdahl: User experience is a reasonable reason.

8 Mr. Hesler: True.

9 Commissioner Reckdahl: We design a lot of stuff to optimize the user experience.

10 Mr. Hesler: I'm not saying this is logical.

11 Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm beating a dead horse, and we should move on.

12 Chair McDougall: Let me let Anne ask another question.

13 Commissioner Cribbs: I'm just agreeing that I think this is a crazy discussion. We are  
14 beating a dead horse. I'd love to ask has anybody ever won or changed BCDC's mind. In  
15 my experience, it hasn't.

16 Mr. Hesler: It would be very difficult. If we went back and said we want to change the  
17 design to have it lower, this year will be off the table immediately. Likely, we would  
18 have a difficult time in getting it permitted. Secondarily, the fact that the new facility is  
19 going to be wider than the existing, we had an issue with potentially having to have  
20 mitigation because of the shading from the structure decreasing the vegetation under the  
21 structure. By having it higher, we offset the shading. That was another thing that we  
22 were trying to do from Day 1, which is to not get the project and the City into this  
23 mitigation mess that could be very costly and very difficult to find in a place like this.  
24 That was also in play. It was another reason why it was a little bit higher than we ideally  
25 would have wanted it, but we had the huge benefit of not having to have mitigation.

26 Ms. Ames: Thank you. That was what I wanted to point out. There are two federally  
27 endangered species, the saltmarsh harvest mouse and the Ridgway rail. You need the  
28 habitat to support the species. The Boardwalk ironically was wider, which could have  
29 caused more shading, but then it was higher so it allowed light to come in and create  
30 more habitat for these endangered species. In that respect, it seems like the agencies are  
31 going to be supportive of the height just because of this condition. Also, I recall, John,  
32 you were saying that there was this report that came out of the State of California, *The*  
33 *Rising Seas in California*. It was issued, I guess, April 2017. Although mid-century to  
34 2050, there would be hardly any change, there are scientific data that shows after 2050

APPROVED

1 it's going to be worse than what we've actually predicted right now. It is kind of a  
2 moving target. They're predicting ice sheets and more greenhouse gases. We already are  
3 experiencing climate change effects right now. The science is still in flux. It is a little  
4 frustrating, but it would be essentially beating a dead horse, I believe.

5 Chair McDougall: Keith, I'm inclined to—I'm sorry, Anne. Go ahead.

6 Commissioner Cribbs: I was troubled by what you said about if we would have gone in  
7 from the beginning with a lower level—the path would have been lower—then we  
8 wouldn't have run into these issues. Right or we might have?

9 Mr. Hesler: Actually we did go in with a lower, and they asked us to raise it because  
10 there was no engineering or geologic reason that we could have come back to them and  
11 said, "Sorry, we can't go any higher for X, Y, Z reasons." If we had had those reason,  
12 they would probably say, "You've done what is practical."

13 Chair McDougall: Not only did we not have the reasons but there aren't reasons. At the  
14 risk of doing what I suggested Mr. Reckdahl not do, my question would be why did we  
15 make it so wide.

16 Commissioner Reckdahl: ADA, isn't it?

17 Ms. Bansal: Yeah. It is accessible.

18 Chair McDougall: That was exactly where I was going. When you think about it, one of  
19 the real advantages of the other one—it was sort of spooky to walk out on this really  
20 narrow thing. It was part of the thrill. The absolutely wrong conclusion here, Keith, is  
21 what we can hope is we have enough sea level rise that it comes up to where we have the  
22 Boardwalk, which is probably the wrong thing to wish for.

23 Commissioner Reckdahl: What'll happen to the pickleweed if we have sea level rise?  
24 Will mud rise with it or will we just have water under the ...

25 Mr. Aiken: I've asked this question. My understanding is that the marsh sediments will  
26 readjust themselves, and the marsh will rise with the sea level.

27 Commissioner Reckdahl: Maybe in 50 years we'll have their optimal height.  
28 Serendipity. Don't bike to work.

29 Chair McDougall: Do we have any other questions.

30 Commissioner LaMere: A quick question. What's the lifespan of the structure? Is it  
31 going to last 50 years, 75 years so there is ...

1 Ms. Bansal: It is 50-75 years.

2 Commissioner LaMere: If sea levels rise in 50 years and it falls apart in 50 years, then  
3 you're building something that would be above sea level when you rebuild it. I was just  
4 curious about it. If sea level's happening that many years down the road and the structure  
5 then falls apart, then you're building something correctly 75 years from now or 50 years  
6 from now or whatever. I don't know if that makes sense. It doesn't really (crosstalk).

7 Ms. Bansal: We are anticipating or based on the research that our consultant has done,  
8 the life of the structure would be 50-75 years. I'm sorry we didn't ...

9 Commissioner LaMere: What we're projecting is what's the sea level going to be 50  
10 years from. What I'm saying is that we're right, but it's going to fall apart then. Why  
11 don't we then build something bigger at that time? That was my only observation.

12 Ms. Bansal: The other thing is it really doesn't make sense to go higher than the  
13 Interpretive Center because that's the axis ...

14 Commissioner LaMere: I don't want to go higher.

15 Ms. Bansal: To address future sea level rise.

16 Commissioner LaMere: The one thing I would say on the graphic or to explain to people  
17 is that it's not—you have elevation height. You should probably also—you have it  
18 indicated as 5.7 feet, but it isn't necessarily clear that the Boardwalk is 5.7 feet above the  
19 existing ground. Is that correct?

20 Ms. Bansal: It is 5.7 feet above the existing.

21 Commissioner LaMere: All the talk is about elevation. It's at 13.5 feet. I think  
22 sometimes you might look at that and just think it's actually even 13.5 feet above the  
23 water.

24 Ms. Bansal: Yeah, because the existing ground ...

25 Commissioner LaMere: When you explain it to people—there's two different numbers  
26 where it's 6 feet above the water.

27 Ms. Bansal: Yes, thank you.

28 Commissioner LaMere: You mentioned something about funding. Is that just funding  
29 for the signage that we don't have?

30 Chair McDougall: It's the signage.

1 Commissioner LaMere: The funding for the Boardwalk, we're good with that. That's  
2 correct?

3 Ms. Bansal: We do have funding for Boardwalk.

4 Chair McDougall: Jeff, I thought you were going to suggest that we should lower the  
5 Interpretive Center.

6 Commissioner LaMere: No, I don't suggest that. One thing I would say is, in light of this  
7 discussion and also seeing that we're not going to be able to do the ADA requirements  
8 and other requirements, be able to put lower observation decks off of this, I don't know if  
9 we can think of a project later on or maybe it's not even feasibly possible because of all  
10 the restrictions. How do we get people closer into the pickleweed and closer into the  
11 marshland? Would there ever be any opportunity? Obviously it's not with this project.  
12 Perhaps brainstorming down the road, is there something that we can think of? It does  
13 seem to be a priority; it's something we've all talked about. It's probably something that's  
14 been in public comments. Is there a way to get people closer to the Baylands? I think  
15 that'd be something to consider.

16 Chair McDougall: David, go ahead.

17 Commissioner Moss: That was my point exactly. Daren promised me we won't lift the  
18 road height because the road floods at the king tide. Believe me, when we have the  
19 higher sea level, it'll flood more often. Just promise me we won't lift that road grade.

20 Mr. Anderson: I can't guarantee that.

21 Commissioner Moss: That's where I'm going to take my grandchildren to get the marsh  
22 experience.

23 Chair McDougall: I think we're at a point where hopefully we can create—do we need a  
24 motion? We don't here. This is just information. On that basis, David.

25 Commissioner Moss: I have one more comment. I forgot the roller. I went to the marina  
26 at Alviso and played with it a little bit. You should know that the maintenance of those  
27 will require that you grease them. They haven't been greased at the marina in quite a  
28 while, so it doesn't turn very easily. Make sure you budget for that maintenance. It  
29 seems to work fine if it's maintained.

30 Chair McDougall: I like this one better than the one that's at the park down south here  
31 because it has these ridges on it. That makes sense. I'd like to comment just briefly on  
32 this signage. I don't know if any of this is in response to Chair McDougall ranting about  
33 signage every time you show up. Every time anybody shows up, I rant about the signage.  
34 If it is, thank you. If it's not, then congratulations. You anticipated me. I would

1 comment relative to my other Commissioners that there are lots of places even just on the  
2 pathway that takes you to the Boardwalk and around the duck pond where you can get to  
3 pickleweed without—in fact you can get to pickleweed where you can pick it and taste it  
4 and feed it to the kids so they can. Therefore, as you're talking about putting signage all  
5 the way from Cooley Landing to Palo Alto, maybe there are—if we looked at it in a  
6 larger context, maybe there should be a few other signs that go in somewhere near where  
7 there is pickleweed that's accessible or whatever, so that you do that. Before you respond  
8 to that, on the other hand, the other two comments I would like to make about it is this is  
9 the schedule and next steps. I doubt that the contractor you sign up is going to put the  
10 signs in.

11 Ms. Bansal: No. That would be ...

12 Chair McDougall: You're missing a step, and that step needs to be, as far as I'm  
13 concerned, on this schedule. The signs need to be installed within 3 months of  
14 completion or whatever it is. To go with my rant, if I go home tonight and tell my wife  
15 that I didn't mention that for another year there are no signs on Byxbee hill and you have  
16 all those stupid blank boxes to put signs on, I won't be allowed in the house. It's no good  
17 to have a sign plan if there isn't a sign installation commitment, which needs to be on the  
18 schedule. In the meantime, we need, Mr. Daren, signs at Byxbee Park, even if those  
19 signs are just simply to point out where the stinkweed is. Sorry about the rant.

20 Commissioner Reckdahl: The signage would have to be TBD from—because we don't  
21 have any funding.

22 Chair McDougall: I understand that.

23 Commissioner Reckdahl: Subject to funding, maybe.

24 Chair McDougall: That would be fine. Just the plan to—I want it on this schedule so  
25 that we know that it's not just a good idea. It's actually going to be completed.

26 Mr. Aiken: You'll be happy to hear that we've identified a place to talk about pickleweed  
27 and saltmarsh grass out on the levee as well.

28 Chair McDougall: Thank you. Thank you very much for a great presentation and  
29 discussion and being patient with all of our good ideas about how to do a better job than  
30 you've done. You've done a wonderful job. David.

31 Commissioner Moss: The signage—the amount of money that you need for the signage  
32 separate and distinct from the money for the construction. As soon as we can get some  
33 kind of an amount for that, we can find some funding sources perhaps for something like  
34 that as soon as you can get an estimate for the signage.

APPROVED

1 Mr. Aiken: I've got the estimates for the signage. I don't have the numbers in front of  
2 me. The total program is \$216,000 to do the signage for Cooley Landing down and the  
3 Boardwalk. I could break out what just the Boardwalk costs.

4 Chair McDougall: I think, Commissioner Moss, we would—they seem to have this  
5 funding, at least a target. I would maybe word your request differently that come back to  
6 us if you're having trouble and tell us what you're having trouble with. In the meantime,  
7 good luck getting the whole \$250,000.

8 Commissioner Moss: I'd like to know how much we need that you can't get.

9 Mr. Aiken: Since you asked, when the state came out and did their inspection last week,  
10 they made a comment saying that, "Your grant would be far more competitive if you had  
11 a matching piece to it." There's a \$54,000 matching piece that we're looking at seeking  
12 private funding for right now. If we're able to guarantee that within the next 2 weeks—  
13 that's the challenge—to change our paperwork and our request. I think it makes the grant  
14 much more competitive.

15 Commissioner Moss: The reason I brought it up is that the Friends of the Palo Alto Parks  
16 looks for low-hanging fruit like this. They can't build you a \$10 million Boardwalk, but  
17 they could come up with smaller amounts. I don't know what that amount is, but I'd like  
18 to jump on that if I can.

19 Chair McDougall: I would encourage you to talk directly to these people and the people  
20 at Friends of Palo Alto Parks.

21 Commissioner Reckdahl: One last question for Daren. We mentioned going to Cooley  
22 Landing. That last dirt trail, are we going to pave that?

23 Mr. Anderson: That is not owned by the City. That is private property, and we need an  
24 agreement from them. You'll notice there's paving on either side of it, asphalt on one  
25 side, decomposed granite on the other. That owner of that property did not give us  
26 approval for it.

27 Commissioner Reckdahl: We own all the way up to Cooley.

28 Mr. Anderson: We do, but not up until that levee. That portion is private, so we had to  
29 get an easement approval from PG&E on one side, a different property owner on the  
30 other. This one, where it's unimproved, we did not get the easement approved. We do  
31 not have the privilege or right to come in and pave that.

32 Commissioner Reckdahl: Where the dirt trail is, we don't own that land?

33 Mr. Anderson: We own up to the levee as it rises, right up to that point.

1 Commissioner Reckdahl: We can't put the trail on the side of the levee. We don't have  
2 an easement?

3 Mr. Anderson: Nope. They wouldn't give us one. I've been working with East Palo Alto  
4 for the last year or so. The City of East Palo Alto is eager to do it too, so they're on our  
5 side and negotiating conversations with the—it's still the same property owner  
6 unfortunately who didn't want to do it before. They're willing to kind of open that again  
7 and put in a new request, a fresh one, to see if there's anything they could do to talk this  
8 individual into opening it up.

9 Commissioner Reckdahl: This is what eminent domain is for honestly. We have a trail  
10 that goes along, and then someone is blocking off that trail.

11 Commissioner Moss: This is far bigger than you think because it's also the Bay Trail,  
12 whatever it's called, the Ring the Bay Trail.

13 Mr. Anderson: Yeah, the Bay Trail.

14 Commissioner Moss: This one person for 100 yards is stopping the entire Bay Trail. I  
15 would think that you could get BCDC and other—ABAG to put pressure on this person.  
16 Otherwise, you could cantilever a path over the marsh about 5 feet and never ...

17 Mr. Anderson: It'd be 13 feet high. The point is we are working on that one. That's been  
18 the status quo for—it's been that way for a decade. We didn't do much for it for a while.  
19 Now, we're picking it back up because East Palo Alto and I had a good conversation.  
20 They're willing to help, which is the great part. I think we'll get traction on that sooner  
21 rather than later and at least get the request to this gentleman. Perhaps East Palo Alto has  
22 some leverage that we don't. Last thing, that's still used. We do come in and mow it, and  
23 people do bike across it regularly. We've even done improvements, although it's not our  
24 right to come in and fill holes and things like that. It's just not the way we'd like it, paved  
25 or decomposed granite.

26 Chair McDougall: Again, Megha, Elizabeth, John, and John, thank you very much.  
27 Great progress. I'm going to put September 1st on my calendar for the—what was it—  
28 groundbreaking; although, I'm not sure how we're going to go about breaking ground out  
29 there. We can't pour wine on the birds or anything, on the mice. We'll have to find some  
30 celebration of the September 1st kickoff. Thank you.

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

32 Chair McDougall: The next topic is Other Ad Hoc Committee Updates. I did not bring  
33 my list of ad hoc committees. Thankfully, Anne rescued me. 7.7 acres we've talked  
34 about. The 10 1/2 acres, I don't think there's anything. I'm not going to read through this



1 whole list. I'm just going to ask if there's anything anybody wanted to add from ad hocs  
2 that wasn't on the handout.

3 Commissioner Moss: Several agenda items today did point out funding needs. The  
4 funding committee has some work to do on at least three of these items. We have asked  
5 staff if we can meet with them sooner rather than later. I just wanted to put that into the  
6 notes. In fact, it's critical.

7 Chair McDougall: I would agree with that. I would welcome an invitation to meet with  
8 the committee when they meet with staff. I would be happy to participate.

9 **VI. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

10 Chair McDougall: Comments and Announcements, the one that I have is there's no  
11 update on the golf course.

12 Mr. Anderson: It's the same status as it was last time.

13 **VII. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR FEBRUARY 27, 2018 MEETING**

14 Chair McDougall: The agenda. It says confirm the date for the retreat and set agenda.  
15 David.

16 Commissioner Moss: Before you do that, one other thing about the ad hoc committee.  
17 The AT&T park, has there been any movement on that?

18 Mr. Anderson: No news on that, that I've heard from our real estate staff.

19 Chair McDougall: Did we get some jump up over here to make an announcement or  
20 maybe an introduction? Do you have information on the retreat?

21 Ms. Bourquin: Kristen was going to go over it with you. I sent her an email with Doodle  
22 results. Anne Cribbs was the only person that wasn't going to be able to make it. I'm not  
23 sure what she wanted to do with that.

24 Commissioner Reckdahl: What was that tentative date?

25 Ms. Bourquin: I think it was the last one. That's what I was looking at. It looks like  
26 February 23rd was the date that everybody except Anne could make it.

27 Chair McDougall: Can we pencil in February 23? I'm sorry, Anne.

28 Commissioner Cribbs: That's okay. It happens.

APPROVED

1 Chair McDougall: Could we pencil in February 23rd? I'll take the action item to meet  
2 with Kristen to talk about the agenda and get everybody's participation and what that  
3 agenda might be. Knowing what we're doing ahead of the meeting is probably better off  
4 than showing up and guessing at it. Is that okay with everybody? Keith, you'll help me  
5 with that?

6 Commissioner Reckdahl: Yeah. I can give you what we did last time, and then you can  
7 work from there. Historically, the Vice Chair will go over what has been done in the past  
8 year. You just basically go through every meeting and say, "We had these presentations.  
9 We had these actions." The Chair will have outstanding issues and ad hocs and things  
10 that we want to talk about. I can give you what I presented last year.

11 Chair McDougall: Maybe I can buy you coffee, and you can reconstruct that and maybe  
12 tell me any learnings you might have had from that. Would that be okay?

13 Commissioner Reckdahl: Yeah, most definitely. Location for the retreat. Sometimes we  
14 have it up in the Foothills Park, which is, I think, a nicer area but not as convenient.  
15 Down in Mitchell Park is more convenient, but you feel like you have less of a retreat.  
16 Do people have feelings of the tradeoff of convenience versus ambience?

17 Chair McDougall: We could use some of the library rooms, which are not—they're City  
18 ambience, but they're not native ambience. I know that Environmental Volunteers is  
19 renting out their space now. I'll bet I can get a deal as in ...

20 Commissioner Reckdahl: That would be good. Where's that space?

21 Commissioner Moss: That's at the Baylands.

22 Chair McDougall: In the Baylands, the Eco Center. The Eco Center's got a very nice  
23 space there, the Sea Scout building.

24 Commissioner Reckdahl: That's true too. We have the Interpretive Center right there  
25 too.

26 Chair McDougall: We don't even have to ask anybody to do that.

27 Commissioner Reckdahl: That might be a nice compromise. It's a little closer than  
28 Foothills.

29 Chair McDougall: Let's plan that. We have a location; we have a date; we have a plan to  
30 get an agenda. Thank you for that reminder that we need to get that.

31 Commissioner Reckdahl: When is our next meeting then? February ...

1 Commissioner LaMere: 27th.

2 Chair McDougall: 27th, right. Are there topics for that meeting that we should make  
3 sure are on the agenda?

4 Commissioner Moss: Normally, we get ahead of time the list of all the future meetings  
5 and the topics so far. Did we get that for this time?

6 Chair McDougall: Yes.

7 Chair McDougall: It's the activities prohibited in dedicated parkland. That was one of  
8 the—we were looking for a definition of dedicated.

9 Commissioner Reckdahl: The related thing was we talked about that art. Sorry. What's  
10 the park over on Alma?

11 Commissioner Cribbs: By the train station.

12 Commissioner Reckdahl: By the train station. Bowden Park. That area is just unused.

13 Mr. Anderson: The grassy area right on the (crosstalk). That's the area we were talking  
14 about perhaps doing a dog park with the art.

15 Commissioner Reckdahl: If we're going to talk about activities prohibited in parks, a  
16 related thing was what constraints do we have on parks. We have public art in that ...

17 Mr. Anderson: I almost wonder if ...

18 Commissioner Moss: Could we get the Art Commission to come and talk to us?

19 Mr. Anderson: That's right. I was thinking the liaison could come and talk with us.

20 Chair McDougall: That would be a really good idea.

21 Commissioner Reckdahl: Another area for public art—I think Byxbee is so barren up  
22 there. If we could have some public art, it would not only add some interest, but it also  
23 would allow us to orient yourself. You get up top on Byxbee, and you feel like where's  
24 where. There's no landmarks at all. It's just stinkwort.

25 Mr. Anderson: You're right. Actually coming up if not the community meeting that I  
26 mentioned—there'll be a subsequent one that's dedicated to public art for the Baylands  
27 Comprehensive Plan. That's a whole element of the plan. Not necessarily for our earlier  
28 discussion about Bowden and what we'd do with that, but for the Baylands that would be  
29 a comprehensive investigation into public art.

APPROVED

1 Commissioner Reckdahl: (inaudible) remember this one when he's back. When we  
2 first—it was about 4 years. We had Friends of Palo Alto Parks come in and give an  
3 overview. I think that would be good. Do you think you could talk to them and see if  
4 they have—are you still going to their meetings?

5 Commissioner Moss: I haven't been invited for a while.

6 Commissioner Cribbs: I'd be happy to do that, call them. On the next meeting, would we  
7 like him?

8 Commissioner Reckdahl: That's something that Don and Kristen will have to figure out,  
9 whether they want to come back and give a presentation. That was very useful. I was the  
10 only one on the Commission at that time that is still here. It'd be brand new to everyone  
11 else. We're talking about bringing the Friends of Palo Alto Parks in to say, "This is what  
12 we do, and this is" ... They want to know how they can help us, and we want to know  
13 they can help them.

14 Chair McDougall: I heard you extolling the virtues of putting more signage up on  
15 Byxbee Park along with the art.

16 Mr. Anderson: That signage is funded, just waiting on design. That'll be part of the  
17 Baylands Conservation Plan. It's coming.

18 Chair McDougall: When can I come over and help design them?

19 Mr. Anderson: This next meeting.

20 Commissioner Moss: Along with the Friends of the Palo Alto Parks, if we could talk  
21 about the AT&T property at the same time, that would be ideal because they're very  
22 interested in helping us with that.

23 Commissioner LaMere: Do we at some point—speaking of the Friends of the Parks,  
24 would we want to invite at some point the Palo Alto Recreation Foundation?

25 Commissioner Cribbs: We probably should.

26 Commissioner LaMere: Especially if we're interested in having them be a pass-through  
27 for some of the fundraising that we want to do. My other question would be what do we  
28 do now as far as the pickleball and tennis. Is that an ad hoc committee and recreation  
29 question? Does that come back? Is that something we address again in another meeting?  
30 What do we think the path forward is with that?

31 Chair McDougall: I think our position is continue to do some more outreach. We'd  
32 already had a discussion. Commissioner Moss earlier mentioned can you just get them in

1 a room. We've already had that conversation. In the short term, I trust the work that  
2 Adam's doing in terms of outreach and looking for a compromise. Both sides talk about  
3 wanting to work together. None of them act like working together. We need to facilitate  
4 that conversation.

5 Commissioner Reckdahl: One thing that I think we have to really get to is good usage  
6 data. How much of the tennis court's used? Also, the lit courts, how much are they used?  
7 For example, if pickleball just had a non-lit court, would that be enough for them for  
8 now? Cubberley has six tennis courts over there. If two of those—there are three sets of  
9 two. If two of those became pickleball with no lights, would that be a good compromise?

10 Chair McDougall: In fact, we were trying to figure out how to get data on when they  
11 were used and not used. The conversation in the ad hoc—maybe it was even in the last  
12 meeting—was setting up cameras. There was all sorts of issues relative to privacy.  
13 Somebody pointed out to me that there are already cameras in the Magical Playground.  
14 There are probably enough pointing in that direction that they ...

15 Peter Jensen: There are no cameras in the playground. The City has a very strict policy  
16 against having any type of camera. Only on the train tracks.

17 Chair McDougall: I would hope so. Thank you.

18 Commissioner Reckdahl: If they were de-focused so all you see is blobs, there'd be no  
19 privacy issue.

20 Chair McDougall: Let's not add it to our agenda.

21 Commissioner Reckdahl: I think what the bottom line is I don't care how they get usage  
22 data, but we need usage data.

23 Chair McDougall: Good data is really important.

24 Commissioner Reckdahl: Right now, we're saying with anecdotal evidence that these  
25 courts aren't used. There are all these leaves on it, and they were sweeping off the leaves.  
26 That suggests that it's not used. Now, the tennis people are saying that's used heavily.  
27 Who's right? We've got to have the data; we need data one way or another.

28 Commissioner Cribbs: The other data I would like to make sure we have is the number  
29 of tennis courts that exist in the City, the lighted ones and the regular ones, and if there  
30 are any tennis courts at the School District that can be used or not. Just the total numbers.

31 Commissioner Reckdahl: The total numbers. The email that I sent you—those numbers  
32 are correct. The lit courts that the City has is we have seven in Mitchell Park that are lit.

1 Chair McDougall: Now, we're getting into ... I think we shouldn't do this. It wasn't  
2 agendized. We're now outside—we're discussing things. We had the people here. I want  
3 to be careful about ...

4 Commissioner Reckdahl: We're going on a tangent we don't need to go on.

5 Chair McDougall: On the other hand, I would reinforce that any suggestions or  
6 recommendations you have—let's get them to the ad hoc. The other thing I would invite  
7 is as long as we don't violate the Brown rule, depending on who's around or whatever,  
8 everybody's invited to participate in the ad hoc as far as I'm concerned as long we don't  
9 go outside the Brown rules. The number of people is the only issue I have.

10 Commissioner Reckdahl: It's already full, isn't it?

11 Chair McDougall: Not everybody shows up all the time. If we knew that somebody  
12 wasn't going to show up, we could have a substitute.

13 Commissioner Reckdahl: For that month, provided it's new information or anything that  
14 you talked about then is briefed.

15 Commissioner Moss: I have two more quick comments. One is (inaudible) discovered  
16 this week that there is a brand new Highway 101 bridge for Menlo Park that is being  
17 built. It sure would have been nice over this past 6 or 8 months to know that when we're  
18 going through all our discussion about our 101 bridge. It seems like it took us a lot  
19 longer to get through all that stuff. They're plowing ahead with a similar-sized bridge,  
20 similar cost. I don't know what happened.

21 Commissioner Reckdahl: It was first proposed a couple of years ago. It's hitting the  
22 news now, but there's been a lot of stuff percolating under the hood.

23 Commissioner Moss: Just a comment. The second comment is Adrian Fine. We talked  
24 last year about getting a City Council person to come to our meetings. Don, I think tag  
25 you're it. It might be good for you to have a private conversation to see if we can get a  
26 City Council person.

27 Chair McDougall: As we turnover and as they bring in a new Mayor, then we need to go  
28 back to the City Council to ask who their delegate is this year and suggest that it should  
29 be somebody new. I have no problem with that. I'll take it.

30 **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

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