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RESOLUTION NO. _____
RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PALO ALTO
ADOPTING THE PALO ALTO BAYLANDS MASTER PLAN 2008

WHEREAS, in 1978, the Council adopted the Baylands Master Plan and EIR including policy recommendations by the Planning Commission and,

WHEREAS, in 1979, the City published the Baylands Master Plan Summary Report to synthesize the original Plan and the adopted policy recommendations of the Planning Commission and,

WHEREAS, in 1980, the Council adopted the Byxbee Park Master Plan titled, Byxbee Landfill Park, Palo Alto Baylands, Park Conversion Plan and Program Phase One and,

WHEREAS, in 1988, the City published an Amended Baylands Master Plan Summary Report to describe policy implementation and Council actions between 1979 and 1988 pertaining to both the Baylands and Byxbee Park and,

WHEREAS, in 1989, the Council adopted the revised Byxbee Park Master Plan titled, Byxbee Park, Palo Alto Baylands, Palo Alto, California prepared by Hargreave’s Associates and,

WHEREAS, the Palo Alto Baylands Master Plan 2008 summarizes changes in the Baylands, consolidates the concepts and policies of the above mentioned documents, and describes policy implementation and Council actions between 1988 and 2008,

NOW, THEREFORE, the Council of the City of Palo Alto does RESOLVE as follows:

NOT YET APPROVED

SECTION 2. Environmental Review: The City as the lead agency for the Palo Alto Baylands Master Plan 2008 (the “Plan”) has determined that the Plan is subject to environmental review under provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Guideline section 15070, Decision to Prepare a Negative or Mitigated Negative Declaration. An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) was prepared for the Plan and it has been determined that no potentially adverse impacts would result from the development that cannot be mitigated, therefore, the Plan would have a less than significant impact on the environment. The Negative Declaration was available for public review beginning July 23, 2008 through August 12, 2008. The Environmental Impact Assessment and Mitigated Negative Declaration are attached to CMR: 376:08.
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Errata Page 1a – addition to Table of Contents
as an international model and was cited as such by the Stockholm Conference on the Environment.

In 1972 Congress established the nation's first urban national wildlife refuge here in the south San Francisco Bay—the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. It spans 30,000 acres of open bay, salt pond, salt marsh, mudflat, upland and vernal pool habitats and is part of a complex made up of seven wildlife refuges in the San Francisco Bay Area. In 1974 California passed the Suisun Marsh Preservation Act. It was the state's first wetlands protection law.

A Change in Attitude, Palo Alto

By the 1950s, the higher marshes—easier to build on—were already gone and the remaining ones had no protection. Then one day, Harriet Mundy was at City Hall to complain about a broken sidewalk. While there, she learned of a $30 million development proposal for the Baylands. It included condominiums, a hotel, and a marina—but no marsh. Harriet Mundy, along with Lucy Evans, Enid Pearson, and other locals rallied to stop this development proposal that would have eliminated most of the remaining marsh.

Over the next decade, these three women became close friends and effective advocates for the marshland. In 1960 they helped to circulate a petition which resulted in the City Council agreeing to forestall any future development until a Baylands Master Plan was prepared.

Enid Pearson also formed PARCS (Palo Altans for Recreation and Conservation Sites), and with the help of John Willets and James Warnock, brought about the 1965 park dedication ordinance that included most of the City-owned land in the Baylands. Other manifestations of Palo Alto's attitude toward protection of the Baylands included the construction of the Lucy Evans Nature Interpretive Center in 1967 and the League of Women Voters', Palo Alto Baylands Handbook, published in 1975. (See excerpt on following page.)

Lucy Evans, educator and preservationist, after whom the Baylands Nature Interpretive Center is named, is shown instructing school children in front of an exhibit called, "Our Bird Friends."
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Vegetation and Wildlife (Maps 1.2 & 1.3)

Today the natural area is approximately 50 acres larger than it was when the Baylands Master Plan was adopted (Maps 6.2 and 6.3).

The most notable changes to vegetation and wildlife are:

- Additional habitat (both marsh and upland grasslands) created by the Harbor Point Restoration project. (See “Harbor Area” for details).
- Additional freshwater and saltwater marsh habitat on the Former ITT Property. This project was, in part, designed to increase the amount of pickleweed which is the favorite habitat of the harvest mouse. (See “Former ITT Property”).
- Additional upland grassland habitat in Byxbee Park Phase I.
- Identification and prioritization of future potential restoration sites in the 1987 Santina Study done for the Harbor Restoration project. (Maps 6.2 and 6.3)
- A new shade house built near the lagoon to propagate native plants.
- New signage to control access to environmentally sensitive areas with well defined trails and signage including restrictions for dogs.
- Cessation of incompatible activities that existed in the Flood Basin when the Baylands Master Plan was adopted, such as Police Department target practice.

Unfortunately, in spite of these significant accomplishments, non-native plants such as Spartina, Altenflora Phragmites, Arrundo donax, and Lepidium have become major threats to the marsh environment and natural habitat. These plants will have to be controlled through active management in order to preserve fragile habitat for wildlife and native plants. To that end, the Parks and Open Space Division is working with an environmental firm to develop the Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan—a management plan. Programs developed in this plan will provide implementation measures for “Overall Environmental Quality” policies nos. 6—10.

Comprehensive Plan policies that are applicable to vegetation and wildlife include:

- The “Natural Environment Element” of the Comprehensive Plan which states that “Palo Alto’s foothills and Baylands will continue to be conserved as open space over the term of this plan. The City will seek out new opportunities for permanent open space in both areas”, and “Elements of the natural environment will be conserved where they remain intact and restored where they have been degraded by past development.”
- Policy N-1 echoes the Baylands Master Plan policies regarding both the need for a management plan and the appropriateness of “low-impact” recreation activities in open space areas.
- Programs N-2 and N-3 are to “Examine and improve management practices for natural habitat and open space areas,...” and, “Review the need for access controls in environmentally sensitive areas, including the Baylands, foothills, and riparian corridors.”
- Policy N-8 specifically calls for the protection of wetlands.
- Policy T-52 calls for active participation in seeking a “connection between Highway 101 and the Dumbarton Bridge” without construction of a southern connection across environmentally sensitive Baylands.”

See “Comprehensive Plan Relationship” in the appendix or individual Element chapters for more Comprehensive Plan policy text.
The Open Space and Parks Division is working with ESA consultants to develop a Comprehensive Action Plan. The Action Plan will provide recommendations for the future of the City's parks, trails, and green spaces. The plan will be developed in cooperation with the City's Recreation and Parks Department, the City's Environmental Services Department, and community members. The plan will include strategies for maintaining and improving the City's open spaces and parks, as well as recommendations for future development.

- Types of projects that may be recommended will be presented at a series of meetings to be held in July 2008. The meetings will be open to the public and will provide an opportunity for community members to provide input on the recommendations.
- The Action Plan will be presented to the City Council at a future meeting.

All projects within the VRA must be reviewed for ALUC. Project Review

1. LP (Prop 17)
2. Type of project (VRA, ALUC, other)
3. Location (LPA)
4. Airport Influence Area (VRA, ALUC, other)
5. Summary (Prop 17)

These zones are based on proximity to the airport and include areas that are impacted by the airport's noise and aviation activities. The zones are designed to provide a buffer between the airport and the areas that are impacted by the airport's noise and aviation activities. The zones are designed to provide a buffer between the airport and the areas that are impacted by the airport's noise and aviation activities. The zones are designed to provide a buffer between the airport and the areas that are impacted by the airport's noise and aviation activities. The zones are designed to provide a buffer between the airport and the areas that are impacted by the airport's noise and aviation activities. The zones are designed to provide a buffer between the airport and the areas that are impacted by the airport's noise and aviation activities. The zones are designed to provide a buffer between the airport and the areas that are impacted by the airport's noise and aviation activities.
Overall Environmental Quality Policies

1. Ensure that the management of the parkland area is environmentally sound and sustainable. This includes minimizing the impact of human activity on the natural environment and promoting biodiversity and ecological balance.

2. Allow access to the food basin only in the certain seasons to protect the wildlife and minimize disturbance. Ensure that this area is not overcrowded and that the wildlife is not disturbed.

3. Implement educational and interpretive programs to raise awareness about the importance of preserving the natural environment and the role of visitors in doing so.

4. Respect the surrounding areas and policies in the "Food Control" and "Access & Circulation" chapters.

The parkland master plan advocates a mitigation of the problem in addition to the following policies. Policies in any area must also comply with policies stated for that area.
ed and trucked to the Kirby Canyon Landfill, 27 miles away in south San Jose.

Since the City started using the SMaRT Station, the garbage coming to the landfill has been reduced to mostly self-hauled loads from contractors and residents. In 2006, Palo Alto delivered approximately 47,000 tons of solid waste to the SMaRT Station, and only 22,000 tons were added to the Palo Alto landfill—less than 25% of the 100,000 tons reported in the 1988 Summary Report. Both the SMaRT station and Kirby Canyon Landfill agreements will expire in 2021.

Since 2005, the Public Works Department has been generating annual reports on the remaining landfill capacity. The reports are based on a photogrammetric survey performed each May.

As of February, 2008, projections indicate that the landfill will reach capacity sometime in late 2010. When the landfill reaches capacity and the operations are closed, a series of intermediate tasks will begin. For example, closure material will be stockpiled and the site will be trimmed per the final grading plan. These intermediate tasks are anticipated to take approximately 18 months, or until mid 2012. When they are done, the capping process can begin. It is anticipated the landfill will be capped and ready for State inspection in 2013. However, it is important to note that the landfill site life estimate is based on assumptions and current conditions and that a change in any of these would likely change the closure date.

Byxbee Park Design and Development

The implementation of the vision for a pastoral park at the landfill area has been guided and continues to be guided by the concepts from a series of Byxbee Park documents. Because of their importance, a supplement describing these documents has been added to the appendix. Additionally, an even briefer description of the Byxbee Park chronology follows here.
Landfill Area

Revised Page 8 - Replaces Page 85

Landfill Area

Mayfield Slough Remnant Marsh

they will be opened as part of the Park area. The
portions of the Park area are illustrated in the
park design on the four chapters of the
revised 1999-

Landfill Area Policies (page 2 of 2)

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies

Landfill Area Policies
The Baylands Master Plan advocates a unification of the Baylands; in addition to the following policies that are specific to the Former ITT Property, activities in this area must also comply with policies stated in the “Overall”, “Flood Control”, and “Access & Circulation” chapters as well as policies stated for the surrounding areas.

The future of the former ITT property goes beyond conservation into rehabilitation, and fits perfectly with the overall goal of the Baylands Master Plan—to preserve and enhance unique and irreplaceable resources.

This marshland seasonal wetland is flat and low, just about at sea level. **Prior to restoration, it was** not as productive now as it could have been because the water environment has been disrupted by the diking. However, when the winter rains were heavy, ponds formed and these ponds provided feeding and nesting habitat for gulls, ducks, and shorebirds. Burrowing owls, rodents, jack rabbits, and ground squirrels nested there during the dry season and birds of prey, pheasants, and mourning doves also visited the site then. Also, the rare “white tailed kites” nested in this area along the road into the building and may still use this site as their habitat.

A possibility to be explored would be construction of a tide gate to open the area to partial circulation of harbor tides and to let freshwater circulate at the other end. This would make the marshland similar to the fluid basin. In 1992, bay water was piped in from the former yacht harbor and the diked marshland and antenna field will be partially restored to their natural states, allowing some of the original tidal flow to occur. As a result, it is biologically productive again, and will become a part of Byxbee Park. Also, in the western portion of the site, a freshwater pond was created by pumping reclaimed water from the RWQCP.

This area, except for the easement where antenna field exists, was dedicated as parkland on May 3, 1982. It was named the Emily Renzel Wetlands on September 29, 1992.

This section is a condensed antenna field and, per the must be maintained because the Federal Communications Commission, may not be shut down unless it is replaced by another facility. It has ruled that the antennas are an essential continues to provide an essential communication link to ships at sea which still don’t have satellite communications equipment. World Communications, who took over from ITT, controls will control 36.5 acres in the central part of the property through an easement agreement and may continue to do so indefinitely into the future. until approximately the year 2000.
The Baylands Master Plan, issued by the Redwood City Planning Department, includes the planning and design of the Baylands Park, located on the south side of the city. The plan is aimed at providing a public park with an emphasis on natural and recreational areas.

The plan includes the development of a 200-acre park area, with trails, picnic areas, and a variety of recreational facilities. The park will also include a 10-acre marina, a 7-acre beach, and a 9-hole golf course. The plan also includes the development of a 100-acre nature preserve, with a variety of natural habitats and wildlife.

The plan also includes the development of a 100-acre residential area, with a mix of single-family homes and townhomes. The residential area will be designed to complement the natural beauty of the park and the surrounding area.

The plan is expected to be completed in 2022, with construction beginning in 2020. The project is expected to cost approximately $200 million, with funding provided by the City of Redwood City and the State of California.

The Baylands Master Plan is a comprehensive plan that addresses the needs of the community and the environment. It is designed to provide a balance of natural and recreational areas, while also providing a vibrant urban area that will benefit the community for generations to come.
Harbor Area Policies (page 1 of 2)

The Baylands Master Plan advocates a unification of the Baylands; in addition to the following policies that are specific to the Harbor area, activities in this area must also comply with policies stated in the "Overall", "Flood Control", and "Access & Circulation" chapters as well as policies stated for the surrounding areas.

Closure of the Yacht Harbor

The Palo Alto Yacht Harbor was created in 1928 when the course of San Francisquito Creek was dredged out where it entered Mayfield Slough.

Council action on June 2, 1980 restricted the harbor to one final dredging, and the harbor lease with the County was subsequently amended to terminate on June 30, 1986.

When the dredging of the Harbor was stopped, the yacht club and berths will be taken out along with all the buildings, except for:

- The harbor master's cottage which was designated as a local Point of Historic Interest in 1969. It is on the City's Historic Resources Inventory as a Category 2 resource which is defined as, A "Major Building of regional importance." The Harbor Master's Cottage is used and maintained as a city facility.
- The Sea Scout building was added to the City's Historic Resources Inventory in 2002. It is designated as a Category 1 which is defined as, An "Exceptional Building of pre-eminent national or state importance." The current lease agreement between the City and the Environmental Volunteers (EV) requires that EV renovate and maintain the building.

Aquatic Park Development

On June 9, 1986, Council directed staff to hire a consultant to study possible uses in the proposed aquatic park which resulted in the Sailing Station for hand-carried craft, completed in 1992.

Harbor Area Renovations

1. Maintain the Harbor Master's Cottage which is used as city facilities.
2. Proceed under the terms of the lease agreement between the City and the Environmental Volunteers Group regarding renovations and use of the Sea Scout building.
3. The Screen parking lots will be screened with earth forms so that they are not so obvious from surrounding areas. The building area will be cleaned up and existing areas defined more clearly. (Completed) Better storage facilities will be built. (Not relevant since closure of the harbor.)
4. All Complete the removal of all utility poles carrying overhead lines or used as parking bumpers will be taken out. (In 2005, most of the utility poles were removed. The ones around the water treatment plant and along the road to the landfill are yet to be removed.)

A public hoist and auxiliary equipment will be provided in the inner harbor, and an access control gate will be installed at the south end of the overpass between the harbor berthing area and the salt water lagoon.
Environmental Quality

- The goal of the Environmental Quality Program is to maintain and improve the quality of the environment.
- The program focuses on reducing pollution and preserving natural habitats.
- Key objectives include:
  - Reducing the use of harmful chemicals.
  - Promoting sustainable practices.
  - Enhancing public awareness.

Drought Conditions

- The current drought conditions have led to water shortages.
- Strategies to address the drought include:
  - Implementing water conservation measures.
  - Encouraging the use of drought-tolerant plants.
  - Adjusting irrigation schedules.

Mitigation Strategies

- Mitigation strategies aim to reduce the impact of human activities on the environment.
- The strategies include:
  - Land use planning.
  - Wetland restoration.
  - Rainwater harvesting.

Burning Comments

- The burning of vegetation is a common practice, but it can cause environmental damage.
- To minimize the impact, the following guidelines are recommended:
  - Burn only in areas with adequate supervision.
  - Use water to extinguish any flames.
  - Avoid burning during periods of high winds.

Photo courtesy of staff
Conversion of Salt Marsh to Brackish Marsh near the Unnamed Slough

As mentioned in the RWQCP element, in 1964, the water treatment plant built a new outfall—that flows into the Unnamed Slough and out to the Bay. This stopped the discharges near the yacht harbor. Today, programs like the fresh water restoration project in the Emily Renzel Wetlands and the Water Reclamation Program re-use approximately 2 million gallons per day of the plant’s discharge. About 26 million gallons per day of treated (fresh) water is discharged through the Unnamed Slough. This has contributed to conversion of salt water marsh to brackish marsh (a mixture of fresh and salt water), in areas adjacent to the Unnamed Slough (Maps 1.2, 6.4, & 10.4).

While brackish marsh is habitat to many animals it is not the habitat of the Clapper Rail or the Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse which are endangered species found in the area. Therefore, the conversion is being monitored by the City and periodically reported to state and federal agencies to ensure that the conversion will not result in a significant loss of habitat for these species. The 1991 monitoring study reported 4.6 acres of brackish marsh, the 1995 study reported 6.89 acres, and the 2002 study reported 10.6 acres. The most recent monitoring study, Salt Marsh Conversion Assessment and Monitoring Study for the City of Palo Alto, was done by WRA Environmental Consultants in November of 2007 and reported 13.63 acres of brackish marsh.

Several other San Francisco Bay marsh lands are experiencing similar conversions. For more information, refer to the monitoring reports available in the City of Palo Alto Public Works Department.
Natural Unit in Context

Site Profile as of 2007

Flood Plain
Habour
Inner Harbour
Sand Point
Point Pleasant
Faher's Island
Dedicated Parkland
The portion within the City:
Zoning: R(D)

08. Map 6.4
South Bay Discharger
Also in the 1970s—despite planned improvements of the treatment plant—the California RWQCB proposed another requirement that all South Bay cities begin work on an outfall pipe to carry sewage discharge north of the Dumbarton Bridge where the tidal interchange is less limited. In 1972, the affected cities formed the South Bay Discharger Authority and funded a comprehensive study of the situation and an environmental impact report. Based on this report, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) decided that further study would have to be done before a decision would be made. The EPA hired Bechtel Corporation to look at the consequences of implementing various wastewater management alternatives. One alternative involved constructing a pipeline through the Palo Alto Baylands. The line would traverse the flood basin adjacent to the freeway, cross the area between the former ITT property and the landfill, cross Embarcadero Road, and continue out through an unnamed slough. The Bechtel report was underway when the City began the Baylands Master Plan. Upon its completion, the EPA, RWQCB, and the South Bay cities were to decide which alternative to implement.

The adopted Baylands Master Plan policies did not support the construction of the South Bay Discharger pipeline.

Thus on October 11, 1978, the Council adopted the Baylands Master Plan that included policies that supported the construction of the Advanced Wastewater Treatment Facility but not the construction of the South Bay Discharger.

1988•Baylands Master Plan
Amended Summary Report

Advanced Wastewater Treatment Facility
There were no changes to the policies for the RWQCP in 1988.

South Bay Discharger
Although it was not noted in the 1988 Amended Summary, during the period between 1978 and 1988, the South Bay Discharger studies were completed and the regulatory agencies concurred that the pipeline should not be constructed. The concept was dropped.

2008•Baylands Master Plan
Information Update

The 2007 review resulted in the following information; this information is the basis for the amendments to the policy text.

Advanced Wastewater Treatment Facility
The RWQCP consistently removes 99 percent of the organic and solid pollutants found in wastewater. The plant also removes dissolved metals from the wastewater; in fact, the RWQCP discharge must meet many quality standards higher than those for drinking water. This has gone a long way to restoring the health of the South Bay.

Required Landscaping
The landscape screening of the Advanced Wastewater Treatment towers (No. 13 on Map 10.3), that was installed per the approved plan in 1980, has degraded over time; a restoration project to improve the landscaping is scheduled for FY08/10.

Brackish Water near the Unnamed Slough
As mentioned earlier, in 1964, the plant built a new outfall—that flows into the Unnamed Slough and out to the Bay (Map 10.4). This stopped the discharges near the yacht harbor. Today, programs like the fresh water restoration project in the Emily Rentzel Wetlands and the Water Reclamation Program re-use approximately 2 million gallons per day of the plant’s discharge. About 25 million gallons per day flow through the Unnamed Slough out to the Bay. This has contributed to conversion of approximately 14 acres of salt marsh to brackish marsh (a mixture of fresh water and salt water) in the area adjacent of the slough. This conversion
Seasonal undercrossing below is parallel and adjacent to Adobe Creek; it goes under Highway 101 and bike bridge.

Bridge above crosses over Adobe Creek and runs parallel to Highway 101.

Adobe Creek

The second of two Highway 101 crossings that afford bicycle and pedestrian access to the Baylands is the seasonal undercrossing along Adobe Creek. Because of a flood risk this undercrossing is open only from April 15th to October 15th each year. It is named for Ben Lefkowitz, a strong bicycle advocate. The other crossing is an overpass bridge at Embarcadero Road.

The plan's list of, “Recommended Projects”, No. 64 is the reconstruction of the Adobe Creek/101 crossing and No 65 is the reconstruction of the existing “Matadero Creek/101 crossing”.

Table 6-3 of the plan prioritizes all the improvement projects identified in the plan for the entire city; priority was given to projects that involved safety concerns or were on school routes. Given that criteria, none of the Baylands projects were “High Priority Projects” in this table.

East Palo Alto Bay Access Master Plan
In 2007, the City of East Palo Alto Redevelopment Agency published the Baylands Access Master Plan to “create a vision for Bay access that will guide East Palo Alto policy makers and the BCDC”. The plan includes a new trail along San Francisquito Creek as well as a pedestrian crossing over Highway 101 near the creek (Maps 14.4 & 14.6).

U.S. 101 Auxiliary Lanes Project from Embarcadero Road north to Marsh Road
The California Department of Transportation is proposing to widen Highway 101 to provide an auxiliary lane in each direction from Embarcadero Road, in Palo Alto, to Marsh Road in Menlo Park. Construction is scheduled to begin in 2011. City staff in conjunction with the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority (JPA) are reviewing the proposal with regard to flood concerns. An agenda published for the July 22, 2004 JPA meeting stated that, “The Board has expressed a desire to coordinate the efforts of the current...project and future flood protection and habitat restoration projects with the traffic studies being conducted for Highway 101.”

U.S. 101 Auxiliary Lanes Project from Embarcadero Road south to Route 85
Beginning in 2011, the Valley Transit Authority (VTA) will begin construction of auxiliary lanes in each direction of Highway 101.

Errata Page 12 - replaces Page 229
There is some overlap between the scope of this study and South Bay Shoreline Study.

Two outcome studies; both studies are interrelated. These are the South Bay Shoreline Study and South Bay Shoreline Study.

Coastal flooding has been observed in recent years, particularly during high tides and storm events. The study aims to evaluate the potential impact of coastal flooding on local communities and to develop strategies to reduce its occurrence.

1. Examine various coastal protection strategies for future development.
2. Determine potential modifications to existing infrastructure to enhance coastal resilience.
3. Investigate flood risk reduction options for flood-prone areas.
4. Develop comprehensive flood management plans for coastal communities.
5. Engage with local stakeholders to promote awareness and understanding of the issues.

South Bay Shoreline Study

South Bay Shoreline Study

South Bay Shoreline Study

South Bay Shoreline Study

South Bay Shoreline Study

South Bay Shoreline Study

South Bay Shoreline Study
Design Plan from Hargreave's 1991 Byxbee Park Master Plan (page 1 of 3)

Statement
The proposed master plan for Byxbee Park is an attempt to place the park in a proper context in relation to the Bay, the City of Palo Alto and the San Francisco Bay Region. The park plan also addresses the unique characteristics of the site itself -- the garbage and its inherent site development restrictions, the specific landforms as an "outgrowth of the landfill, the slough, the marsh, the wind and sky. The elements of the park seek to tie the site to its surroundings and express its own characteristics in a metaphorical and sometimes informational way.

Design Concept
The public gave the design team the strong sense that exploration and discovery are important to the experience of walking the site. The team's own observations told them that refuge was also an important part of experiencing the site. The proposed elements of the park function to heighten the excitement or pleasure of personal discovery, with each aspect providing the opportunity for making physical or cultural observations about the place and the surrounding area, and in some cases, provide places of refuge for people and wildlife.

Landfill Characteristics
Underlying the park design concept are the technical considerations of losing the landfill. The trail system for the entire park provides prospect and refuge. The low perimeter walk keeps the visitor somewhat out of the wind and allows one to move through and connect to the entire area's trail system. The trail to the viewing platforms at the slough's edge takes one to areas of refuge (for people and wildlife), and the trails to the "top" of the site and the viewing point provide the exhilaration of long views, the feeling of being at the top, and all that prospect embodies.

The trails are to be made of crushed oyster shells which will provide a texture consistent with the goals of a soft, passive, even contemplative environment.

Shell Band
A narrow 6" shell band rims the entire east and south edges of the park in Phases I and II. This narrow shell band lines the edge of the maintenance access road atop the levee. Along this band, benches are placed as stopping off points for rest and viewing. The narrow crushed oyster shell band invites pedestrians to use the levee as a promenade around the base of the landfill. When the levee's elevation is raised, as ultimately planned, the band should be replaced with a full trail width of crushed oyster shells.

Chevrons
The Palo Alto Airport can be observed from the ridge top at the northern end of Phase I. The chevrons extend the line of the airstrip through the park itself making a direct visual connection. This line is established by concrete highway barriers placed in pairs at right angles to each other creating a series of chevrons that travel from the top of the ridge down across the park entry path. The use of the highway barriers also makes reference to the Bayside Freeway just to the west. The chevrons will be visible from the air and are an aeronautical symbol meaning "don't land here." As an arbitrary line, it suggests again that the place is man-made and that the hand of man has controlled almost every aspect of its existence.

Land Gate
When walking east from the parking lot, the first feature will be the entry point created by the chevrons moving down the hill. Just beyond this entry a trail forks to the right, leading upward along the side of the hill. This trail will lead into a drainage swale between two landforms. This draw, or swale, is further constricted by two landforms that extend from each side, allowing only enough room for the foot path. This passage-way marks an abrupt change from the openness and exposed north slope to areas of refuge, spe-
Will allow people to see the wind shape the surrounding landscape

Wind Wave Fence

Landmark

Field shape producing a perceptual window for discerning the easterly fence of the

People and wildlife

People will provide a vertical landscape element to the sites. As well as indicate the

Hedgerow

Hedgerows from the hills above and are an invitation to draw people down to them.

Design Plan from Harrogate's 1991 Byebee Park Master Plan (Page 2 of 3)
of ripples and waves. The piece will consist of two vertical poles; suspended and spaced evenly between those poles will be 20 to 30 vertical ropes that will terminate above reach. This piece has been prototyped and proven to show the graceful waves of an ordinary summer’s wind. The location of this piece will be placed at the conceptual “headwaters” of the Alluvial Berms.

The Arc (Alluvial) Berms
Just south of the flare and “the weirs” is an opening in the hills that creates a natural west to east drainage swale. Beyond this drainage swale is another swale that will ultimately drain the south and east sides of a large hill in Phase II. To control erosion in these two areas a series of landforms, which look like alluvial fans from the air are added. Visually, and conceptually, they would enhance the notions of the collection of water from the hillsides to create streams that turn to rivers that turn to oceans. In a sculptural and poetic sense they make visual reference to the delta region of the Sacramento River; and in a geological sense, refer to a natural phenomena that can occur in any drainage system.

Viewing Platforms
Just to the east of the keyhole is the edge of Mayfield Slough. An access road runs parallel to the slough but is set back from the water’s edge a distance that ranges from 50 to 100 feet. The area between is host to a variety of plant life that thrives on that moist environment, providing habitats for bird and animal life. It is also the most protected from the northwest winds and it is a pleasant place to be. Therefore, a series of platforms are to be placed along the shoreline to provide comfortable places for people to sit protected from the wind, enjoy the view, and observe the great populations of birds that move seasonally through the adjacent wetlands. Seen from the hilltops just to the west, the triangular shape of the platforms provides an aggressive sculptured form that point to the water and to the movement of the waves that travel from north to south down to the slough. The aggressive shapes of the platforms will be softened by the existing shrubs on the windward sides. The viewing platforms extend along the slough’s edge in Phase I but do not extend into Phase II where the orientation changes and the quality of views is less desirable.

Viewing Point
The highest and most secluded point in the park, located in Phase II, is proposed as the site of a viewing point. This special paved platform will be the only paving in the park and will “point” directly north to south. The cardinal points - North, South, East and West will be marked in the paving.

Restrooms
The restrooms for the entire park are located near the parking lot and are to be built with the Phase I park development. The design of the restrooms is consistent with the design of the viewing platforms and benches -- all of a triangular format primarily of wood. The translucent top will provide light without electricity during park hours (daylight). The gap between the roof and walls will provide ventilation.

Parking
The parking lot is located at the end of the park via an access road adjacent to the marsh. In Phase I the parking will be gravel and will accommodate 20 cars. With the completion of the park, the lot size will be expanded to provide spaces for 40 cars. Handicap spaces are provided closest to the restrooms. Bike racks are provided at the east end of the parking lot.

Signage
Three types of signage will exist in the park: an entry sign, an interpretive sign, and directional signs. The entry sign will be built in Phase I at the park’s entrance. The interpretive sign will include a map of the park and description of the elements and will be permanently placed on the west restroom wall. This sign will be built in Phase I. Throughout the entire park small directional signs will point the way to the various elements described by the map. The first set of these will be built in Phase I.
After the 2008 Update

The Palo Alto Baylands Master Plan 2008 reflects all the concepts and important information from the three previous editions as well as from the three pre-existing Byxbee Park documents. It replaces these as the primary reference documents.

It also reflects implementation of policies, Council actions, and other relevant information through 2007.

"Palo Alto Baylands Master Plan 2008" (2008)

"Site Assessment and Design Guidelines, Palo Alto Baylands Nature Preserve" by Catalyst (2005)

Errata Page 15b - addition to Timeline...& Other Baylands Documents in the Appendix
# Sources and Reference Documents

**For the entire document:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff: See “Acknowledgements” in the front of the document</th>
<th>City of Palo Alto Planning Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Baylands Master Plan and EIR</em> by Eckbo/Kay Associates (1978)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A Summary Of Actions October 1978 To January 1985 Taken By The Palo Alto City Council Related To The Adopted Baylands Master Plan Prepared For The City Of Palo Alto By Nancy Alexander January 1985</em></td>
<td>City of Palo Alto Planning Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Palo Alto: A Centennial History</em> by Ward Winslow and the Palo Alto Historical Association (1993)</td>
<td>Stores or Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Bay website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.savesfbay.org">http://www.savesfbay.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For specific elements:**

1. **Overall Environmental Quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff: Daren Anderson, Annette Coleman, and Greg Betts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. **Landfill Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff: Matt Raschke, Bill Fellman, Greg Betts, Ron Arp, Sean Kennedy, and Greg Betts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Phase One, Byxbe Landfill Park</em> by Eckbo/Kay Associates (1980)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Errata Page 17a - addition to Appendix**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stills: Gary Weinreich, Bill Fennell, Clare Campbell, and Gre Bens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Valla River Restoration Conceptual Study &amp; Plan by Junyok &amp; Thompson, Inc. (1987)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Location</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Palo Alto Allen Library Main Library | Article from the Peninsula Times Tribune (December 24, 1999), "Wetlands for a Peace City" con-
| Palo Alto Allen Library | Article from the Peninsula Times Tribune (October 13, 1992), "City council votes to ban council woman-
| City of Palo Alto Website (Search on CPR) | Non-Cataloged Report, Title: "Program End of Wetlands Site Update, Final Report, 1995" |
| City of Palo Alto Website (Search on CPR) | CMR: 329-9: 11-Month Enhanced Project CPR: 1990-99: Award of Contract |
| City of Palo Alto Website (Search on CPR) | Park Improvement Ordinance and Subland Commission Lease |
| City of Palo Alto Website (Search on CPR) | CMR: 183-9: Palo Alto Marsh Evaluation Plan: Approval of Site and Design Application, November 2000 (Issued) |
| Edward D. Hopper | Family Reunion Article by Judy Ann Edmonds from (see website address) |
| www.edwarddhopper.com | Edward D. Hopper Club online newsletter called, "The Flyer" |
| City of Palo Alto Website (Search on CPR) | Stills: Paul Dobbs, Bill Fennell, Joe Terens, and Cre Bens |

**3. Former MP Property** |
| CMR: 110-9: Approval of Municipal Compost Facility Study Work Plan |
| City of Palo Alto Website (Search on CPR) | Regional Center |
| City of Palo Alto Website (Search on CPR) | CMR: 159-7: Request for City Council Donation to An Internship for a Palo Alto College |
| City of Palo Alto Website (Search on CPR) | CMR: 397-9: The Final Update of the Palo Alto Landfill Capacity |
| City of Palo Alto Planning Department | Bay Area PAF, Palo Alto Landfill Capping, Landshape Design Consultation by Herkertons, Bay Area PAF, Palo Alto Landfill Capping, Landshape Design Consultation by Herkertons, Bay Area PAF, Palo Alto Landfill Capping |
## Sources and Reference Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Where this document may be found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Changing Tides: The health of the Bay is Improving but Still has a Way to Go” (Palo Alto Weekly- November 29, 2006)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.paloaltoonline.com/">http://www.paloaltoonline.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR:234:02: Recommendation from the Historic Resources Board to designate [the Sea Scout Building] to Palo Alto's Historic Inventory in Category 1 pursuant to Municipal Code 16.49 and Recommendation by staff to delay designation until a structural engineering report is completed.</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR:410:04: Rejection of proposal submitted by the Lucie Stern Maritime Center to relocate, repair, and lease the former Sea Scout facility ...</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR:291:07: Approval Of Option To Lease To The Environmental Volunteers For The Former Sea Scout Building At 2560 Embarcadero Road</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salt Marsh Conversion Assessment and Monitoring Study for the City of Palo Alto</em> by WRA Environmental (2007)</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto Public Works Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Natural Unit - Marsh Preserve

**Staff:** Gary Weinreich, Joe Teresi, Matt Raschke, Bill Fellman, Greg Betts, Daren Anderson, and Annette Coleman

- South Bay Salt Pond Restoration website: http://www.southbayrestoration.org/
- *Exploring Our Baylands* by Diane R Conradson (1966)
- *The Ohlone Way* by Malcolm Margolin (1978)

### 7. Athletic Center/PASCO Site

**Staff:** Matt Raschke, Bill Fellman, Greg Betts, and Clare Campbell

- CMR:426:04: Approval And Adoption Of A Park Improvement Ordinance Associated With Improvements To The Baylands Athletic Center Including An Upgrade To The Electrical And Field Lighting System, Renovation Of The Irrigation System And Installation Of A Batting Practice Cage – Capital Improvement Program Project P#-00010 | City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)
Sources and Reference Documents
### Sources and Reference Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Where this document may be found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Land Use Plan, Santa Clara County, Palo Alto Airport by</strong></td>
<td>“<a href="http://deoeed.sccgov.org/SCC/docs/Planning/Bal%20City%20of%20Palo%20Alto%20Airport%20Land%20Use%20Commissi...%E2%80%9D">http://deoeed.sccgov.org/SCC/docs/Planning/Bal%20City%20of%20Palo%20Alto%20Airport%20Land%20Use%20Commissi...”</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Santa Clara County Airp.. (2008)</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto Administrative Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palo Alto Airport Master Plan, County of Santa Clara, CA</strong></td>
<td>City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR:361:07: Staff Response To The Palo Alto Airport Working Group Report</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And Options Regarding The Future Of The Palo Alto Airport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR:418:07: From Finance Committee: Request For Council Direction</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerning Response To The Palo Alto Airport Working Group Report And</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options Regarding The Future Of The Palo Alto Airport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Regional Water Quality Control Plant</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff:</strong> Phil Bobel, Jamie Allen, Matt Raschke, Jamie Allen, Joe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresi, Greg Betts, and Daren Anderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I by Raines, Melton, and Carella, Inc. (2001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II by Raines, Melton, and Carella, Inc. (2003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Reclamation Master Plan and EIR</strong></td>
<td>City of Palo Alto Public Works Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc., Cascadia Consulting Group, Inc., and Gary Liss &amp; Associates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrated Regional Water Management Plan</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.bayareaairwmp.net">http://www.bayareaairwmp.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR:187:69: Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant—Progress Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR:217:95: Wastewater Reclamation Program—Findings and Recommendations</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR:342:01: Endorsement Of The Long Term Goals For The Palo Alto Regional</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Control Plan (Rwqcp)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR:327:03: Approval of contract with Raines, Melton, &amp; Carella, Inc.</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the amount of $300,000 for the preparation of a water recycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facility plan for the southern region (Mountain View-Moffett) of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Plant service area—a project 50% funded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by the State of California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Errata Page 17e - addition to Appendix**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Sources and Reference Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. MSC A Animal Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Palo Alto Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Palo Alto Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Palo Alto Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Palo Alto Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Palo Alto Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sources and Reference Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Where this document may be found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMR:146:04: Approval Of Amendment No. One To Existing Contract No. C2140022 With Inner space Engineering Corp. In The Amount Of $21,750 To Provide Architectural Design Services For Building Changes Required For Compliance With Federal And State Disabled Access Standards, And Engineering Design For Lighting And Fire Sprinkler Systems Associated With The Construction Of Storage Mezzanines</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR:316:07: Approval Of Amendment One Of Contract C04105673 With Philip Henry Architects, In The Amount Of $65,000 For Design Of Infrastructure Maintenance For The Animal Services Center – Capital Improvement Program Project Pe-04014</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T C Staff Report (4/9/03): Matadero Creek Long-Term Remediation Project [02-D-07, 02-ARB-70]: Request by Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD) for Site and Design review for the installation of an overflow bypass channel for the lower portion of Matadero Creek downstream of East Bayshore Road to increase flood capacity and protection and convey a 100-year (1%) flood event flow.</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR:471:02: Conceptual Approval For Contract With The City Of Sunnyvale To Provide Animal Sheltering And Associated Services</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12. Los Altos Treatment Plan Site

**Staff:** Matt Raschke, Bill Fellman, and Daren Anderson

- **Wetlands Study Summary**

| CMR:161:00: 1237 And 1275 N. San Antonio Road (Former Los Altos Treatment Plant Site), Final Environmental Impact Report For The Site Development Project, Application For Annexation, Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment, And Prezoning To Allow Wetlands Restoration, Construction Of A Household Hazardous Waste Facility, And Office And Maintenance Facility For The City Solid Waste Collection Contractor | City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)                           |
| CMR:297:01: Implementation Of An Environmental Services Center And Initiate Sale Of The Former Los Altos Treatment Plant Site | City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)                           |
| CMR:435:01: Purchase Of The Remaining Half Interest In The Former Los Altos Treatment Plant Site At 1275 San Antonio Road For $3,333,500 | City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)                           |
## Sources and Reference Documents

### ERTA Page 17h - Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 101 Auxiliary Lane Project, from the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Website</td>
<td>Link to project information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Palo Alto Website (search on CMR #)</td>
<td>Additional project updates and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Palo Alto Website (search on CMR #)</td>
<td>Details on planning and development activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.4 Access and Circulation

- Change:
  - (3m) Public transport service on the third and west sides of Highway 101 at the San Bruno Interchange.

### 13. Previously Owned Lands

- Plan site:
  - Article from Palo Alto Weekly (November 14, 2007): "Can deal with may replace old sewage" (CMR-42-08, Zone Ordinance Update - Adoption of an Ordinance Amending the Zoning Code - 2003)
  - CMR-42-08: Approval of an Agreement Between the Cities of Palo Alto and Los Altos For Lease of a West Palo Alto Arid Zone Ordinance - July 1st, 2003
  - December 31, 2003

---

Where this document may be found: [ERTA Page 17h - Appendix](#)
## Sources and Reference Documents (page 9 of 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Where this document may be found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Flood Protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff:</strong> Joe Teresi, Matt Raschke, Gary Weinreich, and Bill Fellman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fema.gov/">http://www.fema.gov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco Bay Shoreline Study website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.southbayshoreline.org/faq.html">http://www.southbayshoreline.org/faq.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR:472:04: Update Of Comprehensive Plan Policies On Baylands</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix: Matrix Comparison Baylands Master Plan and Comprehensive Plan Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR:472:04: Update of Comprehensive Plan Policies of Baylands</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto website (Search on CMR #)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Errata Page 17i - addition to Appendix
PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION DIVISION

STAFF REPORT

TO: PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FROM: Gloria Humble
Senior Planner

DEPARTMENT: Planning and Community Environment

AGENDA DATE: August 13, 2008

SUBJECT: Recommendation to the City Council to Approve a Negative Declaration and Adopt the Palo Alto Baylands Master Plan 2008

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends that the Planning and Transportation Commission recommend that the City Council:

1. Approve the Negative Declaration; and

BACKGROUND
In 1978, the City Council adopted the original Baylands Master Plan and EIR. In 1979, the City published a Baylands Master Plan Summary Report to synthesize the final Council adopted policy recommendations and the original Plan. In 1988, the City published an Amended Baylands Master Plan Summary Report to describe policy implementation and City Council actions between 1979 and 1988. In 2007, as directed by the City Council, staff undertook the task of producing an updated fourth edition of the Baylands Master Plan.

DISCUSSION
The Baylands Master Plan 2008 replaces all earlier plans and reports with one document that includes the history, environmental setting and adopted planning goals and policies for the Baylands area. Policy implementation and City Council actions from 1988 through 2007 are also described.

Brief overview of organization: by geographic area, history, policies, etc: In the new format, the "Adopted Recommendations" and "Significant Recommendations" of the 1988 edition are merged and renamed "Policies." Planning staff worked with staff from Community Services,
Public Works, Administrative Services, and Utilities. No new policy concepts are proposed in this update; however, staff’s research identified information that warranted modifications to the 1988 policy text; key modifications are summarized below.

1. Policies modified to reflect implementation since 1988:
   - The completion of Phase I of the landfill closure and park conversion in 1991
   - The marsh restoration project on the Former ITT Property in 1992
   - The marsh restoration project at Harbor Point completed in 1997
   - The installation of new reduced-glare lighting at the Athletic Field in 2005

2. Council actions since 1988 affecting the Baylands:
   - The adoption of a revised Byxbee Park Master Plan in 1989
   - The SMaRT Station agreement in 1991
   - The adoption of the Golf Course Master Improvement Plan in 1994
   - The adoption of the Water Reclamation Policy in 1995
   - The land use designation change for the LATP site in 2000
   - The addition of the Sea Scout Building to the City’s Historic Resources Inventory in 2002
   - The identification of barriers to and needed improvements for bicycle and pedestrian access to the Baylands across Highway 101 (these were identified in the Comprehensive Plan adopted in 1998 and the Bicycle Transportation Plan adopted in 2005)
   - The approval of funding to repair and improve existing landscaping at the Regional Water Quality Control Plant (budgeted for FY08/10)
   - Various trail and facility improvements since 1988

3. Policies resulting from State law, such as the County’s regulations on land use and development surrounding the Palo Alto Airport

4. Policies deleted that are no longer relevant:
   - Policies regarding repair of the PG&E board walk which is now closed to the public
   - Policies regarding hunting in the Baylands as hunting is not allowed

5. Updated policies that contained out of date information:
   - Policies regarding airport activity
   - Policies regarding the amount of refuse received at the landfill and the anticipated closure date for the landfill

Revisions in Format and Organization: In addition to existing and updated policies, the new format contains:

1. A narrative section that provides:
   - A permanent chronology of policy implementation and Council actions. For example, the strike-outs from the 1988 edition have been removed from the policy text and the information reflected by those strike outs is now contained in the “1988” subsection of the narrative. This format will readily facilitate possible
future updates to the Baylands Master Plan.
- Information about agreements between the City and other agencies such as the Levee Maintenance Responsibility map and easements.
- Information about external-to-the-city projects that may affect the Palo Alto Baylands such as the South Bay Shoreline Study, the East Palo Alto Bay Access Master Plan, and the addition of auxiliary lanes along Highway 101 adjacent to the Baylands.
- Information about volunteer efforts in the Baylands such as the newly constructed native plant nursery built in partnership with Save the Bay.

2. An appendix that includes information such as:
   - A chronology and map of park dedications
   - A chronology and chart of various Baylands documents
   - A detailed chronology and description of the Byxbee Park documents
   - A comparison of Comprehensive Plan policies and Baylands Master Plan policies.

Follow-up Task: The Santa Clara County Airport Land Use Commission will present its new Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for the Palo Alto Airport to the County of Santa Clara for review and adoption in September 2009. If the County adopts the new CLUP, then within 180 days of the County’s action, staff will bring the CLUP to the City Council for adoption by the City of Palo Alto to be in conformance with State law. At this time, staff will amend CLUP references and maps in the Baylands Master Plan and bring those amendments to the Council for approval.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
No new policy concepts are proposed in this update. The Baylands Master Plan is consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan. The 1998 Comprehensive Plan recognizes the Baylands Master Plan as the “adopted planning policy document for the area east of Highway 101”. The Comprehensive Plan reaffirms the City policy of protecting the Baylands, and includes many goals, policies, and programs throughout the Comprehensive Plan that are consistent with and support the policies of the Baylands Master Plan. A comparison of Comprehensive Plan policies and Baylands Master Plan policies can be found in the appendix of the Baylands Master Plan.

TIMELINE
The following additional public hearings for the Baylands Master Plan 2008 are tentatively scheduled:
1. August 19, 2008 Parks and Recreation Commission
2. September 22, 2008 City Council

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:
A draft Negative Declaration has been prepared with the public comment period beginning on July 23, 2008 and ending August 12, 2008 (Attachment A). No negative impacts are anticipated since the document is only a compilation of existing policies and actions updated to reflect prior Council actions. No physical changes are proposed by the Plan.
ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment A: Negative Declaration
Attachment B: Draft Baylands Master Plan 2008 (this item was previously delivered to Commission in an earlier packet dated July 24, 2008)

COURTESY COPIES:
Emily Renzel
Enid Pearson

Prepared by: Gloria Humble, Senior Planner

Reviewed by: Catherine Siegel, Advance Planning Manager

Department/Division Head Approval: ____________________________

Curtis Williams, Interim Director
Chair Garber: We will call ourselves back into session here to hear item number three, the Baylands Master Plan. Our topic is the recommendation to the City Council to approve a Negative Declaration and adopt the Baylands Master Plan of 2008. We will listen to the Staff presentation, take questions and comments from the public, and then go to questions of the Commission. Staff would you like to make your presentation?

Before we do, Vice-Chair Tuma has something that he needs to inform us of.

3. **Baylands Master Plan:** Planning and Transportation Commission review and recommendation of the Baylands Master Plan Clean Up 2008 and recommend adoption of the Negative Declaration. Environmental Assessment: A Negative Declaration has been prepared.

Vice-Chair Tuma: It came to my attention last week during our tour of the Baylands that a company that I have a minor financial interest in is the owner of the radio station, KSF Communications, which is based in the Baylands. I had some discussions this week with the City Attorney and upon reflecting on it myself I have looked at the fact that what is in front of us really is intended to be a consolidation of materials, policies, and documents that already exist as an update to the Master Plan. Additionally there are no new changes in land use or other changes that would affect the existing conditions that are being proposed by this update. As a result at this point based on the advice of the City Attorney and my own conclusion I do not believe that my ownership interest in the company that owns the radio station presents a conflict for purposes of evaluating the update to the Master Plan so I will participate in this item this evening.

Chair Garber: Thank you. Staff.

Ms. Julie Caporgno, Chief Planning and Transportation Official: I want to introduce Gloria Humble, Senior Planner in Advance Planning who is going to give the presentation tonight. You all know that this plan consolidation has been long awaited. She has been working on it for about a year. Again, as Vice-Chair Tuma mentioned it is a consolidation of existing approved policies and changes to the plan that the Council has made over the last 15 or 20 years. We are asking the Planning Commission to recommend to the Council adoption because we have tweaked with the plan to make it work but there are not any new policies that are in this plan. What we are really asking you to do tonight is to give us your feedback as to whether or not we have been accurate in our depiction of any changes that have occurred over the past 20 or so years. With that I will turn it over to Gloria.

Chair Garber: Gloria, before you begin Commissioner Lippert has a comment to make.
Commissioner Lippert: I just want to state for the record that this last Friday I had a tour of the Baylands that was given to me by Gloria Humble as well as a Senior Ranger.

Chair Garber: For clarification I believe that everyone one the Commission has taken that tour. It was done in two groups of three and not more than three with the exception of Commissioner Fineberg who is out of town. Thank you. Gloria.

Ms. Gloria Humble, Senior Planner: The update had two goals consolidate the existing documents and update information about policy implementation, Council actions, out of date facts, and other relevant information.

So part one, consolidating the existing documents. When I started this was the library of reference documents and they fell into three categories the Baylands Master Plan documents, the Bixby Park documents, and other. So we will start with the original Baylands Master Plan. It was presented to the City in 1978. It established the so-called elements of the Baylands. Many of those slides are based on this map so we will take a moment to get oriented. This is Highway 101 right here. You go past the MSC and animal services out here, San Antonio Road leading up to the LATP site. If you were to take Embarcadero through the commercial district, past the golf course, past the airport out here, past the duck pond, and here is the Interpretive Center. So this is East Palo Alto, Mountain View, and here is San Francisquito Creek.

Also in the original plan this site analysis described the Baylands as a unique and important resource. In fact, it gushed about the wonderful opportunity it provided for suburbanites to easily visit a place where nature was dominant. It identified these green areas as a natural unit and it recommended that we protect and enhance it. It identified these orange areas as areas of little or no change, that is there were no proposed changes at the time and it recommended that the uses in these areas which were commercial, utilitarian, and special recreation, that these should not be allowed to encroach further into the natural areas or the passive recreation areas. Finally, it identified these yellow areas as areas of significant change that is the harbor was to be kept open for about 25 years then closed and converted to an aquatic park. The landfill was to be closed and converted to a pastoral park. The former ITT property was to be restored to marsh. You put all this together and you pretty much see the 1978 plan. In fact this is the concept diagram from the 1978 plan.

Now a plan is what it was. It did not contain the policies. For the policies we have to go back to the library and checkout this summary document of 1979, it is called the Summary Report. This is the first place the policies appear. The way that happened was the Baylands Master Plan was submitted to the Planning Commission, it included alternative ways to implement the plan, choices within the alternatives, technical details and timetables for each choice, etc., etc. The Planning Commission digested all this information, chose from the alternatives, and distilled it all into about 66 recommendations. By the way, they added two new elements they added the overall environmental quality element and the LATP site. The City Council adopted most of the Planning Commission recommendations and the original plan.

Once the Council took action a new document was needed to reflect the policies. Therefore, in 1979 Staff published the Summary Report and this Summary Report became the de facto plan.
and it lasted for ten years. However, during that ten-year period major, major changes took
place. So back to the library to checkout the Amended Summary Report. Those major changes I
am talking about mostly affected the areas of significant change we mentioned. For example, the
FCC wouldn’t permit the antenna field for the former ITC site to be removed and that affected
restoration plans. The City decided to keep the landfill open longer and that affected the park
plans. The City decided to close the harbor early and that affected everything. As a result in
1988 we were pretty much in the same spot we were in 1978 as far as implementation goes.

So what I would like to say now is the 2008 document chronicles all these concepts, decisions,
changes, actions, and adds contextual information. Now these prior additions of the Baylands
Master Plan really are not needed for reference documents any more.

So onto the Bixby Park documents. The City adopted the first plan for the landfill park in 1980.
This plan established the butterfly design and was a fully developed plan. However, within eight
years the City was rethinking some of the components of this plan. For example, it included
shade trees that required irrigation, a fair amount of paving, closing Harbor Road, extending
Embarcadero Way, and the Art Commission brought up the point that by ordinance this design
should have had an artist involved with it. So back to the library.

In 1989 the City assembled a new team that included Hargraves Associates and two artists and
they developed a new Bixby Park plan. The result was a softer plan with more natural, lower
maintenance landscaping, and the internationally recognized land sculpture component of phase
one.

Now back to the library with the last Bixby Park document. By 2006 it was time to start thinking
about phase two and the City sent the phase two grading plan to Hargraves to see if it reflected
the intent of their 1991 park plan. This document is their response. You are probably familiar
with the fact that Hargraves made four recommendations for changes to the grading plan and
these changes have been implemented. Now a new final grading plan has been proposed and this
is it. It is included in the 2008 document as a proposed final grading plan.

In fact, as with the Baylands documents the 2008 document chronicles all the concepts,
decisions, changes, and actions that are reflected in all the Bixby Park documents and they are
now no longer needed as reference documents in the library.

So all that remains in the library are the 2008 document and the site assessment and design
guidelines that were developed in 2005. They will remain a separate document. They will not
be gobbled up by the Baylands Master Plan. I have a slide to show you. This is the first major
project in the Baylands that used the Site and Design Guidelines during the review process. I
think we have another one coming up. So that ends part one, consolidation of the existing
documents.

Onto part two, updating it to reflect first policy implementation. In the interest of time I am
going to focus on policy implementation that is germane to this core concept. So please recall
the concept diagram from the original plan and please recall the areas of significant change.
I am going to show you the implementation that has occurred not in chronological order but just from top to bottom. First you want to watch up here. Harbor Point the restoration was complete. The Harbor itself has been allowed to silt in and self-restore. The sailing station was completed in 2000. The Bixby Park phase one completed in 1991. The marsh front trail that connects them completed in 2000.

Now at this point I am going to change the duck pond to this passive recreation in turquoise color. So far it has worn two hats. It was what the plan identified as an area of little or no change but it is also part of the passive recreation area so it becomes turquoise. Then next thing down here is a partial restoration of the former ITT property was completed in 1992. So this is essentially where we are with these two yellow areas representing what has not been completed. It behooves us to take this diagram to the next step and that is even though phase two is not complete if we allow ourselves to color it in, because it is underway, that will allow us to better see the two remaining restoration areas identified in the original plan. So we color Bixby Park phase two in to distinguish the Mayfield slew remnant marsh, which sometimes people think is part of the landfill. So the remaining two areas designated for restoration from the original plan are the antenna field and the Mayfield slew remnant marsh. Now in addition to this there were auxiliary studies that identified these areas for restoration, a few areas around the duck pond and harbor, and of course an in-determined area at the LATP site. If all this were done we would have this, which pretty much realizes this.

Now the next slide I bring in the trails because truly the passive recreation experience is meant to include the natural area and the way that the natural area is incorporated into that passive recreation experience is through the trails. Enough of the maps.

Here is what the implementation looks like on the ground, the sailing station, the silting in harbor, the award winning pole field, the trails. Now in addition another improvement in the core passive recreation area would be the restoration of Harbor Master’s Cottage, also there have been parking lot improvements, trail improvements, a new picnic area, and new plant nursery, I can’t name them all, look in the book. Now an example of the policy implementation outside of that core passive recreation area would be installation of new lights. They are designed to cast less glare into the habitat.

It is also updated to reflect Council actions since 1988. Now in the original plan the Sea Scout building was to be demolished but in 2002 the Council added it to the historic inventory and of course recently they have approved a lease agreement with a volunteer organization. In 1998 the Council adopted the Comprehensive Plan which identifies places where the pedestrian/bicycle access should be improved and two of those places are the Adobe and Matadero Creek underpasses shown here as the Adobe Creek underpass. This identification of areas where access needed to be improved was reaffirmed in 2005 when the Council adopted the Bicycle Transportation Plan.

Another Comprehensive Plan policy identifies the existing commercial areas in the Baylands as districts that play a special economic roll and policies L-46 and B-33 advocate for the protection of these districts and the roll they play. Here we see employees of one of the districts having lunch. In 1994 the Council adopted an $8.0 million Golf Course Master Improvement Plan. In
2005 the Council adopted a water reclamation policy that is applicable to the water treatment plant. In 2007 the Council directed Staff to plan for early termination of the airport lease. So those are examples of Council actions. It is not an exhaustive list there are more in the book.

Out of date information, I only have one example here. The policy text about the landfill had to be updated to reflect the currently anticipated date for closure.

Finally, other relevant information. The plan became a repository for all kinds of other relevant information. A small-scale example of this would be that the plan talks about the easement agreement between the City and the International School. I don’t have an image of that but it would have been a map anyhow. A large-scale example of this other relevant information is the salt pond restoration project. Both this and its sister project, which is the shoreline study, are represented in the document.

Now here is an important thing mentioned in the document of other information. Two things, the Parks and Open Space Division is very concerned about the spreading problem of invasive plants. The Parks and Open Space Division is currently working with an environmental firm to develop a comprehensive conservation plan. As we know from the tour the Senior Ranger kind of indicated that if left unchecked this invasive plant problem could lead to a serious loss of habitat followed by a serious loss of wildlife followed by a serious loss of visitors to the Baylands.

So in summary, the Baylands Master Plan reflects the contents of the previous documents, what has happened since 1988, and is organized in two sections. There is a narrative section that contains the above-mentioned information and then each element has a policy page or two or three. That’s it.

Chair Garber: Thank you. We have four members of the public that would like to speak hopefully in the light, thank you. You will each have five minutes. The first is Emily Renzel to be followed by Enid Pearson.

Ms. Emily Renzel, Palo Alto: I am thrilled that this document has been completed and I want to congratulate Staff on a magnificent job of incorporating a tremendous amount of history and iterations of policy decisions and various documents that were published in a very readable way that is logical and a tremendous asset for the community. With changes of Commissioners and Council Members and members of the public and Staff members there is not a lot of institutional memory. To have something this important put together in one place is just magnificent and I want to thank you very much. I don’t have a lot of complaints. I found one little word that was extra in there and that is about it. I think the mapping is great.

The only thing I did do and it may be in there in a way that I didn’t notice but on each of the segments or areas of interest it is mentioned whether or not they are park dedicated. I sort of played with the map and I did a little bit and it is sort of what Gloria presented putting together the pieces but the map you have, the big bold line is going around park dedicated lands. I took a little liberty by dedicating the section in the middle of Renzel Wetlands but it is not actually dedicated but I put it as if it were. It really shows you what a magnificent resource we have in
Palo Alto. Then if you look at the fact that the City owns and controls both the airport and the Regional Water Quality Control Plant and we control the MSC and the LATP there is just that little bitty intrusion of private lands along the Embarcadero corridor and the rest of this whole thing is something that the City is privileged to have right in our midst. I hope that you will all take seriously your stewardship of these lands and appreciate the amount of work that these folks in Planning have done to put this together. It is really remarkable.

I hope that personally, as you probably know, I am not thrilled with the proposal to continue the compost operation right in the heart of the landfill there, which is also sort of in the heart of a major hunk of land there. That is one thing. Then another thing I would point out even though the golf course is an organized recreation it is green. It is not a natural thing in the normal sense of nature but it is definitely green. The non-park dedicated pole field is also a seasonal wetland for the most part. There are a few little – there is the building and some parking around it but for the most part the 35 acres are a seasonal wetland. So even though we don’t yet control it and we have not yet park dedicated it is a wetland that should be ultimately park dedicated.

Of course the landfill will be green and gold when it is completed as the Bixby Hills Park. I know most of you know this but all of the park dedicated Baylands are known as the John Fletcher Bixby Recreational Area. So it is a little confusion with respect to the Bixby Hills Park, which is only a small part of that.

Finally I would just say I am feeling very proud because I was on the Baylands Subcommittee of the Planning Commission that adopted this. Mary Gordon was a landscape architect on the Commission and spearheaded getting this done. I served with Tad Cody and with Francis Brenner and other people on that Commission, who really worked hard, met with members of the public and experts in all kinds of areas to produce the plan in the first place. It is a good illustration of what advance planning can do for a community because you saw all of the pieces start to come together as various parts of it were implemented. I hope you will continue to do that in all of your planning. I am sorry I used all that time.

Chair Garber: Thank you. Enid Pearson followed by Claire Elliott.

Ms. Enid Pearson, Palo Alto: I am still walking the Baylands. Let me tell you there isn’t a part of it I haven’t been on. I would like thank Ms. Humble and all of her staff and everybody. I think it is monumental task to pull this together and it was absolutely great. Well done.

Palo Alto like every city on the Bay felt that the Baylands were expendable and that they were meant to be used. Even Bixby’s plans were very intense. In the 1950’s there was an industrial park that was envisioned to fill in the marshes. So we have come a long way. Since 1965 there have been at least six plans as you have seen. Each plan said that they protected the marshes and envisioned open space and a passive park. There was not to be any landfill and no recycling center and no compost operation. They were all to be removed. For 40 years every City Council and every Planning Commission and every citizen group has supported this park concept. I would hope that this Planning Commission and this Council will finally say enough, and seriously close the landfill and relocate the recycling that can be done somewhere else because now we have single stream, and we could stop the composting operation now. There should be
absolutely no doubt in anybody's mind after the recent fire in the compost that that does not
belong at the top of our park. Imagine. One of the criteria for compost is that you put it in a
very remote area because you can almost guarantee the compost is going to catch on fire one
way or another. We don't want this this close to our area. It is half a mile from industry and
office buildings, one and a half miles from our own houses, and we don't need the compost out
there. So I would like to see if it is possible that that designation of landfill be removed from the
map. When you are presenting a Baylands Master Plan that that landfill not show on a proposal
that instead it just show that it is going to be a parkland and that will implement the ending of the
landfill operation and the compost and the recycling. So thank you very much.

Chair Garber: Thank you. Claire Elliott to be followed by Tom Jordan.

Ms. Claire Elliott, Palo Alto: Hi. I want to also thank you all for everything that has been done
for the Baylands. I think it is amazing. Palo Alto is obviously way far in front of the other
neighboring communities as far as how much we care about our Baylands. I want to thank
Emily Renzel for her part in making sure that happened and Enid Pearson because I used to work
helping to monitor the Renzel Marsh and now I work helping to restore the Enid Pearson
Arastradero Preserve. So I feel indebted to both of these women for both something I care
passionately about but also my livelihood.

The reason that I got involved in looking at the Master Plan was that I used to work for the City
doing monitoring of the Renzel Marsh and I was curious to see what was happening in the future
for the marsh and what is happening with the ITT facility that when I was there in 1999 and 2000
was leaving any minute so I took a look.

I talked to Gloria about one little change because it says something about the hydraulics have
been restored to their natural condition and that is not completely true. A change is being made
there because there is a pipeline that brings water into the saltwater marsh and then it pumps
back out into Matadero Creek but it is not natural tidal flow. If it were natural tidal flow it is
debatable how that would impact the salt marsh harvest mouse but at least it would improve
conditions for the bird life there. There seems to be fewer birds foraging in the sloughs partly
because the sloughs are clogged in some areas. I personally was out there with a shovel helping to
open some of those up. So I think there are some improvements.

I don't want this document to say this job is done here for either the saltwater marsh or the
freshwater area because the freshwater area is full of poison hemlock. There is verbiage in the
document about weeds and the problem of weeds but I think that could be strengthened as well.
One example is the grasslands are called 'nonnative grasslands' but nowhere do we call those
grasses weeds. Maybe there is somewhere in there but I think there is a lot we could be doing to
improve the grassland conditions.

Something that caught my eye that made me very sad was to see that the document says that in
2005 it was noted that we had eight to ten pairs of burrowing owls now there are none and then
period. No further sentence. I turned the page to see if it was going to say and we are hoping to
learn what the problem is for the burrowing owl and take management measure to hopefully
reinstate the burrowing owl into its habitat in the marshlands.
I was delighted because I am a bicycle rider and I work on East Bayshore to see that there is something in the plan about bike access year-round at Adobe Creek. So I want to put a word in for making that happen as soon as it is affordable especially considering all of the housing that is going in that area, the JCC construction, and the other housing. There are going to be so many people who will have that as a resource to go and learn to love nature out there. Otherwise half the year they are taking their life in their hands going over San Antonio, which is very scary having done it many times.

Other things that I saw in there that I think we should say something more about are it talks about converting the 14 acres of salt marsh to fresh marsh because of our sanitary sewage that outflows and then it doesn’t say anything more. I would love to see something – we are doing a good job in the storm water field of putting in rebate programs. I just saw a brand new rebate program and I am very proud to a Palo Altoan when things like that come out because we are helping to reduce the potential down in San Francisquito Creek when we get people putting the water into the ground. We still have people flushing seven gallons down some of the toilets. We have showers that could be low-flow showerheads and a lot of industries using way more water than they need to. We would be reclaiming some salt marsh if we didn’t allow I think it is something like 28 million gallons per day or something like that going out as fresh water into our salt marsh. I think that is the last one.

I want to thank you all for working on this. It is wonderful that it is all happening. I would just love to see it strengthened a little. Thank you.

Chair Garber: Thank you. Tom Jordan.

Mr. Tom Jordan, Palo Alto: Chairman Garber, members of the Commission I would strongly support you simply taking the Staff recommendation and adopting this plan and sending it on as is. But since there are some important parts in it I want to specifically mention them. I am sure you are aware, everybody in the room is, but they are tremendously important.

One is that this plan sent forward contemplates the landfill closure in late 2010 although it is not a precise date recognizing that it has to do with when it is full. That is the current prediction with about 18 months of grading and capping and then in 2013 being turned over to the state for inspection. If passed then it would be in the category of phases 2-a, 2-b, and would be ready to be made into a park.

The next thing that is tremendously important is that this plan being passed forward contemplates that recycling end at the Baylands or that was the plan until 1980. In 1980 the plan did recognize that there may, underline may, be a recycling site of one to two acres adjacent to the electric or generation station. It seems to me tremendously important that this group take a strong part, I don’t know if it is appropriate you take the lead, but you be heavily involved in commenting whether that is the appropriate site, the possible/may site, or some other place in the city. Why I raise that is that the history in Palo Alto of recycling did not start with the City. It started with the citizens. For years the citizens setup their own collection and managed to turn it over to people who would accept the recycling. It was only after it reached a critical mass that the City
took it over, organized it, and it moved out to the Baylands. So the point is that the recycling site does not have to be in the Baylands. In fact if you think in terms of gasoline mileage you would think perhaps a point more central in the city or perhaps two points more centrally located might be better sites. So I would urge you to take a part. It is clear to me that the Department of Public Works should not have the say in this because the Department of Public Works has a longstanding vested interest in retaining as much control over as many acres as possible for the very simple reason that they charge through the garbage fee $100,000 an acre on your garbage bill which goes into the General Fund. It doesn’t go into park money it goes into the General Fund. My computation on that is that really over the years since area 2-a was closed in 1992 and is 22.5 acres, and area 2-b was closed in 2000 and is 23.2 acres that over the years to date they have collected $54.5 million to go into the General Fund, all of it into the General Fund. Between now and the time it closes they will collect almost another $10.0 million. So what I am saying is that the Manager’s Office and Department of Public Works have a vested money interest that should be watched by people who – we don’t have to pay that. We shouldn’t be paying that. To let them pick a site and determine acreage and so forth has a definite money benefit to the City, which is detrimental to Planning and the park.

The next thing is that actually the composting, which I won’t go into because when I get to the Council we will be putting extensive information in front of the Council that the Department of Public Works memo is simply wrong. It is inadequate. It is incomplete and it shouldn’t be followed. It should be an independent study of any carbon benefits of what they are proposing.

Then I do mention one thing, look on page 76, nothing for you to act on but be aware of it. There is a recitation of a dispute with the State Lands Commission as to who actually owns the land and that there is a lease between State Lands Commission that never was resolved but is sort of put on hold. One the things in the lease the Lands Commission said they won’t charge us any money as long as the lands do not change from a public recreational use. I think it contemplated what was already planned but it didn’t contemplate something longer than what was planned. I thank you very much.

Chair Garber: Thank you. Staff, just before we go into our clarifying questions I think it would be helpful for you to give us a little instruction as to just what the scope of our work is this evening and what our expressed action is so that we can parse our comments appropriately.

Ms. Caporgno: Okay. What we are asking you to do is look at the document. You have heard the public comments, if there are any inaccuracies in the information that is provided in the document. One of the speakers mentioned some policy changes she recommended. Those are not things that you are to be discussing tonight. It is really whether or not this document reflects the changes that have been made by the Council over time and Gloria provided this background information and if there are any inaccuracies in the background information. That seems to be her dimension. She had spoken to Gloria earlier and we are going to make some minor tweaks with the language to reflect that, and Gloria you might want to expound on what that is when I finish, but there will be a minor tweak to the document based on our conversation with her. We can mention it to Council when we go to them. We are not going to reprint this document until after Council has taken action on it and then we will print a final version that includes any changes that either you recommend, Parks and Recreation Commission is going to be looking at
it next week, or the Council makes any changes. Again, to focus on is this accurate or are there inaccuracies, what are those changes that should be made.

Before I turn it back over to you I just wanted to acknowledge Clare Campbell is here tonight. She is the one who prepared the Negative Declaration for the project. So if you have any questions about the Negative Declaration or the Environmental Review process she is here to answer those questions. I also wanted to mention that Gloria almost single-handedly prepared this document and definitely needs to be recognized for that but Virginia Warheight who had been working on the Baylands Master Plan for years before she retired also provided some assistance to Gloria particularly letting her know whether or not this was accurate information. So they both collaborated on the document. Virginia was unable to attend tonight.

Chair Garber: Thank you. Just to clarify your comments we have two specific tasks. One is to look for inaccuracy and the second is to action the EIR. Then we can also offer comments but they are not a part of the explicit action that we are asked to take this evening. Those comments may have anything to with operational concerns, land use actions imagined or contemplated, or management concerns, etc. so just before we start our clarifying questions let me just ask the Commission how much time we should set aside for our clarifying questions, 15 to 20 minutes, he asked leadingly?

Commissioner Sandas: You said 15 or 20 minutes, why don’t we start with 15 and see how we do?

Chair Garber: Commissioner Holman.

Commissioner Holman: Well doing the math 15 minutes isn’t very much per Commissioner so I don’t know if that is quite attainable. We can shoot for anything. I had one other question if I might which is the purview. If we had comments regarding potentially at least improvements to the structure, as hard as that would be to conceive, if we had a couple of comments I presume that those would be allowed as well.

Chair Garber: I would assume so. Staff, you would accept comments relative to format and structure of the report?

Ms. Caporgno: Hopefully they are not going to be extensive but if there is some limited....

Chair Garber: I am sure Commissioner Holman will be very sensitive to the work that has been done thus far.

Commissioner Holman: It is hard to improve on terrific work like this. I just had a couple of thoughts that you might or might not think are good.

Chair Garber: Fifteen minuets? Twenty minutes?

Vice-Chair Tuma: Let’s go with 20.
Chair Garber: Twenty, okay we will go to 20. Commissioners? Shall we just go down the line? I am asking for clarifying questions. You have none? Commissioner Lippert has none.

Commissioner Holman perhaps you have some.

Commissioner Holman: Well, perhaps they are clarifying questions. I will ask it this way, and it is also my possible suggestion for improvement. When the document was being organized was there consideration given to having just a list of maps? The reason I ask is because having just the list of maps would be easier to find, it would seem, some of the things that are specifically of interest. It also could then include the maps that are in the Appendix. So I was just wondering if that was a consideration.

Ms. Humble: Yes, I did consider that and came up with a more integrated version of the Table of Contents. That is where I settled.

Commissioner Holman: I will come back to that then as to why.

Ms. Humble: Maybe we could augment it with a list of maps. Maybe not break up the integrated Table of Contents and then also have a list of maps.

Commissioner Holman: That was the purpose of my question, not to change what you have but to add just a single page that would have a list of maps so that they would be easily discernable.

Ms. Humble: I am glad you read the Appendix. It is nice to know you looked at the maps and the Appendix.

Commissioner Holman: Absolutely.

Chair Garber: Anything else Commissioner Holman?

Commissioner Holman: Yes. On page 112 and this is definitely clarifying, in the far left column it talks about the Harbor Master’s Cottage. It says it was designated as a local point of historic interest in 1969. Then on the top of the next column it says the Sea Scout building was designated as an historic resource. These would not have been Baylands policies necessarily but would it be prudent to integrate other policies that indicate preservation of or is it implied that the Sea Scout building will be preserved and restored because it was added to the inventory. Also, is there any designation other than local point of historic interest? Does that mean it is on the inventory? I don’t know that so those are clarification points.

Ms. Humble: Well, I can tell by the text, the sentence, the Harbor Master’s Cottage designated as a local point of historic interest in 1969 was original text so I didn’t do anything to that. I added the bold part that says it was renovated in 1992. We can expound on that.

Commissioner Holman: I am just wondering if there was a related policy to see that that Harbor Master’s quarters is preserved and retained and the same thing with the Sea Scout building. I don’t remember what number it is on the local inventory but if that is another City policy to see that it is retained and restored so would that be appropriate to add it here?
Ms. Humble: So number one is maintain the restrooms and Harbor Master’s Cottage that is policy number one. Then policy number two, proceed with the approved renovation of the Sea Scout building. Is it supposed to say ‘maintain’ the Sea Scout building?

Ms. Caporgno: I think we could say maintain the Sea Scout building but I think what Gloria is getting at is the Harbor area renovations, the two policies one and two that we added were to get at the fact that the Council had made the decision that they wanted to retain those two buildings and maintain those two buildings.

Commissioner Holman: So I guess the clarification I am trying to get at is it simply maintain or is it to maintain and retain under certain conditions?

Ms. Caporgno: I don’t think there were any conditions identified, under any certain conditions when the Council – I am not sure about the Harbor Master’s Cottage but I was present when the Sea Scout building was approved by Council for designating it and maintaining and restoring it if possible. I don’t think there were any specific conditions it was just not to be demolished. That was the real crux of their decision.

Commissioner Holman: I will pass on.

Chair Garber: Commissioner Keller.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. First let me just preface my questions by saying this is a wonderful assemblage of all of the history in one place. What is interesting for future historians coming back is not only to look at this but also to be able to look at the history from earlier documents that you now say are obsolete as well as City documents of that nature. I am wondering if through the process of your work if an archive has been generated, and I am wondering if that archive is in computer form such as scanned PDFs or whatever, and if that archive might be available to things like the library or the Palo Alto Historical Association or whatever.

Ms. Humble: No, that has not been accomplished yet. I haven’t stopped to take a breath yet but we can take a look at that and see what all it would involve as far as time and money.

Ms. Caporgno: I just wanted to add Gloria was able to do this. When we embarked on the Comprehensive Plan Update this project was supposed to be put on a back burner but since we had some time between the time we actually started the Comprehensive Plan and the Council approved the concept of amending the Comprehensive Plan we did this work on the Baylands Master Plan. Now we are back in the throws of the Comprehensive Plan Update so I don’t know how much time we can commit to any other additional work or subsequent on this. So that may be delayed but it depends on the amount of work that it would entail.

Commissioner Keller: Okay, thank you. The next issue is I was fascinated to read the story about the history of start/stop with respect to flooding issues. I have actually been following the work of the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority. I appreciate the document you have
done here in terms of the five issues for the initial goals and you had a comment about the San
Francisquito Creek JPA creek visibility study but I believe that they did formally include as part
of their purview not only the creek flooding what I think is called alluvial flooding up through
the watershed which goes through I think Adobe Creek. So I am wondering if that matches your
model of the universe and whether that clarification might be worthwhile including somewhere
on page 245 I guess.

Ms. Humble: Which column? Number one through five?

Commissioner Keller: One through five and then you end that with the discussions of the study,
which is going on there. I think the fact that they have made a decision to include although it is
not clear what the interim decisions are. So it might be worthwhile checking this section with
what the Executive Director of the JPA is and make sure that it actually conforms to the
decisions they have made in the interim measures. I think they have a new Executive Director
now.

Ms. Humble: Okay. In other words, I think you are saying that there might be a number six?

Commissioner Keller: No, not that there is another goal but in fact they are exploring interim
measures and as well as they made a decision subsequent to their formation to not only look at
San Francisquito Creek flooding but the alluvial plane flooding which includes the Bay flooding
up through Adobe Creek is what I understand. So I am not sure how you would incorporate that.

Ms. Humble: Okay.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you.

Chair Garber: I just have a note here to close the public hearing, which I failed to do before we
started the questioning. Commissioner Tuma.

Vice-Chair Tuma: Just a couple of comments. If I had a hat on I would take it off to you and
your team for bringing this thing together. It really is spectacular and also I wanted to extend my
personal thanks for the tour the other day. It was extremely informative. Anybody who gets the
opportunity to do that is lucky.

The document I think is fantastic. It is daunting I am sure to put together and also daunting to
review. One suggestion that I would have as this goes to Council is not in the document itself
but rather in the Staff Report to Council. On our Staff Report on page two you list the key
modifications and you have enumerated those. It might be helpful to Council to the extent that it
is practical to reference the report in these items. So when you see that for example the Smart
Station Agreement in 1991 is incorporated well is there somewhere that I can go in here and see
what that means? I think that would be helpful. I recognize that perhaps some of these are in
many places throughout the document but to the extent that it facilitates the review of Council to
be able to point to the specific areas and look into the plan I think that would be helpful. Outside
of that it is a big effort, it is an important effort and thanks once again for doing it.
Chair Garber: Commissioner Lippert.

Commissioner Lippert: I too think that this is a fantastic document. I think probably the thing that has helped the most though is the presentation that was given earlier this year by Virginia Warheigt in terms of bringing just about every Board and every Commissioner as well as City Council Member up to speed as to introducing them to the Baylands. I think probably the most telling feature of the Baylands is that it is though most citizens view it as this homogenous sort of glob of land and it is not. It is actually a very complex set of microenvironments. Even though you are looking over a field and you see that there are these grasses in fact some of them are salt marshes, some of them are natural marshes, and some of them aren't even marshes at all they are just weed infested fields. To understand the complexity of what is out there I think is real important and this as a manual in terms of outlining and defining those areas really begins to take a picture or set in place what we have out there.

Where I think the report falls short slightly is that no environment is fixed. It is not set in concrete. It is ever changing. With global warming coming the Baylands is going to be placed under stress or duress in certain areas. I believe that as part of the Master Plan it is going to be very important to understand where those areas are where they can be in some ways degraded by global warming. I think that maybe something like where we have lost the burrowing owl in some places in some ways is beginning to tell us that something is going on there that is not right. So I don't know if you have any comments that you want to make about that at all.

Ms. Caporgno: I just want to say that gets back to this whole issue of there may be changes that would be good for this, it may be a good time for the City to reevaluate the Master Plan, but that wasn't the task before us. Our task was just to pull together all the pieces and make it up to date and to consolidate everything. The next phase if the Council wants us to go forward and do what you are saying that may be what they decide when they see this now. Now they have seen all the pieces and now you have an opportunity to say maybe certain things should be changed. It was difficult to do that previously because it was so haphazard previously.

Commissioner Lippert: I guess I understand your point. What I said is this is a really good snapshot in terms of a picture. When I say present day I use that term loosely because we are really talking about now, the immediate past, and the present and little bit in the future. What I am talking about is the way future.

Ms. Humble: I just want to remind you that the Parks and Open Space Division is currently working on a conservation plan that will get much more involved with the existing vegetation, existing problems, probably future problems because it is going to be a management plan. I think wildlife, vegetation, and recreation are going to be the three components of that. That might be a very good place for that kind of information to be covered.

Chair Garber: Anything else?

Commissioner Lippert: You don't want us to comment on specific thoughts or ideas of the plan?

Chair Garber: We will do that when we are finished with the questions.
Commissioner Lippert: Then I will hold.

Chair Garber: Okay. Commissioner Holman.

Commissioner Holman: Just one question at this time. A member of the public did comment on the fact that there aren’t burrowing owls there any more. There hasn’t been a policy to create habitat that would restore the burrowing owls or potentially do that. However, would that need to be implicitly stated as a policy because it couldn’t have been anticipated that the burrowing owls also would go away. So how would Staff address that or do you think you have addressed it until there is an explicit policy to address it?

Ms. Humble: Well, except for the word ‘explicit’ in the overall Environmental Quality chapter policy number seven is restore the diversity of plants and animals to disturbed upland sites and number eight is ensure that there is sufficient native food and cover for wildlife. I talked with the Senior Ranger and asked that some of these policies need a little depth/something. For example this could be expanded to explain – I asked that they take some of these policies and consider them when the do the conservation plan. So you could put some flesh on this policy and it could be expanded to describe how ensuring that there is enough native food and cover for wildlife how does that apply to the burrowing owl. So hopefully they are going to take that into consideration. I believe there is a policy here, it is a very broad policy, but I believe you could lean on this to say that we do have a policy to provide food and habitat for the burrowing owl.

Commissioner Holman: Okay, perhaps a reference to that or a comment having to do with that after the text about the burrowing owl might be helpful so it doesn’t just kind of stop dead so to speak.

Chair Garber: Thank you. I have just a couple of quick questions and interestingly enough I will be the one that will take us over the 20 minute limit that we set for ourselves. My first question has to do with your initial diagram that has a portion of the map that is called natural. I was just curious as to is the word ‘natural’ being used in the sense that that land was there prior to some point or in the sense that it is being allowed to develop naturally? What does that mean actually?

Ms. Humble: The natural area actually has five subsections. If you go to page 144 you see the five subsections of the natural areas.

Chair Garber: Yes, the named areas.

Ms. Humble: Then starting on page 126 is an explanation, a site analysis of each one of those sub areas and each one of them have a different degree of pristine-ness. Hook Island is the most pristine. I think the flood basin is the least pristine. The analysis actually explains how pristine it is or if it is not quite pristine why the analysis made allowances for whatever disturbance had occurred. These were the areas that the original analyzer felt could be considered natural because they had not been disturbed any more than they had been. So beginning on 126 to I think 129 will talk about each sub area, maybe a paragraph on each sub area, and describe its
level of pristine-ness or how much it has been disturbed and why we are forgiving that
disturbance and still calling it a natural area.

Chair Garber: Yes, okay thank you. I had read these but it was hard to decipher if these were
areas that had been as we see them now 100 years ago, 200 years ago, or something of that sort.
I was just curious as to that. So when you use the word ‘pristine’ you are talking about things
that are untouched.

Ms. Humble: Mostly in this case it would be by dredge spoils.

Chair Garber: Okay, which is in fact a reality over the entire area to some degree greater or
lesser?

Ms. Humble: Hook Island, and I don’t think the Faber or the Loumeister I think escaped dredge
spoils and Hook Island escaped them.

Chair Garber: Okay. My second question really has to do with the conservation report that is to
be published. There needs to be coordination obviously between these two documents. It may
be that coordination is not something that the Baylands Master Plan policies need to address
directly in that it could be for instance referenced in the Staff Report as an activity that needs to
occur. It seems to me that there is a conflict that we talked a little bit about with the Ranger
when we took our tour. The Baylands policies necessarily deal with logical and/or legal
separations of property which have very little to do with the operational requirements of
managing the property. So it seems to me that inevitably there will be conflicts there in terms of
which properties get which monies, where focus and attention can be placed relative to other
areas, and acknowledging that and setting forth some kind of plan to help mitigate the impacts of
being able to manage it against what the sort of legal or logical divisions of land may be
something that is worth paying some attention to. Has there been any discussion about that thus
far by Staff?

Ms. Humble: Yes.

Ms. Caporgno: Greg Betts who is our Interim Director of Community Services is responsible for
preparation of the conservation plan is here tonight. So he is going to say a few words.

Chair Garber: Welcome Mr. Betts.

Mr. Greg Betts, Interim Director of Community Services: Good evening. Two components of
the Baylands Conservation Plan have been completed so far. It is a three-phase project first
looking at the vegetation in the Baylands, which supports wildlife. That component has been
drafted and the ESA has recently completed a wildlife analysis of what habitat potential there is
for the landfill area. They will continue to work on the wildlife element of what type of
vegetation will support different species of animals, birds, and reptiles in the Baylands. Then the
third component will be public access in terms of how public access and dogs may affect the
biology or wildlife of the Baylands.
Chair Garber: Thank you. I guess the specific sort of question I would have is has there been any consideration for how the policies may constrict or support how the department actually manages the property? One example is that we were informed that rye grass, by way of example, is a plant that is looking to aggressively take over and choke out a number of the more natural species there leading inevitably to a monoculture if it is not managed. The management of that has to occur over properties, which the City has auspice over and some properties that it doesn’t. It is trying to manage that in areas that sometimes have money to do that management and other areas that do not. I am just curious if there has been any sort of consideration about how those things may be coordinated and suggestions that allow management to occur more appropriately or more to our benefit.

Mr. Betts: Let me take a stab at answering that. I guess for right now the emphasis is in terms of the impending timeline for converting the landfill back to Bixby Park Hills and what sort of landscaping design will be necessary to make that working habitat. The ESA report that has recently been done on just the landfill portion, which time-wise is the next area that is really going to need to be addressed before that can be opened up to the public, has made recommendations for certain plant species that are more native, require less maintenance, and will be more supportive of wildlife.

Chair Garber: Okay thanks. Let’s move on. Do the Commissioners have comments and discussion that they would like to raise prior to us entertaining a motion on the topic? Yes. Shall we limit ourselves to another 20 minutes perhaps? I am seeing general acknowledgement of that. Shall we go down the row? Commissioner Holman, are you ready?

Commissioner Holman: Sure. I just had a couple of other things that might be helpful. Scattered throughout the text there is reference to other documents. I was just thinking that might be helpful to just list related documents like the Baylands Master Plant List for instance and the Design Guidelines that were created. I don’t know if you add it at the end of the Table of Contents or if it is a separate entry so there is a compilation of those other associated documents. It would be helpful in helping support the Baylands Master Plan. I think that would be helpful.

I had one and I am not sure if this out of bounds or not as Gloria knows it was a topic of one of my questions prior to our tour. It has to do with parking along Embarcadero Road. I note that on page 219 the next to last paragraph on that page says that the plan envisioned limiting the role of Embarcadero Road to that of access to the park only and restricting parking to the parking areas. The parking areas are specifically delineated in a couple of maps. Then on page 221 at the top in the middle column it talks about a traffic study with special attention to adequate turning lanes, parking needs and the flow of traffic on Embarcadero Road remains a goal. There has been nothing to change that, right?

Ms. Caporgno: That is correct.

Commissioner Holman: So I guess this is just a comment that without studying that we are parking all over Embarcadero Road. I know that is probably a little out of bounds of this discussion but I did just want to note that.
I think those are my only other comments other than I do want to thank Gloria for putting together the tour and with Darrin’s accompaniment too, and Virginia in absentia appreciate her participation in this too. It was really very clear on the tour that Gloria really is passionate about this. You can tell by her familiarity with the document tonight that she cares about it and she is invested in this. Nothing gives me as a Commissioner more confidence and comfort in looking at a document and a plan than knowing that the Planner is that invested in a good outcome. So I want to express my great appreciation for that.

Chair Garber: Thank you. Commissioner Sandas.

Commissioner Sandas: Thanks. The only comment that I have this evening is to thank Gloria and everyone else who also worked on this. I don’t think we have talked at all about the Mitigated Negative Declaration and I think we need to do that before we entertain a motion. Is that true?

Chair Garber: Yes and/or a part of the motion.

Commissioner Sandas: Okay. Just to back up to echo some of the thing that other people said, I usually try not to repeat things that everybody said, but I think it would be bad manners if I didn’t tell you how appreciative of the tour. I had not read the draft before the tour and it was so easy to read the entire thing after the tour. When I was reading it it was like I was on the tour again. It was very, very informative and you touched on the most important things. I didn’t have any clarifying questions about this because to my knowledge it is all very factual and very well done. Thank you very much.

Chair Garber: Thank you. Commissioner Keller.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. The first thing is I think this is a wonderful report and there are a number of minor typos and maybe I will markup my copy for you and give it to you or maybe there is a spare copy I can markup.

I think what Commissioner Holman was referring to is often called a bibliography and it would be nice to have a bibliography at the end documenting all of the reference material and collecting that in one place. It might be a good thing to do. Even if the documents are not collected a bibliography might be helpful.

The next thing about the document is that obviously this is a nice black and white copy of what I hope will be a glorious color copy, pun intended, and I am hoping that when this document is in its final form and published on the website that it will be on the website in color PDF. All too often color documents produced by the Planning Division are put up in black and white form and it makes it hard for the public to enjoy them.

With respect to policy comments I think I am certainly in support of closing the landfill in a timely manner. I think one of the interesting thing is it seems to me that much of what we are putting in the landfill these days is construction and demolition debris. For one thing I would encourage us to be reducing that through various measures. Secondly, it will be interesting to
see where all that goes in subsequent and I am wondering if we are in fact charging sufficient for that to be discouraging its use besides limitations.

The next thing is with respect to the recycling center I realize that according to municipal ordinance that the recycling center has to remain with the City but that is not part of the charter. The recycling center can easily be changed by an affirmative vote of the City Council. I would certainly encourage us to consider aggregating our recycling center with the adjacent one nearby just across the border from Palo Alto at Stanford is a wonderful recycling center. We could collaborate on that and not need to have two within the span of four or so miles from each other or whatever the exact distance is as the crow or raven flies.

The third thing is that I also have concerns with the continued operations of the compost facility in the Baylands. For one, I noticed a horrible amount of smoke when there was the active fire going on that Wednesday night for which I received a phone call about the smoke. Interestingly enough when I drove home two nights earlier from I believe a City Council meeting and I drove along Alma Street I smelled smoke although not as much of it. Two days before I noticed the smoke when I came home, there is a spot when you pass El Verano, when suddenly the smoke came down there. I smelled the smoke two days earlier and that means that it seems to be a recurrent problem. It was also mentioned by Staff that the compost operation is a recurrent problem in terms of smoke and in terms of potential for fire. Therefore, I think that it does make a lot of sense to me not to retain that. The greenhouse gas implications of transporting the compost out of the city limits to a place that can accommodate it better seems to be a reasonable tradeoff considering that small amount of greenhouse gases compared to the air quality issues for the residents particularly of South Palo Alto that seem to be adversely affected by potential fires in the compost. So I would strongly recommend that the City Council in its deliberations export the compost center to agricultural land that can better handle it. Thank you.

**Chair Garber:** Thank you. Vice-Chair Tuma.

**Vice-Chair Tuma:** Just a couple of things to add to my previous comments. I don’t know if there is a plan to take City Council Members on a similar type of tour that we went on prior to our hearing but if there isn’t I would encourage that.

One other thought along those lines to help inform the public if there is interest in a similar type of tour for the public. To be honest with you I don’t know what happens out there on an ongoing basis if there are scheduled tours or the Rangers do it, but I think the educational value to the community of more and more people being informed if they are so inclined about what is going on there is significant. I do think it is important for Council to have the benefit of your knowledge, the Ranger’s knowledge, and sort of the background. It definitely makes this process much better.

**Chair Garber:** Thank you. Commissioner Lippert.

**Commissioner Lippert:** Again, I want to thank you for the efforts that you and the Staff have put in on putting this together. I think probably what is the most apparent is that this project really isn’t a job it is really a labor of love. What I mean by that is that everybody who has come in
contact with this really cares about the outcome whether they be City Staff, or volunteers that
have worked in the Baylands. That includes the Rangers as well as the general public that
volunteer their time to go out there to help conserve and restore the Baylands. I think that
becomes clear in this document.

I think Arthur Keller said something very important here which is that when this document is
finally published it should be in color. I think that one of the positive aspects to printing it in
color is that every citizen in the City of Palo Alto and outside Palo Alto will be able to then
download the document as a PDF and begin to use this document as a living document. In other
words, be able to actually refer to it and begin to have an understanding of the complexity of that
environment. It reminds me of when I was in high school and I took Ecology. I grew up in
Pennsylvania so we went to the Pine Barrens. When I was in architecture school again we took
Ecology and we took a look at Eskers and Kettle Holes and the geography of New England.
Going out to the Baylands and having an interpretive guide like this in terms of the Master Plan
really begins to explain the environment and how it works. I think to have this resource so close
to Palo Alto is really an asset and the Master Plan really not only talks about the way this should
be maintained and up-kept but also explains to the public how it functions. So it is a textbook
basically.

Chair Garber: Thank you. I realize I did have one, possibly two, other questions of Staff if you
will entertain them. The first, and it may be in here and I apologize if I didn’t read it, are there
specific policies that concern themselves with Palo Alto’s water treatment plant and the clean
water that it discharges into the Bay Area?

Ms. Humble: I don’t believe there are any policies. I might prove myself wrong. Page 187?
The long-term goals, the Public Works established for themselves long-term goals in 2001 and
the Council endorsed those. I think I summarized them but those long term goals surely say
something about minimize or eliminate toxins in the…..minimize or eliminate total release of
toxins to the environment….take a leadership role.

Chair Garber: Commissioner Lippert.

Commissioner Lippert: Actually, recently we had seen the new design for the waste treatment
plant and that was the purpose of the redesign using UV radiation to neutralize the toxins rather
than having chemical treatment.

Ms. Humble: It is not the toxins we are worried about it is the freshwater that we are worried
about.

Chair Garber: Understood. So I am hearing that there is nothing that talks about quantity,
amounts, or a plan for anything that deals with that directly.

Ms. Humble: No, Community Services first brought to my attention that that should be
mentioned in here. Then Utilities’ response was I think what I have in here that they
acknowledge that their freshwater discharge is causing something like 11 to 14 acres of saltwater
marsh to become brackish. I think Claire Elliott mentioned that also. Then I talked to the Senior
Ranger, you might have overheard that conversation, he said he talked to the people in the Don Edward’s Preserve and it seems to be something that Rangers are having to just accept. So there are no plans to fix that.

Chair Garber: I see someone approaching the dais. We will open the public hearing for you, please identify yourself.

Ms. Renzel: Many years ago in the 1970’s there was concern about the discharge into the Bay and a big South Bay dischargers pipeline was proposed, which was of itself quite disastrous. It was eight feet in diameter and would have run from San Jose all the way out to the central bay and would have required major mucking around to do. So they were going to put a sewer ban on until that was built so that there would be a halt of construction. So there was stuff like that that happened. Then subsequently the Regional Water Quality Control released the ban on construction hookups based on the local plant demonstrating beneficial use of the discharge. So that beneficial use process resulted in the use of the sewage treatment plant for irrigation in various places and I think Shoreline Park imports water from us from our sewage plant for their irrigation. So that was one of them and the Renzel Wetland was a beneficial use project. So those were things that were intended to try to offset the problems of the discharge. They were accepted at the time by Regional Water Quality Control. So there may not be a true solution to this but that is how the agencies dealt with it at the time.

Chair Garber: Thank you and we will close the public hearing again. So that may be an area that some additional policy could be constructed around. The policy may in fact be something as simple as stating that to the degree possible we will look to find ways to use or reuse that water for Bayshore or for other gray water purposes, etc. That could also be made part of for instance the conservation plan as opposed to this as a way and there may be other ways to sort of put some form around that as opposed to simply accepting it and what it is as opposed to what we would like it to be.

I think there is a sort of similar question around the hazardous materials that come out of the water treatment plant but as Commissioner Lippert had mentioned the new project there presumably makes that issue go away.

So the other comments that I would have are I would suggest you consider including Ms. Renzel’s map of the public and private areas. I think that is an instructive map and may be easily included. Excuse me dedicated parkland versus private land. Some way of addressing the coordination between the two documents, the policy document and the operational or management document of the conservation addressed in some way. I can imagine how it could be included in this document or included in other ways. I think that is it. The only thing I will add is if you have not received enough accolades thus far the tour and being led by you and the Ranger Darren Anderson, your passion and knowledge was inspirational. If we can come close to that in these darkened chambers we will be very lucky indeed.

Unless there are other comments, can we entertain a motion? We have one more comment from Commissioner Holman.
Commissioner Holman: Actually, it is just a question that is related. Several comments have been made about the compost area and I was just wondering when that was going to be coming to the Commission.

Ms. Caporgno: My understanding is the Council has delayed discussion of that until after completion of this document, which is to go to them on September 22. Then it would be a decision as to when the composting would come to you, I believe the Parks and Recreation Commission, and subsequently to the Council would be decided. At this point we have not been told that there are dates requested for that.

Commissioner Holman: So it is the Council’s prerogative whether they make the policy decision on their own or if they refer it to the Commission for land use policy discussion?

Ms. Caporgno: That is correct. I believe when it was discussed by Council previously it was indicated by some Council Members that this document will be helpful in them deciding what avenue to pursue as far as composting, even to consider it and send it to Parks and Recreation and Planning Commission. So I think they were awaiting this document to make that decision.

Commissioner Holman: Thank you.

Chair Garber: Thank you. Can I entertain a motion? Commissioner Keller.

MOTION

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. I move the Staff recommendation that the Planning and Transportation Commission recommend that the City Council approve the Negative Declaration and adopt the Palo Alto Baylands Master Plan 2008.

SECOND

Vice-Chair Tuma: Second.

Chair Garber: Vice-Chair Tuma second. Shall we hear from the maker of the motion, your comments, please?

Commissioner Keller: First I would like to take this opportunity to thank Gloria Humble for all the work that went into this, also for the tours that were given to all the Commissioners with the Park Ranger, to thank Virginia Warheight for the wonderful presentation that was made earlier that I think brought a lot of us up to speed, and also I would like to thank the people who worked to convince Palo Alto many years ago to create the Baylands, to create that conservation, to stop it from development so that we have something that we can all enjoy. There is a saying that if we can see far it is because we stand on the shoulders of giants. Palo Alto has benefited over the years from many giants who have encouraged the City to create such good policies, to other giants who created the Palo Alto Utilities. I think we are going to be forever in their debt. I think that we also will be in the debt of the keepers of the flame or the fern as Chair Garber suggests. I think that as Commissioner Lippert said this is a labor of love and I certainly can tell
there is a lot of energy that went into this and a lot of thought and caring. It gives me great
certainty to have the sense that when future development goes on in the Baylands that we will
have your expertise, Gloria, to count on in guiding that.

Chair Garber: The seconder, your comments.

Vice-Chair Tuma: What he said.

Chair Garber: Would any of the other Commissioners like to speak before we vote?
Commissioner Holman.

Commissioner Holman: I have a question for Chair and Staff both. As I listen to the comments
and suggestions of other Commissioners I heard none that I disagreed with. So I was just
wondering if the maker of the motion might accept a friendly amendment to incorporate the
comments of Commissioners into the motion.

Chair Garber: Commissioner Keller.

Commissioner Keller: I would be happy to do that I am just wondering what the technical
import of that is. I think that we are pretty much in agreement with a lot of stuff so I am not sure
of the effect of putting it in the motion.

Commissioner Holman: Well, they will all be captured in the minutes so if other Commissioners
are also in agreement with the recommendations that were made via comments of the
Commissioners I think Staff could deal with that. Would Staff care to comment on that?

Ms. Caporgno: No, I think the three items that I am thinking of the map, Chair Garber’s issue
regarding the wastewater treatment, and then there was on other one.

Chair Garber: I have a partial list and perhaps between Commissioner Holman and myself we
can make a quick list here.

Commissioner Holman: A list of maps and bibliography.

Chair Garber: Right and plant list. A suggestion regarding the policy of how water is discharged
from the wastewater treatment plant, coordination with the conservation report, coordination
with the San Francisquito Creek JPA.

Commissioner Keller: With that being clear...yes?

Ms. Caporgno: I just wanted to make sure that the Commission realized that what we will do is
your recommendation – we will include in the Staff Report the discharge issue is a
recommendation for a policy change that the Council then can decide whether or not they want
to incorporate that. The conservation plan item we won’t propose to incorporate that in the plan
at all but it will be discussed in the Staff Report that goes to Council.
Chair Garber: Yes. I think that is appropriate. Is that acceptable to the maker?

Commissioner Keller: Well, now that I understand better what the desire is for the motion I would be happy to incorporate it.

Chair Garber: The seconder?

Vice-Chair Tuma: Not to be difficult but I am concerned that we are – everything has been captured in the minutes. The minutes will be attached to what goes to Council. Are we adding too much to the motion? To be honest with you as we were going through I can’t say that I can capture every single comment that people made and said that I am completely in agreement with that. So I am a little bit uneasy about it to be honest with you.

Chair Garber: The action will die without the second. Commissioner Holman would you care to make an alternative motion?

AMENDMENT

Commissioner Holman: Just two things. One is to comment to Vice-Chair Tuma that if we don’t include them as a motion they will just be accepted as individual comments and will not have the weight of them being incorporated in a motion. So that is the purpose of that. I can appreciate that maybe you didn’t capture every one of them just as I was listening I didn’t hear anything I disagreed with so maybe I have a higher level of comfort for that.

So I will move a separate amendment to the motion to incorporate recommendations referenced during the Commission comments as recommendation to City Council.

Chair Garber: This is an amendment not an alternative motion?

Commissioner Holman: It could be handled either way but I am making an amendment to the main motion.

SECOND

Commissioner Keller: I will second the amendment.

Chair Garber: Actually, I believe, correct me if I am wrong that the maker either accepts or rejects it and then the seconder would have to support that.

Commissioner Keller: I am seconding her motion.

Chair Garber: But I am hearing that it is an amendment not a motion.

Commissioner Holman: It is an amendment, which is a motion. In other words I am acknowledging that I agree with the main motion with this amendment. Since the seconder
didn’t accept it as a friendly amendment I am making a separate motion that is a standalone amendment that if passes will amend the original motion. Does that make sense?

Commissioner Keller: I believe that even though I am the maker of the original motion I am still allowed to second an amendment to the motion.

Chair Garber: Okay we will accept that. Commissioner Lippert you had comments before we vote on this?

Commissioner Lippert: I won’t be voting in support of the amendment. Part of it is I don’t agree with some of the comments that were made here. They are very minor but they are inaccuracies and I don’t agree with them. Therefore by accepting that motion I would be accepting those inaccurate things unless I were to individually spell out what they are. Then we get into hair splitting and I don’t want to do that. I think our individual comments are good enough.

MOTION PASSED (4-2-0-1, Commissioner Lippert and Vice-Chair Tuma opposed, and Commissioner Fineberg absent)

Chair Garber: Okay, any other comments before we vote on the amendment? I am seeing none. All those in favor of the amendment that includes the list of items that were iterated as part of the discussion previously say aye. (ayes) Opposed? (nays) The amendment passes with Commissioners Holman, Sandas, Keller, and Garber in favor, Commissioner Lippert and Vice-Chair Tuma opposed, and Commissioner Fineberg absent.

So that brings us back to the primary motion. Are there other comments related to the primary motion from any of the Commissioners? I see none. So all those in favor of the primary motion made by Commissioner Keller as amended forwarding Staff’s recommendation for the EIR. Clare.

Ms. Clare Campbell, Senior Planner: I apologize for interrupting but I just wanted to clarify. Commissioner Keller you made your comments regarding the flooding and all of those things during the actual question segment of the meeting and I don’t know if that is relevant because I know you had reiterated that we should accept all of the comments or issues made during the comment time and that was not part of the actual comments.

Chair Garber: My understanding is that that is not part of the motion because only the things that were enumerated in the amendment are. Commissioner Holman.

Commissioner Holman: No need to comment further.

Chair Garber: Commissioner Keller.

Commissioner Keller: I am not sure whether it was comments or whatever but I think that the expectation, and I think Gloria agreed with this about checking with San Francisquito Creek JPA about making sure that was done I don’t think there is any controversy about that. So I am
assuming that that was one of the comments that was included in the motion even though it was
in the question session.

Chair Garber: Commissioner Tuma.

Vice-Chair Tuma: Prior to voting on the underlying motion because I am going to oppose the
underlying motion simply because of the amendment but I want to make it clear that I am
supportive of the underlying absent the amendment.

Chair Garber: Thank you. Any other Commissioners?

Ms. Caporgno: Just one thing. You need to also make a recommendation on the Negative
Declaration.

Chair Garber: We were forwarding the Staff’s recommendation in support of the EIR.
Commissioner Keller.

Commissioner Keller: The first clause was approving the Negative Declaration and the second
clause is adopting the Master Plan. I believe that is sufficient.

Chair Garber: Thank you for the clarification. Can we vote? No, Commissioner Lippert.

Commissioner Lippert: Thank you. I will vote in support of the motion. I have the same
concerns as Vice-Chair Tuma but I believe that all in all the report is a good recommendation
here.

MOTION PASSED (5-1-0-1, Vice-Chair Tuma opposed and Commissioner Fineberg absent)

Chair Garber: All those in favor of the motion say aye. (ayes) All those opposed? (nay) That
motion passes on a five to one vote with Commissioners Holman, Sandas, Keller, Garber, and
Lippert in favor, Vice-Chair Tuma opposed, and Commissioner Fineberg absent. Thank you.
Commissioner Lippert.

Commissioner Lippert: Is this an appropriate time for us to comment on policies and specific
parts of the plan that we think need further exploration?

Chair Garber: Let me ask Staff. I thought it was after.

Ms. Caporgno: I thought that that was part of this action. One of your comments is that very
thing something that would be subsequent if the Council wanted to incorporate a new policy
regarding discharge. So I would assume that everything that was going to be addressed if there
were any things that you wanted the Council to consider as far as changes would be incorporated
in that motion.

Commissioner Lippert: I asked several times if this is an appropriate time to comment on
specifics.
Chair Garber: Yes, you did and I thought it was going to be but I didn't think of it as being after the vote. Why don't you go ahead?

Commissioner Lippert: No, it's okay. What I will do is wait and I will try to get reappointed in about 25 years and comment then.

Chair Garber: Are there any issues with the Commissioner providing the comments in writing to Staff?

Commissioner Lippert: I think it will take me less time to just get them out than to write them down.

Chair Garber: Commissioner Keller.

Commissioner Keller: I would like to hear Commissioner Lippert's comments and I think just want to make the distinction between document comments and policy comments. Just to clarify I did not interpret Karen's amendment to the motion as including the policy comments such as the ones I made about the landfill, recycling center, and compost center. Those were policy comments, which were not incorporated into the motion just for clarification sake.

Chair Garber: Let's do this. I am going to allow your comments and we will just simply be out of order but please go ahead.

Commissioner Lippert: The first comment I want to make is regarding the recycling center relocation. I think that there is a great opportunity to relocate it to a different part of Palo Alto. I think Tom Jordan said it. Specifically I believe that if you look at the LATP site there is a small parcel or area I think it is four and a half acres that is actually designated to change from Public Park to Major Institutional Special Facilities. That actually might be an opportunity to locate the recycling down there. The recycling really happened in that area originally near the landfill because that is where all the garbage trucks came in. Now we are going to be closing the landfill it doesn't need to be tied to that site any longer even though we do have the waste treatment plant there. That is just one thought that I had.

The Bayshore bicycle access along Adobe Creek and Arastradero Creek are closed seasonally. The reason why Public Works closes it seasonally is because they use a cyclone fence and the cyclone fence actually acts as a sieve and it collects debris and then it clogs Adobe Creek. If there were some sort of low retaining wall or something that allowed for that debris to flow through that area those bike paths could remain open all year round and only when the creeks flood would they actually have to be gated and closed. The whole thing has to do with that twice a year Public Works has to install this fence, that is when they open it up, and then during the rainy season they have to remove the cyclone fence and that is when the gate closes. It doesn't have to be that way it could happen a little more naturally so to speak if there was some sort of fencing or guardrail that didn't collect all this debris.
The third point I would like to make is regarding the freshwater discharge from the waste
treatment plant. What happens with that is it is discharged into a little canal that runs through
Sandy Point I believe it is.

Ms. Humble: The unnamed sllew.

Commissioner Lippert: Yes, the unnamed sllew. It is a canal that runs through Sandy Point and
part of the problem there is that the top part of Sandy Point there when there is a high tide it
doesn’t allow for that discharge to make it out to the Bay. What happens is it overflows and runs
into the salt marsh making it more brackish. On the other side, on the airport side, of that canal
there is an athletic shoe parcel that is really restored area. It is not natural vegetation yet. One
possibility is by allowing that discharge to overflow into that athletic shoe size parcel that is
where the discharge could go just during those periods of high tide where we have that backing
up condition rather than running into the salt marsh and destroying the salt marsh. The only
reason I am suggesting this is that it is like two bad choices and this is probably the best of the
two bad choices.

Then my final comment is with regard to Bixby Park and the artwork or earthworks that are
there. As you know Andy Goldsworthy creates these wonderful earthwork art pieces and they
have a life to them. They are actually meant to self-destruct over a period of time but I don’t
think that was the intent when they built Bixby Park. These pieces of earth or artwork would
have deteriorated and then eventually they would just disappear. So I think it needs to be
examined as to whether the policy is that those pieces need to be maintained and preserved over
a period of time and begin to have the Arts Commission look at whether those pieces need to be
restored as part of the plan or whether in fact they have a life and they will eventually go away
and be replaced by other pieces of earth art. So those are really my main comments on how
policy might be looked at a little bit differently in the future.

Chair Garber: Thank you. Commissioner Keller.

Commissioner Keller: Briefly, I believe the Los Altos treatment plant, the portion of it that is
not going to become wetlands is earmarked for the animal shelter facility. The second thing is I
believe you mentioned Arastradero and I think you mean Matadero Creek.

Commissioner Lippert: You are correct it is Matadero.

Commissioner Keller: With respect to Matadero Creek that is currently not a bicycle
intercrossing and may hopefully become one someday but it isn’t currently. With respect to
Adobe Creek it is not clear whether Public Works would be interested in maintaining that access
and be responsible for it. I think that maybe an overpass might be worthwhile considering in that
thing. So those are quick comments.

Chair Garber: Commissioner Holman.

Commissioner Holman: Two quick comments. One has to do with our review this evening and
comments made and the other has to do with the tour. Having to do with comments made this
evening I guess I hadn’t realized and if I understood Emily Renzel’s comments correctly that the
Emily Renzel Wetlands are not dedicated parkland and it is a little bit hard to tell on the map, is
that correct?

Ms. Humble: Look at page 261 and you will see that the donut hole is not. The area that is
around it, the antenna field is not dedicated and the area around it is.

Commissioner Holman: D includes the wetlands is that what you are saying?

Ms. Humble: Yes. D is everything but the antenna field. It was an additional dedication. It
says it was called the John Fletcher Bixby Recreation Area Addition. It was basically the Emily
Renzel Wetlands excludes the radio station easement area. Emily said she was taking poetic
license when she …..

Chair Garber: I thought as I suspect Commissioner Holman did that she understood that the
portion that was called Emily Renzel Wetlands was not in fact dedicated but I am hearing that
that is in fact not the case and it is dedicated, is that correct?

Ms. Humble: Yes if you look at this you are seeing the D area, that dark area on the bottom near
101 that is the freshwater marsh. You see the white part in the middle that is the antenna field.

Chair Garber: Is that part of the Emily Renzel Wetlands area, the antenna field?

Ms. Humble: No. The donut is the Emily Renzel Wetlands and the donut hole is the antenna
field.

Chair Garber: Understood, which is dedicated? Everything except the donut hole is dedicated
parkland.

Ms. Humble: That’s right, yes.

Commissioner Holman: I guess I had misunderstood the comments then.

Chair Garber: So did I.

Ms. Humble: Emily showed the antenna field as being dedicated and she also showed the Faber-
Loumeister tracks as being dedicated. We can’t dedicate those they are not within our city
limits. So it is a looser rendition of what you are seeing here on page 261.

Chair Garber: Got it.

Commissioner Holman: Okay so with that misunderstanding that I had then perhaps because it
is a significant thing out there and it is on a sign going along the Bayshore maybe it would be
reasonable to try to identify the Emily Renzel Wetlands more specifically on the map to provide
better clarity but I won’t make a motion about this.
Ms. Humble: On the map on page 261?

Commissioner Holman: Yes. Perhaps. Julie?

Chair Garber: We are outside of our limits here I suspect.

Ms. Caporgno: As Gloria has pointed out there are some inaccuracies or inconsistencies between Emily’s map and our map. Now the Commission has recommended that this map be sent to Council. So we will now create some more questions because we have these differences. We can clarify on our map as Gloria pointed out the wetlands area but I think that Staff feels that this map that we have represents the park areas that are dedicated and this may be more confusing to include this with your comments to Council. I am just bringing that up but it is up to you.

Commissioner Holman: She did say that she had taken some liberties with this. So she did acknowledge that.

Chair Garber: Is there anything else because I know that if Don were here he would be all over us at the moment.

Commissioner Holman: It is true and since he is not and Commissioner Lippert was able to give comments I have just one other quick observation and probably it should come later but I am going to make it now anyway. During the tour Commissioner Sandas noted and we discovered that we thought there was another fire at the compost site but actually there wasn’t a fire it was just a whirl of the particulate matter that is generated by the compost pile. In looking at that particulate matter and the concentration of it I was noting how much of that goes up into the atmosphere and I will leave it at that.

Chair Garber: Mr. Keller.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. At the risk of digging deeper I just want to interpret the motion with respect to Emily Renzel’s map as encouraging Staff to meet with Emily Renzel and see if she agrees that page 261 adequately represents the intent of her copy of page 143. Maybe she doesn’t realize page 261 exists and that might be the best way to handle that problem.

Chair Garber: Okay. With that Commissioner Lippert.

Commissioner Lippert: First of all I would like to correct Commissioner Keller if he turns to page 229 it is Adobe Creek it is not Matadero Creek that I had spoken about. And then on page 199 the policy for the MSC and animal services calls for those being maintained where they are not down at the LATP.
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City Hall
250 Hamilton Ave

Commissioners Present: Deirdre Crommie, Joel Davidson, Pat Markevitch, Alex Panelli, Daria Walsh

Commissioners Absent: Carl King, Paul Losch

Others Present: Council Liaison Jack Morton

Staff Present: Greg Betts, Catherine Bourquin, Rob de Geus, Donald Piana

I. ROLL CALL CONDUCTED BY: Catherine Bourquin

II. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – None

III. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS: None

IV. BUSINESS:

1. Review of the Baylands Master Plan Update for Errors or Omissions –
   Staff Betts provided a brief introduction to the topic and informed the Commission that the Baylands Master Plan was being reviewed by both the Planning and Transportation Commission and the Parks and Recreation Commission. The Plan Update was reviewed on Wednesday, August 13 and the Planning and Transportation Commission recommended to Council the adoption of the Baylands Master Plan. Staff Betts then introduced Gloria Humble of the Planning Department who gave the Commission a short recap from the previous discussion with the Commission on this topic. The presentation was then followed by discussion and questions from the Commissioners.

The Commissioners were asked if they had any comments:
Council Liaison Morton – No comments
Commissioner Walsh – No comments
Commissioner Crommie – Commissioner Crommie found the documented to be a very thorough document and expressed her appreciation for what the Planning department had
put together. She found some typos which she would provide to Ms. Humble for correction to the document. Her main concerns were as follows and marked on her copy in pink highlighter:

- Was unsure of when the policies mentioned in the document were amended.
- Section on pedestrian and bike trails needs to be clearer with the words “pedestrian and bike”
- Section where it mentions bicycle bridges should include the location of the bridge.
- Trails mentioned in the document – Staff Betts informed Commissioner Crommie that the document is intended for policy makings and not an extensive trail guide.
- Policy 25 – How does someone reading this find out where this document is located for further reference? Possibly providing an appendix referencing where to find the supplementary documents. Cross reference some key documents, possibly adding a link if they are available on line.
- On page 228-229 take out “However, none of the Baylands projects were included in Table 6-3, “High Priority Projects”.

Commissioner Markevitch – Suggested the Palo Alto Airport working group had a comprehensive report that was available on-line. It would be useful to have a note in the document advising where to find this report for separate reference.

Commissioner Davidson – Commissioner Davidson acknowledged his appreciation for the document. He had one question on the term used as “passive” recreation

Commissioner Panelli – Commissioner Panelli expressed his acknowledgement of the document. He had a question on the ITT antenna field and whether their was an alternate site for their transmission use.

Commissioner Walsh – Commissioner Walsh brought up a past request on providing an appendix referencing what the goals were for recreation. Staff Betts questioned Ms. Humble on a side document she had created that could be included as reference. It was a documented that she had created that listed the recreation elements. It was agreed that Staff Betts would work off-line with Ms. Humble on including this document.

Oral Communications

Emily Renzel 1056 Forrest – Acknowledged the appreciation for the document. Ms. Renzel provided the Commission with some history pertinent to the update.

Enid Pearson – Thanked the Planning Department for the time put into the update of the Baylands Master Plan. She also encouraged the Commission to recommend to Council the acceptance of the Baylands Master Plan.

Libby Lucas – 174 Yerba Santa, Los Altos Ms. Lucas spoke on flood control on page 242. U.S. Fish and Wildlife mandated in 1978 that a tidal marsh was to exist and that the levels were to be kept at a specific level. She would like to see this included in this section and would provide staff with the supporting documents.
Staff Betts reminded the Commission on the next steps related to this business item. He stated that the Commission was to provide Planning and Transportation with any omissions and errors they found in the document and make a motion to recommend to Council the adoption of the Updated Baylands Master Plan.

Motion: Commissioner Panelli moved, seconded by Commissioner Crommie to recommend to Council the Adoption of the Updated Baylands Master Plan

After some discussion from Commissioner Crommie and Commissioner Walsh, they stated that they would like to see a policy included in the Baylands Master Plan that includes the use of recreation, the motion was tabled until next week’s August 26, 2008 regular meeting.

Motion: Commissioner Davidson moved, seconded by Commissioner Walsh to table business item 1: The Baylands Master Plan Update to next week’s August 26, 2008 meeting.
Motion Passed 5:0

2. Recommendation to Council on the Use of Byxbee Park Hills As A Site for Composting

Staff Betts advised the Commission on what their responsibility was to this item of business. The Commission is asked to first consider the basic question of whether composting of green waste is a compatible use of park land. Then recommend to City Council whether composting should continue at Byxbee Park. Staff Betts introduced Mr. Raschke from Public Works who was available to answer questions related to this item. The Commissioners asked questions of Mr. Raschke.

Commissioner Panelli – Commissioner Panelli asked questions related to the cost and the funding of the refuse/recycling/composting center. He also inquired on the trends of cost related to composting.

Commissioner Davidson – Commissioner Davidson requested staff to define what is meant by “passive park” land. Staff Betts responded by reading from the City’s Charter Article 8 section 1 and the Municipal code Title 22. Commissioner Davidson wanted to know the worst case scenario of global warming affects on the Baylands in terms of tide water rise. Mr. Raschke responded by informing the Commission that he believes the US Army Corp of Engineer will be providing a report in September of the sea rise in the coming years. Commissioner Davidson also had some questions related to the CMR from Public Works CMR:219:08.

Commissioner Markevitch - Asked what type of composting facility the San Francisco Presideo has Windrow or In Vessel? Staff Betts replied “Its windrow and it is done on asphalt in a parking lot.” Commissioner Markevitch also pointed out that according to the Baylands Master Plan the municipal code does not require a composting facility.
Commissioner Crommie – She had questions related to the percentage of green waste that we truck out of the City to either Gilroy or the SMaRT transfer station in Sunnyvale.

Commissioner Walsh – Asked if Mr. Raschke could talk about the recent fire that occurred at the refuse. She also enquired on the possibility of a different location within the park for a composting site.

Council Liaison Morton – This issue came about from the City’s Zero waste plan to continuing composting as the city has historically done.

**Oral Communications**

Bryan Long, 1413 Dana Ave PA – Strongly supports continuing composting in its current location. He feels that composting is a conservational use of park land.

Enid Pearson – Industrial composting site does not belong in our park land. She informed the Commission that the recent fire was a wake-up call that the composting site does not belong in the current location.

Sylvia Dolce, 2081 Cornell PA – She supports continuing composting in Palo Alto. She also mentioned that on August 8 a poll was conducted through the Palo Alto Weekly and 80% responded that they support continued composting in Palo Alto.

Cedric de La Beaujardivire, 741 Josina Ave PA – He supports continuing composting in Palo Alto. He doesn’t feel that there is any payback in any of the situations mentioned.

Susan Stansbury, 741 Josina Ave PA – Runs a non-profit called Conexios in Palo Alto. She supports keeping the composting facility at the current location. She feels that running a compost facility at this site has higher ecological importance.

Hilary Gans, 3529 Ramona Street – Spoke on the economics of composting. He believes that it could run more effectively and would cost the city much more if they try to relocate.

Jeb Eddy, 2579 Cowper Street – Mr. Eddy commented on pricing and policy and how it relates to composting. His recommendation to the Commission is to keep the facility in its current location. His wife and him are proud of the recycling and composting that the city offers.

Emily Renzel, 1056 Forest Avenue PA – Urge the Council to discontinue use of composting on dedicated park land.

Herb Brock, PO Box 632 PA – Believes that this issue should be reviewed by the environmental review board. He recommends to the Commission to get more information before making their decision.
Libby Lucas, 174 Yerba Santa Ave Los Altos - She wanted to reiterate what she had said before regarding the wetlands not being honored from the mandated mitigation that happened in 1978. She also feels that there are more sophisticated options to windrow composting that should be considered.

Chair Markevitch suggested given the lateness of the meeting if the Commission would consider continuing the discussion of this agenda item until the next meeting. Staff Betts suggested to the Commission if they had any questions they still needed answers to that they should forward them to him and he would pass them on to Mr. Raschke.

Motion: Commissioner Crommie moved, seconded by Commissioner Panilli to table the agenda item until next weeks August 26, 2008 regular meeting.
Passed 4:1

V. ADJOURNMENT
Adjourned at 9:55 pm
MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
August 26, 2008
City Hall
250 Hamilton Ave

Commissioners Present: Deirdre Crommie, Joel Davidson, Carl King, Paul Losch, Pat Markevitch, Alex Panelli, Daria Walsh

Commissioners Absent:

Others Present:

Staff Present: Greg Betts, Catherine Bourquin, Rob de Geus, Donald Piana, Daren Anderson, Shia Geminder

I. ROLL CALL CONDUCTED BY: Catherine Bourquin

II. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS – None

III. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS: Staff Betts reminded the Commissioners that they had a full agenda and to be mindful of the time when discussing any of the issues.

IV. BUSINESS:

1. Approval of Draft Minutes of July 22, 2008 regular meeting – The Draft Minutes of July 22, 2008 were approved with one correction. Approved 6:1absentioon (King)

2. Review Draft City of Palo Alto and PAUSD Field Use Policy – Staff de Geus introduced Shia Geminder, Recreation Supervisor. Staff Geminder briefly described how the policy came about. The City of Palo Alto currently does not have a Field Use Policy. He informed the Commissioners that the draft of the policy is currently being reviewed by the City Attorney’s office for legal issues. The Draft policy was made available to the general public through the City’s web site for public comment. The timeline for getting this draft policy completed is November 2008 in order to be implemented for spring brokering. There were two reoccurring issues that reviewers identified, both related to eligibility requirements in section 5. The Commission is being asked for assistance with helping clarify the eligibility requirements.
The Commissioners were given the opportunity to ask questions and provide comments on the Draft Field Use Policy.

Oral Communications
Brigitte Turnemure, 845 Garland Drive PA – Up until 3 years ago it was very pleasant living on Garland Drive. The City hasn’t limited the availability and hours for Jordan field use.

Faith Braff, Garland Drive PA – Doesn’t feel the policy will improve the noise conditions at Jordan. The policy doesn’t restrict the users group or amount of play.

Manu Kumar, Garland Drive PA – Concerned more with how much play is being done at Jordan. The current policy doesn’t help the issue at Jordan.

Ian Bimpson, 1744 Crane Ave Mt. View – Feels that brokering is unfair to competitive adult soccer. With the new policy their club (Harmonie Soccer Club) has lost all of their practice time

Bob McCormick, 502 Los Gatos Way, San Mateo - Harmonie Soccer Club, spoke on Community and that their soccer club has been in Palo Alto for 45 years. Would like the tradition of staying in Palo Alto to continue but is worried with the policy that is being implemented will end the tradition.

Bert Baldaccini, 511 De Anza Ave – Coach of Harmonie Soccer Club, feels that they are being threatened by all the recreational teams in Palo Alto.

Bruce Mc Leod, 1404 Bryant St, PA – Member of the Grasshopper Soccer Club, feels that this policy will restrict the smaller less dominant teams.

Paul Skokowski, 1319 Tasso PA – Spoke on the use of Hoover field for Little League games. Spoke on the residency requirements.

Chair Markevitch opened up the floor to questions from the Commission to conclude this agenda item which will be coming back to the Commission in September.

Staff de Geus affirmed that they had made special provisions categorizing Jordan as a level “4” field, which will limit the usage time on that field.

3. Continued from August 19, 2008 Special Meeting – Review of the Baylands Master Plan Update for or Errors or Omissions –
Staff Betts reminded the Public and Commission that this item was closed for Oral Communications at the August 19, 2008 special meeting. Staff Betts also instructed the Commission that this item required a motion from the Commissioners, either to one recommend the adoption to Council as presented with any corrections or you may take vote to take no action at all. Gloria Humble of the Planning Department was available for questions but would not be making another presentation on the topic tonight.

Chair Markevitch asked the Commissioners if they had any comments or questions on the topic and started with Commissioner Losch.

Losch – Was appreciative of the work that went into the plan and had no further comments.
Crommie – Provided her edits and suggestions and gave them to Gloria Humble in written handout. The edits were discussed and accepted for inclusion in the Baylands Master Plan Update.
Alex – Had no further comments.
Walsh – Agreed with Commissioner Crommie’s edits.
King – Had no further comments.
Davidson – Had no further comments.

Chair Markevitch closed the discussion and a motion was made by Walsh.

Motion: Motion made by Commissioner Walsh and seconded by Commissioner King to approve the Baylands Master Plan as updated with the inclusion of any edits and omissions.
Passed: 7:0

Staff Betts requested a representative from the Commission to go to the Council meeting when this item goes to Council. It was agreed that Commissioner Crommie would act on behalf of the Parks and Recreation Commission.

4. Continued from August 19, 2008 meeting – Recommendation to Council on the Use of Byxbee Park Hills as a site for composting operations-
Chair Markevitch reminded the Public and Commission that a recommendation is requested of the Commission and that this was continued from the Special Meeting on August 19, 2008 and that Oral Communications was closed at that time.

Staff Betts informed the Commission that Matt Raschke from Public Works was here to follow up with any answers to questions the Commission might have. Staff Betts continued by informing the Commission that they had two considerations to make.

1. Is composting compatible with park use? And
2. Will the Commission recommend to Council the continuation of composting on park land or not? They could also suggest to Council that they would like them to direct Public Works to investigate the possibility of other locations beyond the four sites considered.

Chair Markevitch asked the Commissioners for any comments or questions on this issue. After a brief question and answer session the Commissioners agreed to make a motion on this item.

**Motion:** Motion by Commissioner King, seconded by Commissioner Davidson: We (Park and Recreation Commission) believe that large-scale composting is incompatible with park land use.
Passed 7:0

**Motion:** Motion by Commissioner Panelli, seconded by Commissioner King: We (Park and Recreation Commission) recommend that the City Council direct staff to continue evaluation of alternative non-parkland sites, including those three sites within the staff report, as well as studying alternative technologies to windrow composting.
Passed: 6:1 (Commissioner Losch voting no)

The item should be going before Council in September. It was agreed that Commissioner Crommie would attend to represent the Parks and Recreation Commission.

5. **Recommendation from Commission to Council on the Adoption of an Ordinance to Prohibit the Consumption of alcoholic Beverages in Heritage and Eleanor Parks.**

Staff Anderson, Senior Ranger, was introduced and presented the Commission with a brief background on the use of alcohol in city parks. The Commission was being requested to recommend the adoption of an ordinance to prohibit the consumption of alcoholic beverages in Heritage and Eleanor Parks.

**Motion:** Motion made by Commissioner King, seconded by Commissioner Panelli to approve the recommendation to adopt an ordinance to prohibit the consumption of alcoholic beverages in Heritage and Eleanor Parks.
Passed: 7:0

The Commission had a brief discussion on the use of alcohol in city parks. The ordinance will state that alcoholic beverages used at these parks be by permit use only.

**V. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**
1. Chair Markevitch announced to the Commission that she went to the VTA meeting and pleaded the case of considering a pedestrian overpass at the San Antonio location when they are increasing the lanes on 101.

2. Staff Betts went over the California Parks and Recreation Conference flyer that was provided to the Commission that evening. The conference is being held in March, 2009 and the Commission has the opportunity to have a maximum of two Commissioners attend. Commissioner Davidson expressed his interest in attending.

3. Commissioner Davidson announced that Michael Clossen the Executive Director of Acterra, is doing well after a recent accident in France.

4. Commissioner Panelli commended Chair Markevitch on the running of tonight’s meeting.

5. Commissioner Crommie inquired on training for instruction on speaking with the Media on issues related to the Parks and Recreation Commission. Staff would assist the Commission with guidance in this area.

VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR SEPTEMBER REGULAR MEETING: September 23, 2008

1. Approval of the minutes of the August 26, 2008, regular commission meeting.

2. Approval of the minutes of the special meeting of August 19, 2008.

3. Review of Banning Smoking in City Parks and Facilities

4. Review and Action on the Draft City of Palo Alto and PAUSD Field Use Policy

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 pm in honor of the Palo Alto 14 Babe Ruth team.
Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration

A notice, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code 21,000, et seq.) that the following project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Number</th>
<th>TAZ</th>
<th>APN(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>July 22, 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Name**
Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update

**Project Type (Use)**
Update of a Master Plan

**Owner**
City of Palo Alto

**Applicant**
City of Palo Alto, Planning Division

**Project Location**
The Palo Alto Baylands Master Plan applies to all properties on the easterly side of Highway 101, bounded by the City limits, with the exception of (1) including the Faber Laumeister Tract to the north, owned by the City of Palo Alto but located in East Palo Alto (2) and excluding the developed parcels at the most southerly portion of the boundary.

**Project Description**
Current Updated Edition of the Baylands Master Plan
The 2008 Baylands Master Plan is an up-to-date record of Council approved policies and actions for the Baylands, including activity between 1988 and 2007. The 2008 edition of the Plan reflects policy implementation and Council approved changes through 2007. The review identified information that warranted modification to the existing policy text, and that text was amended in three ways:

1. Strike-outs from the 1988 update were removed; that information is now recorded in the “historical information” section for each relevant chapter of the plan.
2. Adopted & Significant Recommendations were merged and called Policies.
3. Policy text was amended to reflect progress and Council-approved changes between 1988 and 2007.

**Purpose of Notice**
The purpose of this notice is to inform you that the City of Palo Alto Planning Staff has recommended that a Negative Declaration be approved for this project. City Planning Staff has reviewed the Initial Study for the project, and based upon substantial evidence in the record, finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, changes or alterations have been incorporated into the project to avoid or reduce impacts to a point where clearly no significant effects will occur. It should be noted that the approval of a Negative Declaration does not constitute approval of the project under consideration. The decision to approve or deny the project will be made separately.

**Public Review Period:**

| Begins: July 23, 2008 | Ends: August 11, 2008 |

Public Comments regarding the correctness, completeness, or adequacy of this negative declaration are invited and must be received on or before the end of the public review period. Such comments should be based on specific environmental concerns. Written comments should be addressed to the City of Palo Alto, Planning Department, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94303. A file containing additional information on this project may be reviewed at the Planning Department under the file number appearing at the top of this form. For additional information regarding this project and the Negative Declaration, please contact Clare Campbell at 650-617-3191.
The Negative Declaration and Initial Study may be viewed at the following locations:

(1) Planning Department, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94303
(2) Development Center, 285 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94303

Responsible Agencies sent a copy of this document:
Not Applicable.

Mitigation Measures included in the project to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level:
Not Applicable.

A reporting or monitoring program must be adopted for measures to mitigate significant impacts at the time the Mitigated Negative Declaration is approved, in accord with the requirements of section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepared by:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Approved by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clare Campbell, Planner</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Curtis Williams, Assistant Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The page is signed by Clare Campbell, Planner, and Curtis Williams, Assistant Director.
I. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Date: July 22, 2008

Project Name: Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update

Project Location: The Palo Alto Baylands Master Plan applies to all properties on the easterly side of Highway 101, bounded by the City limits, with the exception of (1) including the Faber Laumeister Tract to the north, owned by the City of Palo Alto but located in East Palo Alto (2) and excluding the developed parcels at the most southerly portion of the boundary.

Applicant: City of Palo Alto
Department of Planning and Community Environment
Gloria Humble, Senior Planner

Owner: City of Palo Alto
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Project Location and Description:

Project Location

The Palo Alto Baylands Master Plan applies to all properties on the easterly side of Highway 101, bounded by the City limits, with the exception of (1) including the Faber Laumeister Tract to the north, owned by the City of Palo Alto but located in East Palo Alto (2) and excluding the developed parcels at the most southerly portion of the boundary.

Project Description

Background
In 1978, the City adopted the Baylands Master Plan as a long-range holistic plan for the future development for the entire Baylands area in Palo Alto. The overall goal was to preserve and enhance the unique irreplaceable natural resources while providing a framework and guide for future actions in the area.

The 1978 adoption of the plan also included the approval of numerous recommendations from the Planning Commission. In the effort to consolidate the approved recommendations from the Plan and the Planning Commission, a summary document was published, the Baylands Master Plan Summary Report (1979).
By 1987, major changes had occurred that affected the Baylands Master Plan policies. The City published the *Amended Summary Report* (1988) to reflect to these changes. This publication maintained the 1979 base document (*Baylands Master Plan Summary Report*) and utilized strike-outs and italics throughout the text to reflect Council approved actions and changes to the policies between 1979 and 1988.

**Current Updated Edition of the Baylands Master Plan**

The 2008 Baylands Master Plan is an up-to-date record of Council approved policies and actions for the Baylands, including activity between 1988 and 2007. The 2008 edition of the Plan reflects policy implementation and Council approved changes through 2007. The review identified information that warranted modification to the existing policy text, and that text was amended in three ways:

1. Strike-outs from the 1988 update were removed; that information is now recorded in the "historical information" section for each relevant chapter of the plan.
2. Adopted & Significant Recommendations were merged and called Policies.
3. Policy text was amended to reflect progress and Council-approved changes between 1988 and 2007.

**II. DETERMINATION**

In accordance with the City of Palo Alto’s procedures for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the proposed project located on San Antonio Road and frontage roads from Alma Street to U.S. Highway 101 Interchange could have a significant effect on the environment. On the basis of that study, the City makes the following determination:

- **X** The proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** is hereby adopted.

Although the project, as proposed, could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect on the environment in this case because mitigation measures for traffic impacts have been added to the project and, therefore, a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** is hereby adopted.

The attached initial study incorporates all relevant information regarding the potential environmental effects of the project and confirms the determination that an EIR is not required for the project.

*Signature*

**Date**

Adopted by City Council, Attested by **Date**

Director of Planning and Community Environment
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. PROJECT TITLE

Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update

2. LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS

City of Palo Alto
Department of Planning and Community Environment
250 Hamilton Ave.
Palo Alto, CA 94303

3. CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER

Clare Campbell
City of Palo Alto
650-617-3191

4. PROJECT SPONSOR

City of Palo Alto
Department of Planning and Community Environment
Gloria Humble, Senior Planner

5. PROJECT LOCATION

The Palo Alto Baylands Master Plan applies to all properties on the easterly side of Highway 101, bounded by the City limits, with the exception of (1) including the Faber Laumeister Tract to the north, owned by the City of Palo Alto but located in East Palo Alto (2) and excluding the developed parcels at the most southerly portion of the boundary, see Figure 3.
Figure 1: Vicinity Map

Figure 2: Location Map
6. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:

There are seven Comprehensive Plan land use designations in the Baylands. The two land use designations that comprise the largest area of the Baylands are Publicly Owned Conservation Land and Public Park. The land use designations, as described in the Palo Alto 1998 – 2010 Comprehensive Plan, are the following:

Publicly Owned Conservation Land: Open lands whose primary purpose is the preservation and enhancement of the natural state of the land and its plants and animals. Only compatible resource management, recreation, and educational activities are allowed.

Public Park: Open lands whose primary purpose is active recreation and whose character is essentially urban. These areas have been planted with non-indigenous landscaping and require a concerted effort to maintain recreational facilities and landscaping.

Major Institution/Special Facilities: Institutional, academic, governmental, and community service uses and lands that are either publicly owned or operated as non-profit organizations. Examples are hospitals and City facilities.
**Open Space/Controlled Development**: Land having all the characteristics of open space but upon which some development may be allowed. Open space amenities must be retained in these areas. Residential densities range from 0.1 to 1 dwelling unit per acre but may rise to a maximum of 2 units per acre where second units are allowed, and population densities range from 1 to 4 persons per acre. This designation is found on the Former ITT Property.

**Research/Office Park**: Office, research, and manufacturing establishments whose operations are buffered from adjacent residential uses. Other uses that may be included are educational institutions and child care facilities. Compatible commercial service uses such as banks and restaurants, and residential or mixed uses that would benefit from the proximity to employment centers, will also be allowed. Additional uses, including retail services, restaurants, commercial recreation, churches, and private clubs may also be located in Research/Office Park areas, but only if they are found to be compatible with the surrounding area through the conditional use permit process. Maximum allowable floor area ratio ranges from 0.3 to 0.5, depending on site conditions. This designation is found primarily along the developed corridor of Embarcadero Road.

**Light Industrial**: Wholesale and storage warehouses and the manufacturing, processing, repairing, and packaging of goods. Emission of fumes, noise, smoke, or other pollutants is strictly controlled. Compatible residential and mixed use projects may also be located in this category. Floor area ratio will range up to 0.5. This designation is found on West Bayshore near the northern City limits.

**Service Commercial**: Facilities providing citywide and regional services and relying on customers arriving by car. Typical uses include auto services and dealerships, motels, lumberyards, appliance stores, and restaurants, including fast service types. In almost all cases, these uses require good automobile and service access so that customers can safely load and unload without impeding traffic. In some locations, residential and mixed use projects may be appropriate in this land use category. Non-residential floor area ratios will range up to 0.4. This designation is found along the developed corridor of Embarcadero Road.

### 7. ZONING

The Baylands is comprised of four zone districts. The Public Facility (PF) with the Site and Design Overlay (D) district covers the majority of the area. Much of the Baylands is subject to Site and Design Review due to its sensitive habitat and location. The Site and Design Review combining district (D) is intended to provide a process for review and approval of development in environmentally and ecologically sensitive areas, including established community areas which may be sensitive to negative aesthetic factors, excessive noise, increased traffic or other disruptions, in order to assure that use and development will be harmonious with other uses in the general vicinity, will be compatible with environmental and ecological objectives, and will be in accord with the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan.

The zoning districts in the Baylands are split up generally by two categories, developed areas and undeveloped areas. The undeveloped area is zoned Public Facility with the Site and Design Overlay PF(D) and is designed to accommodate governmental, public utility, educational, and community service or recreational facilities, with the added review process. The more substantial developments in this zone are the Regional Water Quality Control Plant, Municipal Services Center, and Animal Services Center.

The developed areas are comprised of several zone districts, the largest of which is the ROLM(E)(D)(AD) district. The zone districts are explained as follows:
ROLM(E)(D)(AD)
- The research, office and limited manufacturing subdistrict [ROLM(E)] modifies the site development regulations of the ROLM research, office and limited manufacturing district to apply to smaller sites in areas with limited access or with environmental sensitivity due to their proximity to the Palo Alto Baylands in the Embarcadero Road area.
- Site and Design Review (D) is required.
- The automobile dealership (AD) combining district is intended to modify districts to create and maintain areas accommodating automobile dealerships primarily engaged in new and used automobile sales and service on a citywide and regional basis. Such uses generally require special parking, access, and outdoor display provisions for customer convenience, servicing of vehicles or equipment, loading or unloading, or parking of commercial service vehicles.

Most of the parcels with this designation are research and office buildings. Currently there is one automobile dealer on Embarcadero Road.

PC
The planned community PC district is intended to accommodate developments for residential, commercial, professional, research, administrative, industrial, or other activities, including combinations of uses appropriately requiring flexibility under controlled conditions not otherwise attainable under other districts. The planned community district is particularly intended for unified, comprehensively planned developments which are of substantial public benefit, and which conform with and enhance the policies and programs of the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan.

The parcels with the PC zoning in the Baylands are comprised primarily of office type uses and one larger scale eating and drinking establishment.

GM
The general manufacturing GM district provides for light manufacturing, research, and commercial service uses. Office uses are very limited in order to maintain the district as a desirable location for manufacturing uses. The GM district is intended for application to land designated for light industrial use in the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan.

8. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Background
In 1978, the City adopted the Baylands Master Plan as a long-range holistic plan for the future development for the entire Baylands area in Palo Alto. The overall goal was to preserve and enhance the unique irreplaceable natural resources while providing a framework and guide for future actions in the area.

The 1978 adoption of the plan also included the approval of numerous recommendations from the Planning Commission. In the effort to consolidate the approved recommendations from the Plan and the Planning Commission, a summary document was published, the Baylands Master Plan Summary Report (1979).

By 1987, major changes had occurred that affected the Baylands Master Plan policies. The City published the Amended Summary Report (1988) to reflect to these changes. This publication maintained the 1979 base document (Baylands Master Plan Summary Report) and utilized strike-outs and italics throughout the text to reflect Council approved actions and changes to the policies between 1979 and 1988.
Current Updated Edition of the Baylands Master Plan
The 2008 Baylands Master Plan is an up-to-date record of Council approved policies and actions for the Baylands, including activity between 1988 and 2007. The 2008 edition of the Plan reflects policy implementation and Council approved changes through 2007. The review identified information that warranted modification to the existing policy text, and that text was amended in three ways:

1. Strike-outs from the 1988 update were removed; that information is now recorded in the “historical information” section for each relevant chapter of the plan.
2. Adopted & Significant Recommendations were merged and called Policies.
3. Policy text was amended to reflect progress and Council-approved changes between 1988 and 2007.

9. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING
The Palo Alto Baylands comprises all lands on the east side of Highway 101 and extends to the edge of the San Francisco Bay. It is generally bounded on the north by San Francisquito Creek and the Charleston Slough to the south. To the north is a single family residential neighborhood located in the City of East Palo Alto. On the south end of the Baylands is a commercial pocket with office uses and the abandoned Los Altos Wastewater Treatment Plant; further towards the bay is the jurisdiction of the City of Mountain View.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. [A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).]

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) “(Mitigated) Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, “Earlier Analysis,” may be cross-referenced).
5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (C)(3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

**DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS**

The following Environmental Checklist was used to identify environmental impacts, which could occur if the proposed project is implemented. The left-hand column in the checklist lists the source(s) for the answer to each question. The sources cited are identified at the end of the checklist. Discussions of the basis for each answer and a discussion of mitigation measures that are proposed to reduce potential significant impacts are included.

**A. AESTHETICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 6, 10, 13, 14, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on a public view or view corridor?</td>
<td>1, 2-Map L4, 6, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>1, 2-Map L4, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Violate existing Comprehensive Plan policies regarding visual resources?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6, 10, 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>1, 6, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Substantially shadow public open space</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The implementation of the Baylands Master Plan has resulted in significant aesthetic improvements in the Baylands. Examples of these aesthetic improvements are the elimination of the unsightly above ground utility and light poles (partially completed in 2005) and the restoration of the Emily Renzel Marsh, Harbor Point, and the harbor itself. The conversion of the landfill into a rolling pastoral park is one of the major changes for the future of the Baylands that will be a significant aesthetic improvement to the Baylands.

DISCUSSION:
The Palo Alto Baylands is recognized for its sensitive habitat and scenic beauty. The overall goal of the Baylands Master Plan (BMP) is to preserve and enhance the unique and irreplaceable natural resources while providing a framework and guide for future development in the area. The 2008 update does not make any modifications to the existing BMP policies that address the aesthetic qualities of the Baylands. The existing policies are consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

In the BMP, a major design concept for the landfill park is the introduction of a high place in an otherwise horizontal landscape that will provide panoramic views of the surrounding marshes and beyond to the hills ringing the south Bay. The BMP also includes several recommendations to enhance the park quality of Embarcadero Road as the entrance to the Baylands and to create a gateway experience for visitors to the park. This is consistent with Comprehensive Plan identification of Embarcadero Road as a scenic route and as a gateway to the Baylands at East Bayshore Road. The Comprehensive Plan recognizes the importance of dramatic views from the Baylands, and acknowledges the importance of visual connections in defining the character of the community. Map L-4 showing Community Design Features identifies major view corridors in all directions from within the Baylands.

The BMP includes specific proposals for park improvements such as landscape screening in strategic locations, park quality signs, the under grounding of telephone and electric lines, and reduction of glare from night lighting. There are no Comprehensive Plan programs that specifically address park improvements in the Baylands; it includes a general policy to maintain and enhance existing park facilities.

In 2005, the Site Assessment and Design Guidelines, Palo Alto Baylands Nature Preserve was developed to assist with the implementation of the BMP and Baylands-related policies and programs in the Comprehensive Plan. The guidelines are intended for use when designing or reviewing projects located in any part of the Baylands. While the more specific guidelines are primarily applicable to the dedicated parkland, the design principles and concepts are also applied in the service and commercial areas when designing or reviewing projects for compatibility with the special aesthetic qualities and environmental conditions unique to the Baylands. In addition to the use of the guidelines, all projects located in the Baylands that have the (D) zoning overlay are required to go through a more extensive review process called Site and Design Review.

The Baylands area is currently used for open space, recreation, and limited commercial uses along the Embarcadero Road corridor; these existing uses are not intensive and are relatively unobtrusive. It should be noted, however, that these uses could be intensified based on the limitations of the individual land uses and zoning designations of each property. The policies in the Baylands Master Plan would support minimal aesthetic impacts from any development and/or intensification. Implementation of the Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update will not create any new aesthetic impacts. The plan outlines preservation and enhancement goals and policies that
address the aesthetic qualities of proposed projects. All individual proposed projects in the Baylands are subject to CEQA and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for potential impacts.

Mitigation Measures: None Required

B. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES
In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources Would the project:</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>1, 2-MapL9, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>1, 2-MapL9, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION:
The Baylands is not located in a "Prime Farmland", "Unique Farmland", or "Farmland of Statewide Importance" area, as shown on the maps prepared for the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The site is not zoned for agricultural use, and is not regulated by the Williamson Act.

Mitigation Measures: None Required

C. AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources Would the project:</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct with implementation of the applicable air quality plan (1982 Bay Area Air Quality Plan &amp; 2000 Clean Air Plan)?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation indicated by the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Direct and/or indirect operational emissions that exceed the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) criteria air pollutants of 80 pounds per day</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Issues</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or 15 tons per year for nitrogen oxides (NO), reactive organic gases (ROG), and fine particulate matter of less than 10 microns in diameter (PM_{10});</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Contribute to carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations exceeding the State Ambient Air Quality Standard of nine parts per million (ppm) averaged over eight hours or 20 ppm for one hour (as demonstrated by CALINE4 modeling, which would be performed when a) project CO emissions exceed 550 pounds per day or 100 tons per year; or b) project traffic would impact intersections or roadway links operating at Level of Service (LOS) D, E or F; or c) project would increase traffic volumes on nearby roadways by 10% or more)?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Probability of contracting cancer for the Maximally Exposed Individual (MEI) exceeds 10 in one million</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Ground-level concentrations of non-carcinogenic TACs would result in a hazard index greater than one (1) for the MEI</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Not implement all applicable construction emission control measures recommended in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Baylands Master Plan advocates the reduction of automobile usage in the Baylands, the expansion of the bicycle and pedestrian access, and improved access to public transit. These policies contribute to better overall air quality for the Baylands.

**DISCUSSION:**
The Baylands is located within the jurisdiction of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), the regional agency empowered to regulate air pollutant emissions from stationary sources in the Bay Area. The
BAAQMD regulates air quality through its permit authority over most types of stationary emission sources and through its planning and review process. All development in the Palo Alto is subject to the BAAQMD regulations. The overall direction of the Plan is to preserve the natural setting and limit urban uses. The Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update will not create any new air quality impacts. All individual proposed projects in the Baylands are subject to CEQA and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for potential impacts.

Mitigation Measures: None Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, including federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or as defined by the City of Palo Alto’s Tree Preservation Ordinance (Municipal Code Section 8.10)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The implementation of the Baylands Master Plan has made significant improvements to the wildlife habitat. The restoration of the marsh areas has created new and improved habitat for protected plants and animals.

DISCUSSION:
The Baylands contains several sensitive biological resources, including federally and state protected wetlands, state and federal Endangered Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse (SMHM), nesting habitat for birds including a heronry
near the duck pond, and state and federal Endangered California clapper rail. The clapper rail and SMHM are also state Fully-protected. There are also several special status wildlife and rare plants that occur in the Baylands. The Baylands is not in an area covered by a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

The Comprehensive Plan goals and policies in the Natural Environment element recognize the significance of the Baylands as a high value ecosystem and provides for the preservation and protection of the natural areas, and the conservation and preservation of the Baylands as open space. The Baylands Master Plan includes more specific recommendations, such as the conversion of the landfill to a habitat rich pastoral park, which would help to implement the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies for conservation and restoration.

The Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update will not create any new biological impacts. All individual proposed projects in the Baylands are subject to CEQA and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for potential impacts.

**Mitigation Measures: None Required**

### E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Directly or indirectly destroy a local cultural resource that is recognized by City Council resolution?</td>
<td>1, 6, 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?</td>
<td>1, 2-MapL8, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>1, 2-MapL8, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>1, 2-MapL8, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Adversely affect a historic resource listed or eligible for listing on the National and/or California Register, or listed on the City’s Historic Inventory?</td>
<td>1, 2-MapL7, 6, 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1978 Baylands Master Plan called for the removal of the all structures associated with the yacht harbor use, including the Sea Scout Base. As time passed, there was recognition from the community of the value of the historic nature of the Sea Scout Base. The City confirmed the importance of this structure when it was added to the City’s historic Inventory in 2002. The Harbor Master’s House has been recognized since the late 1960’s as a point of local historic interest. The Plan recognizes historic importance of these building and supports their preservation.
DISCUSSION:
There are two structures within the Baylands that the City has recognized as historic, the Harbor Master's House (now used as the Baylands Ranger Station) and the Sea Scout Base. These two structures are listed on the City's Historic Inventory List as a Category 2 and 1 resource respectively. In order to preserve and enhance the City's historic inventory, all exterior improvements to these resources require review and approval, as outlined in the City's Historic Preservation code, PAMC 16.49.

As a Category 1 resource, the Sea Scout Base is an "exceptional building," which means any building or group of buildings of preeminent national or state importance, meritorious work of the best architects or an outstanding example of the stylistic development of architecture in the United States. An exceptional building has had either no exterior modifications or such minor ones that the overall appearance of the building is in its original character.

As a Category 2 resource, the Harbor Master's House, is a "major building," which means any building or group of buildings of major regional importance, meritorious works of the best architects or an outstanding example of an architectural style or the stylistic development of architecture in the state or region. A major building may have some exterior modifications, but the original character is retained.

The 2008 update describes their historic status and summarizes past and current preservation efforts. The Baylands Master Plan supports the retention and rehabilitation of these resources.

There are no known archaeological or human remains located in this area. For any future projects, if during grading and construction activities, any archaeological or human remains are encountered, construction shall cease and a qualified archaeologist shall visit the site to address the find. The Santa Clara County Medical Examiner's office shall be notified to provide proper direction on how to proceed. If any Native American resources are encountered during construction, construction shall cease immediately until a Native American descendant, appointed by the Native American Heritage Commission of the State of California, is able to evaluate the site and make further recommendations and be involved in mitigation planning.

The Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update will not create any cultural impacts to the area that the plan covers. All individual proposed projects in the Baylands are subject to CEQA and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for potential impacts.

Mitigation Measures: None Required

---

### F. GEOLOGY, SOILS AND SEISMICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known</td>
<td>6, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-MaN10, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-MaN5, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td>Landslides?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-MaN5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Result in substantial siltation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-MaN5, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-MaN5, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Expose people or property to major geologic hazards that cannot be mitigated through the use of standard engineering design and seismic safety techniques?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 4, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

The Baylands is in an area that would experience very strong to violent shaking in the event of a major earthquake along the San Andreas or Hayward fault. Any development in the area would not expose people or property to major geologic hazards that cannot be mitigated through the use of standard engineering design and seismic safety techniques. With proper engineering, new development is not expected to result in any significant adverse short- or long-term impacts related to geology, soils or seismicity.

The Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update will not create any new geology, soils and seismicity impacts. All individual proposed projects in the Baylands are subject to CEQA and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for potential impacts.

**Mitigation Measures: None Required**
### G. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Note: Some of the thresholds can also be dealt with under a topic heading of **Public Health and Safety** if the primary issues are related to a subject other than hazardous material use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routing transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Construct a school on a property that is subject to hazards from hazardous materials contamination, emissions or accidental release?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>1, 2-MapN9, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>1, 6, 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working the project area?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>1, 2-MapN7, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>1, 2-MapN7, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment from existing hazardous materials contamination by exposing future occupants or users of the site to contamination in excess of soil and ground water cleanup goals developed for the site?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Baylands Master Plan supports the Airport Land Use Commission which has specific regulations outlining the appropriate uses and development within the Airport Influence Area of the Palo Alto Airport.

DISCUSSION:
The 2008 Plan update does not create new hazardous conditions. Projects proposed in the Baylands, however, are potentially exposed to an existing hazard, the Palo Alto Airport. The Comprehensive Plan states that the airport is a much needed business and recreational facility and calls for support of its continued vitality and effectiveness but reaffirms the airport policies that were adopted in the Baylands Master Plan i.e., limiting the airport to a single runway, not more than two fixed base operators, and allowing only improvements that do not significantly increase its intensity or intrude into open space. The proximity to the airport is a potential hazard for all development and uses in the Baylands.

The entire Baylands, except for the LATP site, is within the Airport Influence Area (AIA) of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) adopted by the County’s Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). All land use and development must be consistent with CLUP guidelines. The purpose of the CLUP is to provide limits on land uses allowed in the vicinity of airports in order to protect public and passenger safety. A further function of the CLUP is to control noise exposure by limiting types of development within the AIA. It contains guidelines for appropriate land use and development in the airport’s environs.

The Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update will not create any new hazards and hazardous materials impacts to the area that the plan covers. All individual proposed projects in the Baylands are subject to CEQA (and the CLUP) and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for potential impacts.

Mitigation Measures: None Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Baylands Master Plan identifies several sites as future restoration areas: Mayfield Slough Remnant Marsh, portion of the LATP site, the antenna field, and some specific areas near the Duck Pond. The existing marsh restorations and the future restorations all contribute the improved water quality of the Baylands.

DISCUSSION:

The two major sources of water within the Baylands are the tides and freshwater runoff. There are two high tides and two low tides almost every day in the Baylands. Spring tides (tides with the greatest range) occur around the new moon and full moon each month. The highest of the spring tides take place in June and January. The three major influences the tides have over the productivity of the Baylands include 1) transport of sediments, nutrients, salts and other materials; 2) creation of gradients of decreasing moisture; and 3) the physical means for fish and other aquatic organisms to move across tidal flats and marshes at high tide. Rivers, creeks, surface and subsurface runoff (including water from storm drains and wastewater treatment facilities) all feed freshwater flows into the bay. Within the Baylands, Matadero Creek and San Francisquito Creek provide the majority of the freshwater flow. These creeks flow into a flood control basin. The Palo Alto Flood Basin water level of approximately minus 2.2 feet (mean tide) is fairly consistent throughout the year, except for the rainy season where there is a slight rise to approximately minus 2.0 feet. The water levels are maintained by opening and closing a tide gate as needed.

There will always be a potential for flooding in the Baylands during unusual tidal/storm events due to the proximity to the bay and the low elevation of the land. However, all development is required to comply with building codes that address the flood safety issues. All development projects are required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) for construction activities as specified by the California Storm Water Best Management Practices Handbook (CASQA, 2003) and/or the Manual of Standards for Erosion and Sediment Control Measures (ABAG, 1995). The BMPs include measures guiding the management and operation of construction sites to control and minimize the potential contribution of pollutants to storm runoff from these areas.
These measures address procedures for controlling erosion and sedimentation and managing all aspects of the construction process to ensure control of potential water pollution sources. All development projects must comply with all City, State and Federal standards pertaining to storm water run-off and water quality.

The Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update will not create any new hydrology and water quality impacts. All individual proposed projects in the Baylands are subject to CEQA and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for potential impacts.

Mitigation Measures: None Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. LAND USE AND PLANNING</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues and Supporting Information Resources Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 6, 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially adversely change the type or intensity of existing or planned land use in the area?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Be incompatible with adjacent land uses or with the general character of the surrounding area, including density and building height?</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 6, 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with established residential, recreational, educational, religious, or scientific uses of an area?</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Convert prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance (farmland) to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>1, 2-MapL9, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conversion of the landfill to pastoral park is a significant land use change that is detailed in the Baylands Master Plan. With this conversion, it will create a park that will continue the natural open space and create another environmental asset in the Baylands.

DISCUSSION:

The Baylands comprises a variety of land uses. The primary land use policy of the Baylands Master Plan is that the existing development east of Highway 101, when the Plan was originally adopted, may continue but not intrude further into the existing open space or passive recreation areas, and the remaining undeveloped Baylands will be conserved as open space and restored where it has been degraded. The existing urban land uses and intensive recreation activities along the Embarcadero Corridor are thriving and have made no additional intrusion into the natural area. The most notable land use changes in the Baylands is the increase in the natural area (by at
least 50 acres) as a result of three successfully completed restoration projects and the completion of Phase I of the landfill closure/park conversion.

Due to the proximity of the airport, most of the Baylands, except for the LATP site, is within the Airport Influence Area of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) adopted by the County's Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). All land use and development must be consistent with CLUP guidelines. The purpose of the CLUP is to provide limits on land use allowed in the vicinity of airports in order to protect public and passenger safety. A further function of the CLUP is to control noise exposure by limiting types of development within the airport influence area. It contains guidelines for appropriate land use and development in the airport's environs.

The Baylands is not in an area covered by a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

The Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update will not create any new land use impacts. Compliance with the designated land uses, zoning and CLUP is a requirement for all development. All individual proposed projects in the Baylands are subject to CEQA and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for potential impacts.

Mitigation Measures: None Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J. MINERAL RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues and Supporting Information Resources Would the project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION:

The City of Palo Alto has been classified by the California Department of Conservation (DOC), Division of Mines and Geology (DMG) as a Mineral Resource Zone 1 (MRZ-1). This designation signifies that there are no aggregate resources in the area. The DMG has not classified the City for other resources. There is no indication in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan that there are locally or regionally valuable mineral resources within the City of Palo Alto.

Mitigation Measures: None Required.
## K. NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibrations or ground borne noise levels?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6, 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Cause the average 24 hour noise level (Ldn) to increase by 5.0 decibels (dB) or more in an existing residential area, even if the Ldn would remain below 60 dB?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Cause the Ldn to increase by 3.0 dB or more in an existing residential area, thereby causing the Ldn in the area to exceed 60 dB?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Cause an increase of 3.0 dB or more in an existing residential area where the Ldn currently exceeds 60 dB?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Result in indoor noise levels for residential development to exceed an Ldn of 45 dB?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Result in instantaneous noise levels of greater than 50 dB in bedrooms or 55 dB in other rooms in areas with an exterior Ldn of 60 dB or greater?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Generate construction noise exceeding the daytime background Leq at sensitive receptors by 10 dBA or more?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Baylands Master Plan supports the Airport Land Use Commission which has specific regulations outlining the appropriate uses, with associated acceptable noise exposure levels, and development within the Airport Influence Area of the Palo Alto Airport.
DISCUSSION:
All development, including construction activities, must comply with the City's Noise Ordinance (PAMC Chapter 9.10), which restricts the timing and overall noise levels associated with construction activity. Short-term construction that complies with the Noise Ordinance would result in impacts that are expected to be less than significant. Projects, as applicable, are also required to comply with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) adopted by the County's Airport Land Use Commission which regulates noise exposure.

The Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update will not create any new noise impacts. All individual proposed projects in the Baylands are subject to CEQA and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for potential impacts.

Mitigation Measures: None Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a substantial imbalance between employed residents and jobs?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Cumulatively exceed regional or local population projections?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION:
The Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update does not encourage growth and development in the Baylands and therefore will not create any new population and housing impacts. All individual proposed projects in the Baylands are subject to CEQA and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for potential impacts.

Mitigation Measures: None Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Issues</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

The Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update does not encourage growth and development in the Baylands and should not generate a significant number of new users as to create impacts to the existing public services for the City since the intent of the plan is to provide a pastoral park with low intensity recreation uses. The more intensive recreational uses within the Baylands, such as golf and flying, are not encouraged by the Plan to intensify or expand. All individual proposed projects in the Baylands are subject to CEQA and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for potential impacts.

**Mitigation Measures: None Required**

---

**N. RECREATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conversion of the landfill to pastoral park is a significant land use change that is detailed in the Baylands Master Plan and will increase the size of the passive recreation area in the Baylands. With this conversion, it will create a park that will continue the natural open space and create another environmental asset in the Baylands.

**DISCUSSION:**

The Baylands Master Plan identifies two kinds of recreation. The first type is the more intensive recreational activities such as team sports and special requirement activities such as golf and recreational flying. The second type is passive recreation such as biking and hiking. The Baylands Master Plan observed that the pre-existing
intensive activities were limited to the Embarcadero Corridor and accommodated their continuance. However, the Baylands Master Plan repeatedly states that the recreational activities in the open space areas, including the future landfill park should be more passive and compatible with the goal of conserving and protecting the natural environment.

The Comprehensive Plan describes the City's focus to be maintaining and rehabilitating existing facilities, given that as a "built-out" community there will be little opportunity to acquire new parkland. The Comprehensive Plan provides that the baylands will continue to be conserved as open space and that the City will seek out new opportunities for more open space in the baylands. The Comprehensive Plan addresses the possibility that there may be proposals to locate infrastructure improvements in public open space and provides that this should be done only when such improvements are consistent with goals to protect and conserve the natural environment.

The Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update does not encourage growth and development in the Baylands and should not generate a significant number of new users as to create any new recreation impacts for the City. All individual proposed projects in the Baylands are subject to CEQA and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for potential impacts.

**Mitigation Measures: None Required**

### O. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>NO IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., pedestrian, transit &amp; bicycle facilities)?</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 12, 13, 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Cause a local (City of Palo Alto) intersection to deteriorate below Level of Service (LOS)</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D and cause an increase in the average stopped delay for the critical movements by four seconds or more and the critical volume/capacity ratio (V/C) value to increase by 0.01 or more?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Cause a local intersection already operating at LOS E or F to deteriorate in the average stopped delay for the critical movements by four seconds or more?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Cause a regional intersection to deteriorate from an LOS E or better to LOS F or cause critical movement delay at such an intersection already operating at LOS F to increase by four seconds or more and the critical V/C value to increase by 0.01 or more?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Cause a freeway segment to operate at LOS F or contribute traffic in excess of 1% of segment capacity to a freeway segment already operating at LOS F?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Cause any change in traffic that would increase the Traffic Infusion on Residential Environment (TIRE) index by 0.1 or more?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) Cause queuing impacts based on a comparative analysis between the design queue length and the available queue storage capacity? Queuing impacts include, but are not limited to, spillover queues at project access locations; queues at turn lanes at intersections that block through traffic; queues at lane drops; queues at one intersection that extend back to impact other intersections, and spillover queues on ramps.</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) Impede the development or function of planned pedestrian or bicycle facilities?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o) Impede the operation of a transit system as a result of congestion?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p) Create an operational safety hazard?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Baylands Master Plan advocates the reduction of automobile usage in the Baylands, the expansion of the bicycle and pedestrian access, and improved access to public transit. These policies contribute to the reduction of vehicle use and vehicle miles traveled. A significant improvement supported by the Plan is to create pedestrian/bike access across Highway 101 at several locations.

**DISCUSSION:**
A key concept in the Baylands Master Plan is to reduce automobile use within in the area as much as possible, facilitate use of alternative transportation modes for access to and around the Baylands, and to locate and design parking lots in a way that will minimize their visual impacts upon the Baylands. The objectives of the Comprehensive Plan policies and programs for bicycle and pedestrian access are to provide a system that is integrated with local and regional networks, and to maintain bicycle and pedestrian facilities that are safe and easy to use. The Transportation Element includes policies regarding completion of the Bay Trail and evaluating a Bay-to-Foothills trail. The recommendations in the Baylands Master Plan are consistent with these policies and programs.
In addition to the above mentioned policies, the City has adopted a Climate Protection Plan and green building regulations that encourage alternative modes of transportation as one of many methods for meeting required reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

The Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update encourages low intensity uses, and bicycle and pedestrian access; as a result its implementation should not generate any new transportation and traffic impacts in the area. All individual proposed projects in the Baylands are subject to CEQA and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for potential impacts.

**Mitigation: None Required**

### P. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Result in a substantial physical deterioration of a public facility due to increased use as a result of the project?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION:
The Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update does not allow intrusion of new urban uses into open space and conservation areas and does not encourage growth and development in the Baylands and no significant increase in the demand on existing utilities and service systems or impacts to these services are expected. All individual proposed projects in the Baylands are subject to CEQA and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for potential impacts.

Mitigation Measures: None Required

Q. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degrade the quality of the environment,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substantially reduce the habitat of a fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>population to drop below self-sustaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community, reduce the number or restrict the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range of a rare or endangered plant or animal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or eliminate important examples of the major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 6, 12, 13, 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individually limited, but cumulatively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means that the incremental effects of a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project are considerable when viewed in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connection with the effects of past projects,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the effects of other current projects, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effects which will cause substantial adverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effects on human beings, either directly or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION:
The Baylands Master Plan encourages retention of the sensitive habitats and scenic beauty of the natural areas in the Baylands. The overall goal of the Baylands Master Plan (BMP) is to preserve and enhance these unique and irreplaceable natural resources while providing a framework and guide for future changes planned for the area including the closure of the landfill and completion of the pastoral Byxbee Park. The Comprehensive Plan goals and policies in the Natural Environment element recognize the significance of the Baylands as a high value ecosystem and provide for the preservation, conservation and protection of the natural areas as open space.

The Baylands contains several sensitive biological resources, including federally and state protected wetlands, two state and federal endangered species, and nesting habitat for birds. There are also several special status wildlife and rare plants that occur in the Baylands. The Baylands Master Plan includes more specific recommendations that would help to implement the City’s Comprehensive Plan goals and policies for conservation and protection.
Global Climate Change Impacts
Global climate change is the alteration of the Earth’s weather including its temperature, precipitation, and wind patterns. There is no comprehensive strategy that is being implemented on a global scale that addresses climate change; however, in California a multiagency “Climate Action Team”, has identified a range of strategies and the Air Resources Board, under Assembly Bill (AB) 32, has been designated to adopt the main plan for reducing California’s GHG emissions by January 1, 2009, and regulations and other initiatives for reducing GHG emissions by January 1, 2011. AB 32 requires achievement by 2020 of a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to 1990 emissions, and the adoption of rules and regulations to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective greenhouse gas emissions reductions.

By 2050, the state plans to reduce emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels. While the state of California has established programs to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, there are no established standards for gauging the significance of greenhouse gas emissions. Neither CEQA nor the CEQA Guidelines provide any methodology for analysis of greenhouse gases.

Although greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) generated by future development projects in the Baylands, as allowed under the Comprehensive Plan, would cumulatively contribute to global climate change, the Baylands Master Plan encourages future uses in the Baylands that preserve, conserve and protect natural areas, and limits urban development. The City has adopted green building regulations that require all major development projects to be LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) certified, which further facilitates the reduction of the GHG emissions of all projects.

This project, the Baylands Master Plan 2008 Update, would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change associated with greenhouse gas emissions. The Plan does not encourage development in the Baylands, but rather provides direction on how to preserve, rehabilitate and enhance natural environment.
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DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(X) I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect: 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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