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Vision Statement

To meet the high expectations of the community, Palo Alto should provide sufficient high quality playing fields to fully satisfy the year-round needs of the youth and adult sports organizations, including: a high standard of maintenance to ensure the condition, safety, and quality of the fields and an adequate supply of field space for both games and practices. Achieving these goals should not be at the expense of one group over another; should provide for sports organizations both large and small, and should minimize the impact on parks designed to serve neighborhood needs.
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Executive Summary

Palo Alto, a City that has long taken pride in providing the finest community services, faces a growing crisis on its playing fields. Demand now exceeds supply, which has resulted in a significant decline in the quality of the fields, competition for space between user groups, and the beginnings of waiting lists for young people who sign up to play in organized sports leagues.

Recognizing this growing problem, the City formed a citizen’s Fields Advisory Committee comprised of representatives of organized youth and adult sports organizations in Palo Alto. For almost a year this Committee has been meeting with the assistance of City Staff to first understand and then recommend solutions for the growing playing fields problem. This report chronicles that effort, presenting a comprehensive overview of the problem — and a thorough review of potential approaches and solutions. The individual chapters of this report summarize the results of the Committee’s efforts — Appendices provide supporting details.

The problem is clear; and will only get worse. The growing pressure on the playing fields is beginning to defeat the best efforts of a very dedicated and hard working City Staff to maintain the fields at the level of quality expected by the community. A two phased approach to solving the problem is presented. The first phase would focus on extending the capacity of existing fields, primarily through the use of synthetic turf in combination (where possible) with lights. The goal of longer term second phase would be the development of one or more new athletic fields facilities. As the City pursues this goal, the Committee recognizes the many complexities and difficulties associated with this recommendation, including the need to work cooperatively with other jurisdictions including the School District, Stanford, and neighboring cities.

Acting on the draft of this report, the Parks and Recreation Commission has made a strong recommendation to the Council supporting the Committee’s work and overall approach, beginning with the request that the Council establish finding a solution to this difficult issue as a Council priority.

The youth and adult sports organizations of Palo Alto began the work of the Committee as separate groups too often at odds over the use of playing fields. We have emerged from this process as a unified team working together and speaking with one voice for solutions that serve all at the expense of none. This report is a testimony to that unity, and to our commitment to work together with the City for a better future for all those who participate in organized sports activities.
1.0 Introduction

Are Palo Alto athletic playing fields living up to the standards of the community?

A boy signs up for his favorite sport and is disappointed to learn that he must go on a waiting list. A girl falls during a soccer match and badly cuts her leg because the field was dirt and stones rather than grass. A frustrated coach tries to plan an effective practice for his team in a time cut short by the waiting group scheduled next. A young outfielder chasing a ball has to be careful to avoid contact with adults whose field sport overlaps the outfield. A team manager has to produce a field permit to dissuade another group trying to find practice space. A park maintenance worker looks in dismay at a field destroyed by a season of too heavy use.

These are snapshots of the growing problems with athletic playing fields in Palo Alto. They are real ... and become more frequent with each year as the growing interest and participation in youth and adult sports puts increased pressure on a static supply of playing fields. If Palo Alto playing fields are to meet the high standards of the community, something must be done.

Fall softball and soccer players share space at Cubberley ... the girls are restricted to the infield because the outfield is in use for soccer.

Responding to this growing issue, the Parks & Recreation Commission created the Athletic Fields Advisory Committee (aka, the Fields Advisory Committee). This draft report is the product of nine months of effort by that Committee.
This report outlines the problem, describes the makeup of the Committee and its objectives, reviews the needs that are driving the problem, discusses the issues involved in seeking solutions, notes the institutions that could be partners in those solutions, presents a wide range of ideas that could create solutions, and suggests the next steps in the process. Appendices provide details about available fields, how they are used, user groups, field maintenance, brainstorming ideas from the Committee, new technology opportunities (turf and lighting), and the minutes of the Committee meetings.

The Committee, comprised of often competing user groups, came together in an extraordinary spirit of unity and common goals. This report is submitted to the City in that spirit. It was first submitted in draft form to the Parks and Recreation Commission ... we now submit it to the City Council with the hope that the Council will act forcefully on the recommendations of the Commission for action that will solve the problem and return our City's playing fields to the high standards expected by the residents of Palo Alto.

Aspiring young football stars wait for the high school players to finish so they can practice.
2.0 The Problem

Palo Alto playing fields are overloaded, which has caused their quality to deteriorate ... with the result that the City can no longer provide top quality facilities for athletic programs.

While interest and participation in athletic programs in Palo Alto are rapidly growing, the availability and quality of the playing fields needed to support those programs are moving in the opposite direction. The problem of playing fields in Palo Alto has many dimensions. Use patterns and growing demand have created an often unpleasant competition between user groups. The supply of available field space no longer meets demand, and the difficulties associated with maintaining such heavily used space have seriously impacted the quality of the fields.

Field use patterns. Palo Alto has approximately 77 total field sites (if you include neighborhood parks which were not originally designed or intended for organized sports uses) which must accommodate 60,000 annual hours of use. Forty two of these sites are primarily used for soccer, which wears the fields out the most, resulting in approximately 43,000 annual use hours. Specialists in the field suggest that 42 sites can accommodate 27,000 hours of use before they become unsafe. Analysis demonstrates that Palo Alto needs an additional ±100 acres of fields to accommodate existing needs. The alternatives come down to either reducing the use of fields (translation: cutting back on organized sports programs) or extending the available use of extant fields and/or adding new field space. Ultimately, only an increase in supply will enable the City to meet the growing demand.

Appendix A provides a listing of currently available playing fields.

Given the growing disparity between supply and demand, how do groups get the space they need and how does the reservation process work? Fields are initially brokered in two priority periods, March through August and September through February. After the priority brokering has occurred, the remaining space is made available on a first come basis. The priorities for Palo Alto's brokering system are: (1) City and Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) activities, (2) resident youth users, (3) resident adult users, (4) seasonal sports, (5) nonresident youth, and (5) non-resident adults. To streamline the brokering process for all of the groups, a separate meeting is conducted with the youth groups that have priority for the upcoming season. Soccer has priority in the Fall. Softball and baseball have priority in the Spring. Adult requests are processed once
the youth programs have been addressed. Conflicts often arise between the adult and youth space requests resulting in a meeting with those groups after the conflicts have been identified. User groups work together to resolve any space issues at this meeting. After the field space has been scheduled for a group, a permit is developed; insurance certificates verified, and if applicable, fees collected.

**Playing Field Quality.** The quality of our Palo Alto Fields is maintained by the Parks Division. The exceptional work that is put into the maintenance and field closure renovation program is, at once, both commendable and discouraging. Working with budgetary limitations, the Parks Division maintains the highest quality of standards possible for their fields. However, because of the high demand for and use of field space, the proper maintenance is simply not possible. A major problem is that maintenance of the fields is severely impacted by demands from both scheduled and non-scheduled user groups.

Heavy use has caused neighborhood parks to be co-opted for organized sports ... uses for which they are not designed ... with the results that: (1) neighborhoods are deprived of their intended use and (2) they, too, are suffering great wear that is very hard to maintain. Neighborhood parks used for organized sports are: Bol, Boulware, Bowling Green, Briones, Cameron, Eleanor Pardee, Hoover, Johnson, Mitchell, Peers, Ramos, Rinconada, Robles, Seale, Weisshaar, and Weery. This use of neighborhood parks to accommodate the needs of organized sports could become a major issue for neighborhood groups.

![Impact of sports use on a neighborhood park](image)

**Maintenance.** A key factor, driving the need for more space is the fact that most playing areas do not have the time to "rest."
A major component of the problem is soccer, which is extremely hard on grass fields. By the end of a season’s play, bare muddy areas are left in front of the soccer goals, and the rest of the field is worn out in several areas. This is an annual problem that requires significant maintenance every year when the season ends. Without some combination of new fields or extending the use of existing fields with the installation of sport grass, lights, and other improvements, the alternative for the future will be to require reduced use which will impact the quality of the programs.

All City fields are closed annually for rest and renovation. We only close each field for renovation once, annually, for a period of 10 to 12 weeks. Renovation consists of grading, aeration, overseeding, fertilizing, and top dressing of the turf area. This process requires one week for preparation, two weeks for germination of newly planted seeds, and three weeks for establishment. The infield surfaces of all softball diamonds are graded on an annual basis. This process takes three to four days, after which the field is available for play immediately. We close the Baylands Athletic Center baseball diamond from Mid October to February on an annual basis for renovation of the infield and the outfield as needed. We also perform maintenance of the Palo Alto Lawn Bowling Facility.

The City’s maintenance burden has expanded significantly over the years, largely because of taking on the maintenance of more and more school playing fields (Appendix E). The actual total supply available for the community has grown very little if at all.

The purpose of the Athletic Field Maintenance Program is to maintain the City’s and PAUSD’s athletic fields at a level that will ensure year-round safe use and attractive facilities. It is instructive to note that Palo Alto currently spends approximately $14,000/acre/year on the maintenance of Athletic Field facilities, while our neighbor, Mountain View, spends approximately $25,000/acre/year.
3.0 **The Playing Fields Committee**

A user groups committee initiated by the Parks and Recreation Commission.

The Athletic Fields Advisory Committee was formed out of a request from a regular meeting of the City of Palo Alto's Parks and Recreation Commission on October 23, 2001. This request captured the concerns of community members and parents involved with Palo Alto youth sports organizations, as expressed to both the PARC and Council, regarding the lack of sufficient playing field space and availability ... and the resultant overuse of athletic fields and neighborhood parks. As Presentation of the issue identified both the immediate situation and associated problems, and raised concerns about the possible impacts of future needs and how those needs might be addressed.

At the next regular meeting on November 27, 2001, the PARC voted to form a committee ... managed by City staff and composed of two commissioners, and representatives from interested athletic field user groups ... to investigate and develop proposals for creating and allocating new athletic fields in Palo Alto. The City Council has since included the following into their "Top 5" priorities on the City Council's Infrastructure Work Plan for 2002-2003: *Incorporation of recommendations of the Parks and Recreation Commission study of options to enhance recreation and field space as appropriate.*

**Committee formation/makeup**

As a result, the Playing Fields Committee was organized with the following members/organizations:

- **Diego Beltrami**
  California Youth Soccer Association (CYSA) -- Palo Alto
- **Doug Kreitz**
  AYSO
- **Diane Minasian**
  Palo Alto Adult Soccer League (PAASL)
- **Candace Maruyama**
  Bay Area Women's Soccer League (BAWSL)
- **Chris Stirrat**
  CYSA -- Stanford
- **Kevin Coleman**
  Palo Alto Girls' Softball (formerly PA Bobby Sox)
- **Mike Cobb**
  Palo Alto Girls' Softball
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Craig Laughton</td>
<td>West Bay/Legion Baseball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Goldman</td>
<td>PA Little League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Parsons</td>
<td>PA Babe Ruth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Losch</td>
<td>PA Babe Ruth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Tadlock,</td>
<td>PA Babe Ruth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Piha</td>
<td>Pop Warner Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Kelly</td>
<td>Peninsula Green Rugby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Boyce</td>
<td>Palo Alto Tomahawks (Lacrosse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Dennis,</td>
<td>Palo Alto Tomahawks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Beckwith</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Garvey</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Calvert, Chair</td>
<td>Superintendent of Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Christensen</td>
<td>Recreation Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Dias</td>
<td>Director of Parks and Golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Piana</td>
<td>Parks Superintendent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Athletics Fields Committee Chair, Dawn Calvert called the first meeting on February 5, 2002. The members quickly agreed to specific ground rules for professional conduct and overall productivity of the meetings, and then immediately began with an education process to learn about the areas impacting the athletic fields issues. The Committee developed a list of objectives that clearly defined their purpose.

A core group of the Committee ... primarily (but not exclusively) Doug Kreitz, Chris Stirrat, Craig Laughton, David Goldman, Paul Losch, Mike Piha, and Mike Cobb ... together with Commissioners Rich Beckwith and Bill Garvey have worked over the past nine months to study and understand the issues — and develop potential solutions. This report is the product of their work to date.

It should be noted that these groups, which have historically had strongly competing interests relative to the use of playing fields, have worked together in a spirit of extraordinary cooperation and mutual support toward common goals and solutions where all can emerge as ‘winners.’
4.0 **Committee objectives**

The objectives of the Fields Committee as developed by the Committee.

The Athletic Fields Advisory Committee discussed a large number of issues and objectives, ranging from very specific and immediate to "big picture" and long term. Initial discussion by the Committee resulted in the following list of objectives:

- Develop a complete understanding of the current use of fields, including school fields.
- Determine the most efficient use of fields for all groups in the context of using fields both equitably, appropriately, and efficiently.
- Develop recommendations that do not jeopardize the financial/operational health of user group organizations.
- Develop an understanding of the issues and the limitations of the City.
- Determine if reallocation of the fields is an option.
- Do not improve one group at the expense of another.
- Seek new athletic field opportunities, leaving no opportunities unexplored.
- Explore field opportunities in neighboring communities.
- Explore new technology for managing/maintaining fields.
- Ensure that the City's efforts to meet housing requirements includes a parallel commitment to maintaining sufficient fields to meet the needs of both existing and new residents.
- Understand and improve field maintenance.
- Understand the use of school fields, including a clear understanding as it relates to schools, including short and long term capacity constraints.
- Understand the cost of field maintenance relative to different sports.
- Recognize/determine potential threats to current field space.

While this longer list remains part of the Committee's mission, it was distilled down to the following short list for the objectives of the Playing Fields Committee:

- Support all member organizations (users) needs.
- Evaluate the supply, both present and future.
- Understand and provide for proper field maintenance.
- Understand the demand for playing fields, and define the necessary solutions in terms of meeting this demand.
- Develop a strategic plan for resolving the playing fields issue in Palo Alto in a way that meets the present and future needs and expectations of the community for fields that are both sufficient and of high quality.

With the development of these specific and overall objectives for its work, the Committee moved on to determine the need, evaluate the issues, and explore the full range of potential solutions.
The demand for quality playing fields to serve our youth and adults is growing.

Athletic field space is in very high demand in Palo Alto. More often than not, the demands exceed the space available for programs.

One unfortunate result of this pressure on field space is an athletic field-brokering program that too frequently pits one group against another in a competition for scarce field space. The brokering process includes all the athletic field space in City parks and on school district property. Nearly 80 different user groups, representing many thousands of users, annually request space on Palo Alto athletic fields and Palo Alto parks.

The demand for athletic field space has been on the rise for the past nine years. Why? One factor is that demographics in Palo Alto have changed. While the total population is relatively stable, during the past 10 years the youth population has grown by 25% or approximately 2,500 additional children. The baby boom the school district is experiencing not only relates to the district but to the youth sport organizations as well. AYSO, Little League, CYSA, Girls' Softball, Babe Ruth, and other groups have all experienced a growth in their programs. Pop Warner also has a growing waiting list. Approximately 4,600 children have participated in these 6 programs alone in the past year.

A snapshot of the number of field users, including the two major adult user groups, includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYSO/CYSA</th>
<th>3,200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Softball</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop Warner Football</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaCrosse/Rugby</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Soccer</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Softball</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a very significant constituency that represents a very wide cross section of the Palo Alto community ... and most are growing programs.
While soccer and baseball are the predominant users of Palo Alto athletic fields, the City's Recreation Department regularly fields calls from sports groups other than soccer and baseball. New user groups are also experiencing growth related to this boom. In the past few years, a number of new sport organizations have been requesting space on our fields, including youth and adult rugby, lacrosse, ultimate Frisbee, flag football, cricket, Australian football, and travel teams in the sports of baseball and softball.

Another trend that has increased demand is that many programs now have year-round program seasons (a change from the traditional three month program seasons). One example is AYSO, traditionally a Fall season program ... for the last several years, AYSO has fielded between eight to eleven soccer teams for the Spring season. As sports programs became more competitive, dedicated enthusiasts will ensure that this trend continues. Both CYSA clubs are highly active in the Spring and need space. The addition of their new uses to the historic Spring requirements for Little League and Girls' Softball are typical of the growing demand placed on Palo Alto's limited supply of playing fields.

To accommodate its many teams, the City has had to work with AYSO, and both CYSA clubs to require teams to share practice fields. For example, as many as 8-9 teams can be found practicing on the three fields at Cubberley Community Center during weekday practice times.
If Palo Alto playing fields are already seriously overburdened to the point of compromising both the quality and condition of the fields and the ability of youth and adult sports organizations to efficiently and effectively operate their programs, projected growth will only increase the problem in the years ahead. That growth will come from three sources: desired expansion of existing sports programs, new sports programs, and population growth from planned new housing development (to meet State-mandated requirements, Palo Alto is targeted to add 1,500 new housing units; additionally, new housing for staff and students is planned by Stanford).

While the user group population, especially the youth, has grown and will continue to grow ... no new playing fields have been added to reflect that growth. Instead, the City has been forced to schedule parks and school sites to provide the additional space needed for the growing demand for sports activities and programs.

Appendix D provides user group data for numbers of participants, and a measure of those who are turned away because of limitations placed on the programs by insufficient playing field space. Of particular note, and another key element of the growth in programs, is the growing number of girls involved in team sports.
6.0 Issues.

Issues range from meeting community standards to agreement on the best use of physical and monetary resources.

There are many many issues associated with addressing and resolving the playing fields issue, and some will be very difficult. The major issues include:

- **City-School relationship** ... historically, the City and the PAUSD have cooperatively worked together on many projects with mutual benefits to the community. As it relates to the use of school properties, the playing fields issue will be a difficult element in an already complex relationship — but one that can be resolved in a spirit of cooperation and good will.

- **City-Stanford relationship** ... as with the PAUSD, the City and Stanford often cooperate on issues of mutual benefit. University faculty, staff, students, and their children use Palo Alto playing fields ... and Stanford has extensive lands which could be part of the solution.

- **Financing** ... with many interests competing for public funds, paying for facilities improvements is always an issue ... one made more difficult in the current down economy.

- **Limited physical space** ... as a built-out community, Palo Alto has very limited options for providing new playing field space.

- **Competing political agendas** ... there is a wide range of political issues — the need for housing, environmental concerns, transportation needs, overdue infrastructure improvements, growth management, regional problems, and a host of others — all attempting to command the attention of the community ... the playing fields issue will become one of many, each seen as most important by its advocates.

There are many smaller but still significant issues that also must be addressed to resolve the playing fields dilemma. These include whether or not there should be resident only priorities, physical access questions associated with potential new sites, youth vs. adult uses, deciding where turf and lights could be acceptable, and many more.

It is not the purpose of this report to develop or resolve these issues — that process will be part of the next steps which must be taken on the road to finding solutions.
7.0 Community goals.

Palo Alto has traditionally provided services and facilities of the highest quality — that should be our goal for our playing fields.

The work of the Fields Committee demonstrated that all of programs represented had very similar common goals — objectives that could reasonably be characterized as community goals:

- **More recreational field space** ... more space is needed to fully meet the needs of sports organizations.
- **User groups should not be in competition for field space** ... historically, groups have been in often difficult competition ... we would like to focus our energies on offering the best possible sports programs.
- **Fields should be designed and maintain for the primary using sport and usage** ... this means that, for example, soccer works best when played on fields designed for soccer ... when very different sports coexist on the same fields, each use is typically compromised by the other.
- **Fields should be available year-round** ... the growth of year-round activity in many sports, including soccer, baseball, and softball provide a great opportunity for our young people ... we need year-round fields to meet this need.
- **Adequate time and space should be available for team practices** ... sharing of fields and shortened practice times seriously compromise the quality of the programs provided by user groups.
- **Neighborhood parks should be open and available for neighborhood uses** ... it should always be possible for residents to go to their neighborhood park for personal or family activities without being 'bumped' by practices for organized sports.

Achievement of these goals will enable the resident users groups to offer quality programs without comprise and without negative impacts on the community.
8.0 **Partners in solving the problem.**

*Solutions will require cooperation between users, the City, Stanford University, the Palo Alto Unified School District, and neighboring communities.*

The problem of providing adequate, quality playing field space is not unique to Palo Alto. Many of our neighboring communities face very similar problems for common reasons. (One Peninsula city is considering reducing practice times to just 45 minutes ... a step that most coaches would argue would seriously impact their programs.) Stanford University and the Palo Alto Unified School District are both very key elements in addressing this difficult issue.

Stanford faculty, staff, and students and their children are all participants in the various user groups that create the growing demand for Palo Alto playing fields ... the same playing fields that provide constructive after-school programs for the children of the PAUSD. It is thus not unreasonable for the users to look to both Stanford and the PAUSD lands for part of the answer to the problem.

Collaborative, cooperative, and mutually beneficial partnerships will be needed to resolve the playing fields issue. To that end:

- **Stanford University.** The City is currently working with Stanford University to negotiate an agreement for use of their athletic fields for youth practice opportunities. A specific request has been submitted to Stanford executives outlining the need for the use of 5-7 lined soccer fields.
from September 1-November 30 and March 1-May 31 (two three month blocks), weekdays, from 3:30 until dark. The City strongly supports the participation of Stanford's constituency as Palo Alto residents, and considers these requests as benefiting both the Stanford and Palo Alto communities.

- **Palo Alto Unified School District.** The City is continuing to work on improving our relationship with the PAUSD. The current contractual agreement between the school district and the City allows for a cooperative effort in resolving the field space shortage. The schools are given the highest quality maintenance service by the City as we continue to broker their contracted fields. This allows for consistent and problem-free scheduling for the City and school district. Our cooperation with the PAUSD recognizes the priority of school uses.

- Because, as noted above, our neighboring cities are also struggling for athletic field space. The Community Services Department will continue on-going efforts to collaborate on opportunities for new space and shared scheduling and facilities with bordering communities.

It is anticipated that these efforts will continue into the future, and expand to include longer term, ‘big picture’ solutions where all parties can benefit.
9.0 Potential solutions.

Both near and long term solutions have been considered and evaluated.

A two-phased approach is suggested to resolve the playing fields issue — the first phase would apply methods to extend existing field space in the near term ... the second phase would consider and pursue long-term solutions for expanding our options by obtaining additional field space.

As demonstrated by Appendix F, the Committee explored a very wide range of solutions with, literally, everything on the table for consideration. We then sorted through the many suggestions and determined some priorities for action, both near and longer term. In general, the potential solutions fell into one of three categories:

- Enhancing and leveraging existing field space.
- Multi-party and regional approaches.
- Development of new facilities.

The first of these generally encompasses the set of near-term solutions with the others longer term in nature because of the institutional, financial, and political complexities involved.

NEAR TERM SOLUTIONS

It is tempting to suggest that the easiest first step would be better maintenance and more efficient scheduling for the available playing fields. While there may be some opportunities for more efficient scheduling of the fields ... and in the spirit of mutual cooperation that has emerged from the Committee’s work, we will certainly do all we can in this regard ... opportunities for real improvements through scheduling are likely to be rare and difficult. As noted in other parts of this report, competition for space is intense, and lack of sufficient space has already caused situations where children had to be put on a waiting list. The alternative of cutting back on the practice or game time available for any particular group only serves to compromise the quality of the programs.

Certainly, the Committee would like a higher level of maintenance for the fields. But, the only way this can be achieved is to take the fields out of service...
which further skews a supply/demand imbalance that is already an on-going and growing problem.

The search for ways to extend and leverage the existing supply of fields came to focus on two areas: (1) the use of synthetic sports turf (sports turf is one of several names for what has historically been called "artificial turf"), and (2) the use of lights. Here, it must be noted that while lighting fields enables them to be used into the evening to get more hours per field, this greater use only exacerbates the maintenance issue, virtually mandating the concomitant installation of synthetic turf. The discussion of turf and lights which follows is not to suggest that many of the other ideas that came out of the Committee's brainstorming sessions should not remain under active consideration — they should. Clearly, *it will take a combination of approaches to provide an overall and lasting resolution of the playing fields issue.*

**Synthetic sports turf.**

A number of communities and schools are turning to synthetic sports turf for their athletic facilities, including the City of Burlingame, Redwood City, Menlo Atherton High School, and many others. Members of the Committee have visited a number of these installations, and came away very impressed with the potential that such installations could have for Palo Alto.

Comparing synthetic surfaces with natural grass, we found a number of advantages, including:

- **Low maintenance** ... turf has lower maintenance costs, and can relieve the pressures on an overworked parks staff.

- **More playing time per field** ... because there would be significantly fewer field closures ... in fact, playing time would almost literally be 7 days per week, 365 days per year (because teams can even play in inclement weather).

- **Safer playing surface**... the surfaces are uniform, and have been improved so they are not hard as was once the case ... the absences of bare spots and ruts prevents injuries that occur on beat-up natural grass fields.
Turf football field at Menlo Atherton High School

- **Lower replacement cost** ... after the useful life of the turf is over (8 or more years), replacement is at approximately 1/3 of the original installation cost, providing additional cost savings.

- **Water drainage** ... synthetic surfaces have excellent drainage, virtually eliminating standing water.

- **Environmental savings and benefits** ... synthetic fields do not require watering (they are just cleaned periodically) ... by comparison, a football field requires 5 million gallons of water each year. Other environmental benefits include the elimination of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers that can run off into and poison the ecosystem.

- **Cost savings** ... one Peninsula city has calculated a 5 to 6 year return on investment, not including water cost savings which could be very significant. The direct dollar savings for water not used at current prices is approximately $4,000 ... which is $20,000 annually for the football field example cited above.

- **Water conservation with no loss of fields in periods of drought** ... in times of drought, which we will surely periodically experience, there will be fewer thirsty athletic fields that need precious water ... and the fields will remain playable allowing sports programs to continue.

An investment in turf installations is protected by warranties for materials, installation, and performance.
Modern synthetic turf is not “Astro Turf” ... it represents a very significant advance in technology. It looks like grass, it plays like grass — and it wears like iron. There are competing brands of the new turf, and these alternatives would need to be studied very carefully ... including learning all we can from nearby installations already in place and in use ... to make the best possible choice to meet our needs.

The major negative associated with turf is likely to be the reaction that some may have that turf just isn’t “natural.” While turf applications might well and reasonably be resisted for a neighborhood park, a field used exclusively for organized sports activities might be very acceptable.

The use of synthetic athletic field surfaces has exploded with recent technology advances. Superior performance and aesthetics demonstrates durability, the look of natural grass, and high cost savings on maintenance. At selective sites, the use of lights in combination with turf can significantly extend the use of available field space. Although this new "grass" does not produce oxygen, or allow for birds to seek worms, the net overall environmental benefit is very high.

Appendix G gives one example (from one manufacturer) of the cost of a turf athletic field compared to a new natural grass field. In this example, eliminating the nonrecurring costs for the grass field, the costs are approximately equal after 8 years ... about $600,000. However, the lower cost of renewing the artificial surface means that use of turf will save approximately $250,000 in the subsequent eight year period.
There is also a more difficult to quantify but very real 'opportunity cost' associated with extending extant field space. To the extent that the use of turf reduces the need to acquire and maintain additional space, significant dollars have been saved for other purposes.

Lights.

The primary case for lights is very direct — approximately 1,000 extra hours per year per field. Another benefit is greater safety ... a well lit field can prevent injuries that might otherwise occur in the early evening.

Lighted fields also offer the potential for Palo Alto-based groups to host tournaments, and provide profit center potential. They also provide a better venue for adult sports, allowing people to play after working hours ... this can also free up more fields for youth sports, which currently sometimes compete with the adults. As has been noted above, lighting without the concomitant use of turf can be self defeating for high impact sports like soccer.

New technology has also advanced the science of lighting. Modern field lighting installations are very directional and much less intrusive with less glare — all with better quality lighting. An example is provided by the new lighting for Stanford Stadium which can be compared to the previous portable lights that were bright enough to read by near downtown Palo Alto.

Modern sports lighting is very directional ... excellent lighting for sports is no longer intrusive on surrounding neighborhoods.

Even so, installation of lights close to residential neighborhoods can be expected to
generate public opposition, and may not be acceptable in all locations.

Lighting is a relatively low cost way to extend the use of available field space. As an example, the estimate for lighting the Paly football field is approximately $50,000 (plus, of course, on-going utility costs). Lighting should also be considered in the context of its 'opportunity cost.'

Applications.

There are many candidate locations in Palo Alto for the installation of new technology turf and/or lights. Turf could be usefully installed at JLS, Jordan, and portions of the Palo Alto High School and Greer Park facilities. Turf could also be installed at the Cubberley Football and El Camino Park fields.

Looking ahead to the longer term solutions, which need to include new facilities, the combination of turf and lights could be used to great advantage. Examples include: the Mayfield site, Byxbee Park (Palo Alto Dump site-several acres), Stanford fields, the Palo Alto airport vacant field site (2-3 acres), Baylands Athletic Center, JLS and Jordan Middle Schools, and East Palo Alto joint partnerships.

LONGER TERM SOLUTIONS

As a built-out community, we have very few options for new field space. Those few include:

The former Mayfield School site on El Camino in the center of Palo Alto would be ideal in terms of size and location for a much-needed new athletic complex.
• **The Mayfield Site ...**
  
  **Pros:** This site is potentially available, centrally located, accessible by car and transit, and has reasonable size.
  
  **Cons:** Acquisition is complicated by other issues ... various other uses are being discussed and/or considered. The location, on a very busy part of El Camino, might make it more useful for adult than youth sports.
  
  **Approach:** Begin by developing supporting need/use information.

• **Stanford Lands-El Camino ...**
  
  **Pros:** Stanford playing fields across from Paly High are large and conveniently located.
  
  **Cons:** Stanford may not be willing to share these facilities.
  
  **Approach:** Look for approvals that Stanford needs from the City that could be used to develop a quid pro quo.

• **Stanford Lands- Sand Hill Road area ....**
  
  **Pros:** Some of this land will likely be long-term or even permanent open space anyway.
  
  **Cons:** Stanford may be reluctant to share these lands; and environmentalists would have to accept playing fields as an equivalent to open space. Location is not convenient, especially for youth sports.
  
  **Approach:** Look for approvals that Stanford needs from the City that could be used to develop a quid pro quo. Work to get an understanding with environmentalists on open space verses field use issues.

• **Stanford Lands-Research Park ...**
  
  **Pros:** Conveniently located, this location would be ideal to support corporate leagues.
  
  **Cons:** Environmentally protected area. Commute traffic compromises use during the week. This windy area had drawbacks for some sports. Location not easily accessed for youth sports.
  
  **Approach:** Explore practical and political feasibility.

• **Acquire/convert commercial space ...**
  
  **Pros:** Would represent a social upgrade to older commercial properties ... potential locations include Park Blvd near Fry's, East Meadow near 101, and West Bayshore.
  
  **Cons:** Expensive... high Development costs.
Approach: Evaluate opportunities/costs.

- Required dedication of field space for all new projects ...
  Pros: Puts the cost burden on developers.
  Cons: Unlikely to develop large areas.
  Approach: make this a part of the requirement for all new projects.

- Space Conversions ... conversion of existing space may offer some limited opportunities, including:

- Cubberley football field.
  Pros: Area could possibly yield more efficient use with redevelopment.
  Cons: Neighbors and PAUSD might object to change to existing facilities.
  Approach: Study alternatives

- Fields over parking lots/other facilities.
  Pros: Provides truly new space and greatly leverages land use.
  Cons: Very Expensive, particularly for retrofits.
  Approach: Study alternatives-inventory possibilities

- Convert parts of existing neighborhood parks.
  Pros: City has land.
  Cons: Compromises and reduces neighborhood park uses.
  Approach: Study alternatives-inventory possibilities. Look for ways to replace lost park space with mini-parks.

As the Committee considered the many options and ideas, both near and longer term, many considerations and issues emerged, including:

- We will need a phased approach.
- We need a test plot to see how artificial turf could work.
- We shouldn’t be using neighborhood parks for organized sports.
- Expansion of El Camino Park should be on the list.
- Maintenance can not be ignored.
- Consider co-use of EPA property/facilities.
- We should sit down with other cities who have developed new facilities and learn from their experience.
- Our fields are suffering from overuse.
- Our fields aren’t good enough to attract tournaments, and the dollars that those tournaments could generate for the City.
Clearly, there are a number of political forces in the community which are essentially competing for scarce financial and other resources that will be needed to successfully address the playing fields issue. These forces include: sports advocates, housing advocates, environmentalists, social services advocates, and fiscal conservatives concerned about City spending.

We know it won't be easy — just as we know it must be done.
10.0 **Next steps.**

Where do we go from here ... the next steps are to develop an action plan and a timeline to resolve the playing fields issue.

Where do we go from here? The intention of the Committee was to use this report to, in effect, put the issue on the table with enough information about the problem, the needs and goals, and potential areas of solution so that the City can formally and officially start the process of moving forward toward achieving both near and long term solutions.

In draft form, this report was formally presented by representatives of the Committee to the Parks & Recreation Commission. The Commission responded to the presentation with a motion (CMR:462:02) forwarding the issue to the City Council with positive recommendations for Council action ... recommendations which, if supported by the Council, will put in motion the policy decisions that will lead to the near and longer term solutions to the playing fields issue.

As a follow up to the action of the Commission, this report is forwarded to the Council and the community. While fundamentally the same as the document presented to the Commission, it does update the draft with some additional information and detail, including new cover art and additional illustrations, the Executive Summary, cost data (based on vendor information), and a proposed timeline for action on this issue.

**Council action.**

Building on the recommendations of the Commission, the Committee urges the Council to take the following actions:

- **Establish and adopt of policy direction that will give priority for near and long term solutions to providing adequate, quality playing fields for Palo Alto ...** we will urge the Council to make the provision of adequate, top quality playing fields consistent with our community goals (Section 7.0) a policy direction to the staff ... and a Council priority for the future.
• Direct the staff to develop a Phase 1 action plan to implement near term solutions on the most aggressive time line possible ... we believe that many of our near term solution options could be implemented relatively soon, with broad community support, and urge the Council to officially set these wheels in motion.

• Direct the staff to begin the process of developing issues and approaches for Phase 2, which would address potential long term solutions ... we do understand that the long term solutions are more complex and will involve many other participants and difficult trade offs that will surely require a longer time line to resolve ... which is why the Phase 2 process should be initiated now.

Our Committee will remain available to work with the City in whatever manner we are needed to help the City Council, the staff, and the Parks and Recreation Commission.

Projected action time line.

A projected or proposed action time line follows. This time line is in two segments, separating the Phase 1 near term actions that would extend the capacity of current city playing field facilities for the longer term (and more difficult) Phase 2 actions which would lead to the development of new playing field facilities that will ultimately be need to fully meet the needs of the community.

This time line is, of course, speculative. It is offered as a way of defining some broad schedule targets. For example, over the next two to four years, we believe the City could accomplish a proof of concept development project and implement two additional improvement projects for existing playing fields. We envision that, during this same period, work would begin on the longer term efforts to develop new facilities ... with the larger goal that within a six to eight year time frame, one or more new facilities would be completed or at least in formal development. We do recognize the difficulties associated with the longer term projects, which is the reason for separating the two phases or element of the projected solutions.
Set Council Priority
Identify Candidate Sites/Feasibility Studies
Review/Approvals
Proof of Concept Demonstration Project
Project #2
Project #3

Site Feasibility Studies
Preliminary Site Design/Development
Final Site Design/Development
Implementation/Site No. 1
Implementation/Site No. 2

Phase 1: Near Term Solutions — Extending Existing Facilities

Phase 2: Long Term Solutions — Development of new Facilities
Budgetary Costs.

Cost is, of course, one of the key elements in the projected time lines. And, specifics costs will need to be developed for specific projects. For the projected Phase 1 projects, we have obtained the following vendor data for some of the major critical cost items:

- El Camino Park ...
  Turf $510,000  Lights $50,000

- Greer Park/Field 2 ...
  Turf $490,000  Lights $50,000

- Greer Park/Field 5 ...
  Turf $400,000  Lights $50,000

- Cubberley Football Field ...
  Turf $690,000  Lights $50,000

Details of these budgetary numbers have been included in Appendix G.

The Committee looks ahead.

Reflecting the common bond and unity of purpose that have resulted from the work of our Committee, we plan to continue our work as a community interest group, to build and develop community awareness of and interest in this issue — and support for the commitment of City resources and actions to the development and implementation of solutions that will result in adequate, top quality playing fields for Palo Alto. As a necessary part of this process, we also anticipate participating as a group in future elections to encourage candidates for Council to support our goals.

As a final note, as a group we are universally and emphatically grateful for the exceptional work and support of the staff, led by Dawn Calvert with the support of Eric Christensen, Paul Dias, and Don Piana — they have done a wonderful job and provided a great service for the community. We also tip our hats to the leadership provided by the two participating members of the Commission, Rick Beckwith and Bill Garvey.

We are confident that the unity and positive spirit of our Committee will continue as we move forward with the Council to find a resolution of this difficult but very important issue that meets the high standards that Palo Altans set for our community.
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Appendix A

AVAILABLE PLAYING FIELDS IN PALO ALTO

This appendix summarizes the available playing fields in Palo Alto. It should be noted that many of these have limited availability because they are PAUSD fields for which school uses have first priority ... and some are not available at all for organized sports teams. The use of neighborhood parks for practice fields should also be noted.
### SOCCER FIELDS:

- **Cubberley Community Center**
  - Soccer Field #1
  - Soccer Field #2
  - Football Field
- **El Camino**
  - Soccer Field
- **Greer**
  - Soccer Field #1
  - Soccer Field #2
  - Soccer Field #3
  - Soccer Field #4
  - Soccer Field #5
- **Jordan**
  - Soccer Field #1
  - Soccer Field #2
  - Soccer Field #3
  - Soccer Field #4 (short)
- **JLS**
  - Soccer Field #1
  - Soccer Field #2
  - Soccer Field #3
  - Soccer Field #4 (short)
- **Terman**
  - Soccer Field #1
  - Soccer Field #2
- **Palo Alto High School (PALY)**
  - Soccer Field #1
  - Soccer Field #2
- **Gunn High School**
  - Soccer Field

### BASEBALL DIAMONDS:

- **Baylands Athletic Center**
  - Baseball Field (lights)
- **Jordan**
  - Baseball Field #1
  - Baseball Field #2 (grass)
  - Baseball Field #3 (grass)
- **JLS - Baseball 1**
- **Palo Alto High School (PALY)**
  - Baseball Field
- **Gunn High School**
  - Baseball Field
- **Hoover -- Little League**
- **Greer -- Little League**

### SOFTBALL DIAMONDS:

- **Baylands Athletic Center**
  - Softball Field (lights)
- **Cubberley Community Center**
  - Softball Field #1
  - Softball Field #2
  - Softball Field #3 (short)
  - Softball Field #4
- **El Camino**
  - Softball Field (lights)
- **Greer**
  - Softball Field #1
  - Softball Field #2
  - Softball Field #3
- **JLS Softball/Baseball Field #1 (grass)**
  - Softball/Baseball Field #2 (grass)
  - Softball/Baseball Field #3 (grass)
- **Terman**
  - Softball Field (short)
- **Palo Alto High School (PALY)**
  - Softball Field
- **Gunn High School**
  - Softball Field #1 (dirt)
  - **Softball Field #2 (grass)**
- **Elementary Schools - Multi Use Sites**
  - Addison
  - Barron Park
  - Juana Briones
  - Duveneck
  - El Carmelo
  - Escondido
  - Fairmeadow
  - Walter Hays
  - Hoover
  - Nixon
  - Ohlone
  - Palo Verde
  - Terman (Old Garland Site)
  - Greendell
Other Parks Used: These are not athletic fields. They are parks that have enough turf to allow for practice or games (Seale is the exception – it does have a smaller soccer field).

Bol
Boulware
Bowling Green
Briones
Cameron
Eleanor Pardee
Johnson
Mitchell
Ramos
Rinconada
Robles
Seale
Weisshaar
Werry

** These are soccer fields that have portable backstops in place to allow for multiple (little league/soccer) use in the spring season. They are not “legitimate” softball/baseball fields.
Appendix B

MULTI-USE OF PALO ALTO PLAYING FIELDS

As illustrated by these diagrams for Greer Park and the Cubberley Community Center facilities, Palo Alto playing fields serve many overlapping needs. This multi-use requirement significantly impacts the wear on the fields and their scheduling.
GREER #1,#2
LOCATED ON AMARILLO AVENUE,
JUST WEST OF BAYSHORE FREEWAY

West Bayshore Road

AMARILLO AVENUE

PARKING

RESTROOMS

SOFTBALL #1

SOCCER #1

SOCCER #1

SOCCER #2

SOFTBALL #2
CUBBERLEY FIELD: 4000 MIDDLEFIELD RD.
Appendix C

PLAYING FIELDS
USER GROUPS

Who uses Palo Alto playing fields ..., as shown by this Appendix, the user groups include: Baseball, Football, Lacrosse, Rugby, Soccer, Softball, and a variety of other teams, camps, clubs, and schools. Within each category, there are multiple groups serving both youth and adults, and ages from young children to seniors.
Who uses Palo Alto fields?

**Baseball**
Palo Alto Oaks
Palo Alto Babe Ruth
West Bay Baseball Club
Palo Alto Little League
NorCal Baseball School
American Legion
Stanford Baseball Camps
Pony League
Starmaker Baseball
SF Giants Youth Baseball Camps

**Football**
Pop Warner Youth Football
Santa Cruz Australian Football Club

**Lacrosse**
Palo Alto Tomahawks
Palo Alto Lacrosse Club

**Rugby**
Peninsula Green Rugby
BASH Rugby
Mission Rugby
San Mateo Rugby Club

**Soccer**
BAWSL
American Soccer Association
Harmonie Adult Soccer Team
Palo Alto Adult Soccer League
Palo Alto Coed Soccer League
Wildcat Soccer Camps
World Cup Soccer Camps
STCYSFA
PACYSFA
Silicon Valley Soccer Academy
AYSO
Athletics Adult Soccer Team
Castilleja School
DV8 Adult Soccer team
Grasshoppers Adult Soccer team
SVSA
Stanford Business School Adult Soccer Team
Fiji Soccer League
Keys School
ALSJCC Camps
Palo Alto Recreation – Youth soccer classes
Softball
Palo Alto Lawyers Softball League
Connetics Softball League
Geron Corp. Softball League
AIA Softball League
Palo Alto Bobby Sox
Loral Space Systems Softball League
Organization of Chinese American Women
Gray Cary Softball League
Palo Alto Chiefs Senior Softball Teams
Palo Alto Recreation – Adult Softball leagues
Peninsula Bible Church

Other Sports, Multi-Sport & Miscellaneous Field Use
Palo Alto Recreation
Foothill College
Gunn HS
Paly HS
Jordan MS
JLS MS
Terman MS
Mid-Peninsula HS
Pallota Teamworks
Jefunira Camp
Palo Alto Buddhist Temple
UCOPA (Ultimate Frisbee)
Mission Trail Poodle Club
PAUSD Summer School Program
JCC Maccabi Sports Programs
Decathlon Sports Camps
Palo Alto YMCA
Stanford A Cricket Club
Peninsula Sports Club
Medaka No Gakko
International School of the Peninsula
Santa Clara County Special Olympics
PA Family YMCA
Palo Alto Lightning Track Club
Children’s International School
American Diabetes Association
Mid Peninsula Jewish Day School
Appendix D

PLAYING FIELDS USER GROUPS SURVEY DATA

Each of the user groups was provided with and responded to a questionnaire about the group, its participant profile, numbers, practice and game fields, tournaments, and other relevant data. Some of the key data — total enrollment, number of teams, participants turned away, and male/female enrollment — are presented in bar chart form by group. The actual responses are also included.
What is the total enrollment in your program for the spring 2002 session?
How many teams participated in your program?

- Pop Warner: 5
- Bobby Sox: 32
- Stanford CYSA: 16
- BAWSL: 42
- Babe Ruth: 6
- Peninsula Green Rugby Titans: 10
- West Bay Little League: 130
- AYSO: 8
- Tomahawks: 2

Chart 6
Approximately how many participants are turned away per season?
How many males/females are enrolled in spring 2002 session?

- Pop Warner*: 175 Males, 26 Females
- Bobby Sox: 350 Males, 35 Females
- Stanford CYSA: 165 Males, 135 Females
- BAWSL: 714 Males, 71 Females
- Babe Ruth Green Rugby: 200 Males, 3 Females
- Peninsula Titans: 75 Males, 3 Females
- West Bay Little League: 42 Males, 42 Females
- PA AYSO Tomahawks: 60 Males, 60 Females
- Lacrosse: 143 Males, 143 Females

* Cheerleaders
Fields Committee Survey

Name of Organization:

1. How many residents participate in your program? non-residents?

   Pop Warner - 150/25
   Bobby Sox - 350
   Stanford CYSA - 240/60
   BAWSL - 86/714
   Babe Ruth - 150/50
   Peninsula Green Rugby - 45/33
   West Bay Titans - 6/6
   PA Little League - 850/0
   AYSO - 2280 (approx)/120 (approx)
   Tomahawks Lacrosse 19/24

2. What is the total enrollment in your program this season (spring '02)?
   2a. For the years 2000 & 2001? Please break down into fall & spring leagues where applicable.

   Pop Warner - 175
   Bobby Sox - 350
   Stanford CYSA - 300; 2a - 250 in '01
   BAWSL - 714; 2a - approx. 700 in '01
   Babe Ruth - 200; 2a - 200, 90 in '01
   Peninsula Green Rugby - 78
   West Bay Titans - 12; 2a - 12 in '00, 14 in '01
   PA Little League - 850; 2a - 800 in '00, 825 in '01
   AYSO - 2280 (approx)/120 (approx); 2497 in '00, 2440 in '01
   Tomahawks Lacrosse - 43

3. How many males are enrolled in spring '02? females? Please break this down by season as per question #2 & 2a.

   Pop Warner - 175 males & 25 females (cheerleaders)
   Bobby Sox - 350 - all are female
   Stanford CYSA - 165 males/135 females
   BAWSL - 714 - all are female
   Babe Ruth - 150 - all are male
   Peninsula Green Rugby - 75 males/3 females
   West Bay Titans - 11 males/1 female
   PA Little League - 808 males/42 females
   AYSO - 60 males/60 females; fall '01 had 1308 males/1012 females
   Tomahawks Lacrosse 43 males

4. Are you turning away participants? If so, how many per season?

   Pop Warner - yes, 20-30
   Bobby Sox - no
5. Do you verify residency? By what methods?

Pop Warner - yes, parent drivers license or pg&e bill
Bobby Sox - yes, we look at addresses on checks and verify mail to addresses
Stanford CYSA - no
BAWSL - place teams in divisions according to geographic location; league is a bay area league
Babe Ruth - yes, all mailings sent to home addresses - no po boxes
Peninsula Green Rugby - yes, usa rugby Certified Individual Player Participation verified application by applicant
West Bay Titans - yes, mailing addresses & personal knowledge
PA Little League - yes, dl, utility bill, rental agreement, voter reg., school/welfare records, property insurance
AYSO - no. for those requesting financial assistance, they must register w/City’s fee reduction program
Tomahawks Lacrosse - no

6. How many teams participated in your program (the past two seasons)?

Pop Warner - 5 teams in each season
Bobby Sox - 32 in each season
Stanford CYSA - 18 each season
BAWSL - 42
Babe Ruth - 6 in spring 2000, 3 in fall 2000, 10 in spring 2001, 6 in fall 2001
West Bay Titans - 8 to 10 (in league?)
PA Little League - 130
AYSO - 8 in spring '02, 220 in fall '01, 8 in spring '01
Tomahawks Lacrosse - 2 each season

7. Are you using fields or facilities outside of Palo Alto? If so, where and how many?

Pop Warner - no
Bobby Sox - no
Stanford CYSA - older teams play in morgan hill complex
BAWSL - yes, need 11 fields per season
Babe Ruth - yes, menlo park, mtn view, redwood city
Peninsula Green Rugby - no, have tried menlo park without success for years.
West Bay Titans - yes, purissima, flood park-menlo park, st francis-mtn view
PA Little League - no
AYSO - all practice fields are in PA. 99% of fall games are in PA. 50% of spring games are in PA.
Tomahawks Lacrosse - No
8. If you believe additional-field space is needed, which is the higher priority, weekends or weekdays?

Pop Warner – need both equally
Bobby Sox – weekdays
Stanford CYSA – weekdays for practices, weekends for games
BAWSL – weekends, unless lighted fields become an option to provide more adult access during week
Babe Ruth – weekdays
Peninsula Green Rugby – weekends
West Bay Titans – weekdays
PA Little League – weekdays
AYSO – weekdays; if we lose any more game space on weekends, then weekends becomes priority
Tomahawks Lacrosse – both

9. Are you aware of any open areas of land where more fields could be developed?

Pop Warner – no answer given
Bobby Sox – no
Stanford in the future, the PA landfill
BAWSL – no
Babe Ruth – mayfield site, greer park. Some existing sites may be candidates for artificial turf and lights
Peninsula Green Rugby – not in PA
West Bay Titans – behind baylands sb field, undeveloped greer park space, foothills park, PA landfill
PA Little League – mayfield, ventura
AYSO – 2280 (approx)/120 (approx)
Tomahawks Lacrosse - no

10. Would your group be willing to financially participate in construction of new fields if space were available?

Pop Warner – yes
Bobby Sox – we operate on a shoe string budget and it is unlikely we could offer financial support to a plan for new fields
Stanford CYSA – possibly; it would have to be through fundraising
BAWSL – possibly, it would have to be a board discussion re: amount, fundraising, manpower
Babe Ruth – possible but unlikely
Peninsula Green Rugby – possibly, yes.
West Bay Titans – limited, but yes.
PA Little League – we would be willing and open to discussion that may lead to potential financial support for new field development
AYSO – yes. We’d consider financially participating in the construction of new fields. We’d need to increase our reg. fees.
Tomahawks Lacrosse - yes
Fields Committee Survey, Part 2

AYSO

11. What are your organization's age groups?

4 1/2 to 18 years old.

12. How many participants are in each age group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ages 14-18</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 12-13</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 11</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 10</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 9</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 8</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 7</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 6</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 5</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. List the fields used by each age group.

**Game Fields (used Weekends)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages 11-18</th>
<th>Jordan (all)</th>
<th>Greer (all)</th>
<th>JLS (all)</th>
<th>Cubberley (all)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 10</td>
<td>Seale Park</td>
<td>Ohlone School</td>
<td>Ramos Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 9</td>
<td>Nixon School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 8</td>
<td>Eleanor Park</td>
<td>Palo Verde School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 7</td>
<td>Hoover Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 6</td>
<td>Greendell School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 5</td>
<td>JLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Practice Fields (used Weekdays)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age 6</th>
<th>Bouware Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 6-10</td>
<td>Nixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 6-10</td>
<td>Ohlone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 6-10</td>
<td>Peers Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 6-7</td>
<td>Greendell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 6-7</td>
<td>Johnson Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 6-7</td>
<td>Paly Quad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 6-8</td>
<td>Cameron Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 6-8</td>
<td>Eleanor Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 6-8</td>
<td>Palo Verde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 6-8</td>
<td>Weissharr Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 6-9</td>
<td>Briones Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>Hoover Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>Ramos Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>Walter Hays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>Werry Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lawn Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>Seale Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>Duveneck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>Fairmeadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>Hoover School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>Juana Briones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>Addison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>El Carmelo #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>Rinconada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bol Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Garland/Terman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>El Camino Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Robles Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>JLS (all fields)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-18</td>
<td>Greer (all fields)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cubberley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>Terman/JCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How does your group delegate field space to your age groups?

For practice fields, AYSO assigns fields based on field size and field type. Age 11-18 are assigned practice on full-sized soccer fields with goals. Game fields are based on suitability of location.

15. Does your group schedule tournaments on Palo Alto fields? Do you participate in tournaments on field space outside of Palo Alto?

Yes to both. In the first weekend in December, we host a tournament for boys age 10-11, and we send boys 13-14 and girls 10-14 to other nearby cities.

16. Would the addition of lights, allowing for nighttime use, benefit your program?

Yes, lights would be of some benefit.

17. How would nighttime use (as a result of lighted fields) benefit your program – what could you do with it?

Players age 16-18 could use lighted fields for practice on weekdays. We may also schedule weekend games in the evening since it gets dark very early in our fall season.

For us, the direct benefits of lighted fields would be limited. However the indirect benefits could be large. We presently compete for fields with other soccer organizations and sports groups. Some of the competing
organizations are adult groups that could be moved to the lighted fields, thus freeing space for us. Some adult groups would actually prefer to play in the evening so this would be better for them as well as for us.
11. What are your organization's age groups?
Babe Ruth: 13-15

12. How many participants are in each age group?
50 Boys per age (total 150) for Spring Season
60 Boys for Fall Ball Season

13. List the fields used by each age group.
Baylands, PALY, Jordan (practice), JLS (some practice), Flood Park (Menlo Park).

14. How does your group delegate field space to your age groups?
Fields are divided up by managers on a team basis.

15. Does your group schedule tournaments on Palo Alto fields? Do you participate in tournaments on field space outside of Palo Alto?
Yes, Babe Ruth both hosts tournaments at Baylands and PALY and travels to tournaments in other cities.
No teams travel during the regular season
Tournaments take place during the month of July
This year we host both a state and district tournaments, in which a number of out of town families will stay in the area while the tournaments are under way.

16. Would the addition of lights, allowing for nighttime use, benefit your program?
We already have lights at Baylands all our night games

17. How would nighttime use (as a result of lighted fields) benefit your program – what could you do with it?
Our current night time play needs are covered with BayLands, but it would make expanding the number of teams our League can support a greater possibility, depending on which fields are lighted.
11. What are your organization's age groups?
Age group... Five through twelve

12. How many participants are in each age group?
5-7 300
8-9 300
10-11-150
12 75

13. List the fields used by each age group.
Good question. A fluid situation. We are forced to mix different age groups at the same site. I need
to conduct more research.

14. How does your group delegate field space to your age groups?
Determined by the space allotted at each site. We schedule the younger players at the grammar schools
As an example.

15. Does your group schedule tournaments on Palo Alto fields? Do you participate in tournaments on field
space outside of Palo Alto?
Yes. An example... the LL All Star tournament last summer. Yes to the second question. Other cities
Host tournaments.

16. Would the addition of lights, allowing for nighttime use, benefit your program?
Absolutely

17. How would nighttime use (as a result of lighted fields) benefit your program – what could you do with
it? Lights would increase the number of games at our primary sites. This would increase the number of
available practice sites for our younger leagues.
Eric,

Here are my answers to your second survey. This is for West Bay Titans. Note that similar answers could be expected for the two other travel teams in Palo Alto (one 14 y/o team and one 13 y/o team).

Craig

**Fields Committee Survey, Part 2**

11. What are your organization's age groups?

15 years old

12. How many participants are in each age group?

12 players at this time

13. List the fields used by each age group.

Baylands

14. How does your group delegate field space to your age groups?

We only have one team. I work with other baseball groups in order to prevent conflicts.

15. Does your group schedule tournaments on Palo Alto fields? Do you participate in tournaments on field space outside of Palo Alto?

Yes to both parts

16. Would the addition of lights, allowing for nighttime use, benefit your program?

We already have lights at Baylands.

17. How would nighttime use (as a result of lighted fields) benefit your program - what could you do with it?

We use Baylands, which has lights. Very beneficial to our program.
Fields Committee Survey, Part 2

PA Knights

11. What are your organization's age groups? Age 7 - 9, 9-11, 11-13, 12-14, 13-15.

12. How many participants are in each age group? Each group (5) has 35 participants.

13. List the fields used by each age group. Palo Alto High School (football practice & game) and Baylands.

14. How does your group delegate field space to your age groups? N/A

15. Does your group schedule tournaments on Palo Alto fields? Do you participate in tournaments on field space outside of Palo Alto? We host the League play-offs. We do participate in other play-off locations.

16. Would the addition of lights, allowing for nighttime use, benefit your program? YES! We currently practice at Baylands from October 1st - December. We need lights to practice.

17. How would nighttime use (as a result of lighted fields) benefit your program – what could you do with it? Practice and play games on Saturday nights.
TOMAHAWKS LACROSSE

11. What are your organization's age groups?
   High School (14-18 yr olds)

12. How many participants are in each age group?
   Approx. 40

13. List the fields used by each age group.
   Cubberly

14. How does your group delegate field space to your age groups?
   Both Varsity and Junior Varsity teams practice on one field at Cubberly.

15. Does your group schedule tournaments on Palo Alto fields? Do you participate in tournaments on field space outside of Palo Alto?
   No; we have attended tournaments at Stanford University and in So. Calif.

16. Would the addition of lights, allowing for nighttime use, benefit your program?
   YES!!

17. How would nighttime use (as a result of lighted fields) benefit your program – what could you do with it?
   We would play games in the evening.
Fields Committee Survey, Part 2

PA Bobby Sox

11. What are your organization's age groups?

5yrs – 16 yrs

12. How many participants are in each age group?

5-6: 40 girls
7-8: 100 girls
9-10: 100 girls
11-12: 60 girls
13-16: 50 girls

13. List the fields used by each age group.
5-8: practice at grade schools, play at Cubberley
9-16: practice & play at Cubberley

14. How does your group delegate field space to your age groups?

Primarily by need. The older girls require bigger fields with dirt infields, so they are assigned Cubberley fields.

15. Does your group schedule tournaments on Palo Alto fields? Do you participate in tournaments on field space outside of Palo Alto?

We don't often schedule tournaments in PA, but we do play in one tournament outside of PA each year.

16. Would the addition of lights, allowing for nighttime use, benefit your program?

Lights probably would not be significant to our program.

17. How would nighttime use (as a result of lighted fields) benefit your program – what could you do with it?

Probably we would not do much with lights.
Name of Organization: Palo Alto Soccer Club - CYSA

1. How many residents participate in your program? non-residents?
   260/60

2. What is the total enrollment in your program this season (spring '02)?
   approx. 20-22 teams, 300-330 players

2a. For the years 2000 & 2001? Please break down into fall & spring leagues where applicable.
   '01 spring 14 teams approx. 210 players, '01 fall 17 teams, 260 players,

3. How many males are enrolled in spring '02? Females? Please break down by season as per question #2 & 2a.
   approx. 10 boys teams 150 players, 10 girls teams 150 players

4. Are you turning away participants? If so, how many per season?
   NO

5. Do you verify residency? By what methods?
   NO

6. How many teams participated in your program (the past two seasons)?
   15/17

7. Are you using fields or facilities outside of Palo Alto? If so, where and how many?
   Yes, for away games/scrimmages (Morgan Hill Complex, etc.)

8. If you believe additional field space is needed, which is the higher priority, weekends or weekdays?
   Weekdays for practices, weekends almost equally important for games and other soccer program.

9. Are you aware of any open areas of land where more fields could be developed?
   Not really. Baylands? Moffed Field?

10. Would your group be willing to financially participate in construction of new fields if space were available?
    Yes, we would support fundraising and participate in the construction of new fields, if appropriate.

11. What are your organization's age groups?
    9-19 boys and girls

12. How many participants are in each age group?
    By age group 1-2 teams for both boys and girls, some age groups may not be able to form teams

13. List the fields used by each age group.
    Cubberly, Jordan, JLS, Greer, Terman, El Camino, also use elementary sites - show where each group plays

14. How does your group delegate field space to your age groups?
    Age, class

15. Does your group schedule tournaments on Palo Alto fields? Do you participate in tournaments on field space outside of Palo Alto?
    Yes, Tall Tree Tournament in September, 4v4 Spring League in March/April/May/early June. All our teams participate in numerous tournaments outside Palo Alto.
Fields Committee Survey, Part 2

Peninsula Green RFC

11. What are your organization's age groups?
   Mini rugby: ages 8-13
   HS Rugby: 14-19

12. How many participants are in each age group?
   Mini rugby: 30
   HS Rugby: 40

13. List the fields used by each age group.
   In 2002, Cubberly 1,2, and football

14. How does your group delegate field space to your age groups?
   N/A

15. Does your group schedule tournaments on Palo Alto fields? Do you participate in tournaments on field space outside of Palo Alto?
   Yes and Yes. We have planned a National Qualifying tourney for 5/4 @ Cubberly. We have participated in other rugby tourneys in Sacramento and Sonoma.
   Men's Rugby (Mission) runs 7's Tourney @ Cubberly.

16. Would the addition of lights, allowing for nighttime use, benefit your program?
   Yes. We have had to buy our own lights and use space in Menlo Park because it's the only time/space available to us in that other user groups [little league, soccer, etc] get priority during sun lighted times.

17. How would nighttime use (as a result of lighted fields) benefit your program – what could you do with it?
   We currently do this. Since we can not find space available to our group when the sun it up, we have purchased our own lights and practice at night.
Fields Committee Survey

Name of Organization: PAASL

1. How many residents participate in your program? non-residents? **Approx. 350**

2. What is the total enrollment in your program this season (spring '02)? ~**696**
   2a. For the years 2000 & 2001? Please break down into fall & spring leagues where applicable.
   **About the same**

3. How many males are enrolled in spring '02? females? Please break this down by season as per question #2 & 2a.
   **Males** - 576
   **Females** - 123

4. Are you turning away participants? If so, how many per season?
   **Some each season. It varies – 10 to 20 usually**

5. Do you verify residency? By what methods?
   **No**

6. How many teams participated in your program (the past two seasons)?
   **38**

7. Are you using fields or facilities outside of Palo Alto? If so, where and how many?
   **No**

8. If you believe additional field space is needed, which is the higher priority, weekends or weekdays?
   **Weekends**
9. Are you aware of any open areas of land where more fields could be developed?

Gunn?

10. Would your group be willing to financially participate in construction of new fields if space were available?

Yes

Fields Committee Survey, Part 2

11. What are your organization's age groups? Over 25

12. How many participants are in each age group? ~700

13. List the fields used by each age group. JLS, Cubberley

14. How does your group delegate field space to your age groups? N/A

15. Does your group schedule tournaments on Palo Alto fields? Do you participate in tournaments on field space outside of Palo Alto?

No

16. Would the addition of lights, allowing for nighttime use, benefit your program?

Yes

17. How would nighttime use (as a result of lighted fields) benefit your program – what could you do with it?

We could schedule later in the day.
Appendix E

PALO ALTO PLAYING FIELD MAINTENANCE

This Appendix presents a report that summarizes the playing fields, City and PAUSD, maintained by the Parks staff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Athletic Fields Maintained by City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ATHLETIC FIELDS MAINTAINED BY CITY STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SOCCER</th>
<th>SOFTBALL/BASEBALL</th>
<th>BOWLINGGREEN</th>
<th>TRACK</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Nixon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greendell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barron Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairmeadow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Carmelo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Briones Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohlone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duveneck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walter Hays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palo Verde</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional fields available:

*Palo Alto High  1  2
*Gunn  1  1

37  19  1  1  58

*However, these schools are not maintained by City Staff.
Appendix F

PLAYING FIELDS
BRAINSTORMING IDEAS
AND PRIORITY SETTING

The Fields Committee went through a thorough two-step process to consider every possible approach to solutions for the City's playing field dilemma. First, there was a round of brainstorming, as outlined by the first part of this appendix. With every idea on the table, the Committee then organized them in categories for further consideration and development ... this categorization is outlined by the second part of this appendix.
Brainstorming Session of 5/7 Fields Committee

P. Losch, D. Goldman, M. Cobb

Long Term Ideas
Byxbee Park
Landfill
create a public policy that tests development approval against impacts on playing fields
Ask the question: are there public properties whose current uses could be converted to playing fields
look for opportunities to partner with East Palo Alto

Short Term Ideas
Develop Gunn BB field
Softball also
Partner w/LL & BR to do so
Lights & artificial turf at Greer park
Greer LL Field - infield grass & fence to enhance facility
Lights at El Camino Soccer field
Review configuration of park also
Mayfield Site
Move DO?/convert
Approach Stanford
Artificial turf at Jordan & JLS
Lights at JLS
Have staff do a City-wide study of every potential site for additional playing fields
not offer scheduling 'at the limit' as a potential solution
look seriously at Stanford lands
look at the Daly City example cited previously where the 'roof' of a low-lying public facility did double
duty as a soccer field

C. Laughton & M. Piha

Short Term Ideas
Lights and/or Artificial Turf @ Greer Park, El Camino Park, Gunn and Paly HS, PALL diamond
Explore Stanford use
Explore Foothill College use
Renovate Baylands softball field by extending fence to allow soccer in OF & placing multiple pegs for
multiple bases for multiple age use
Use Foothills Park
Undeveloped corner of Greer Park
Rent/work to develop space at Twin Creeks or external properties
There is an open area of approx. 2-3 acres between Embaracadero Rd. East and the airport plane parking
area. It currently only has weeds. It looks ideal for soccer.
Jordan baseball field should be improved to have a grass infield, with multiple pegs to accommodate 54/80
and 60/90 (similar to Rosita Park in Los Altos). Such an improvement would allow top level teams to
eagerly accept this venue for their games.
Long Term Ideas
Mayfield Site
Convert Golf Course to playing fields
Palo Alto property in EPA along golf course near friendship bridge
All large new development projects should include playing fields
Field space on top of parking structures
Convert parking lots to playing fields & underground the parking

P. Dias, D. Calvert, D. Piana, E. Christensen

Short Term Ideas
More use of HS’s for alternative space
Use of Stanford Space
Re-eval schedules vs use – do in subcommittees
City wide study of potential sites (in short & long term and in subcommittees) including public properties & regional sharing
Land use development vs open space park
Greer 4 (undeveloped acre?)
Artificial Turf for multi-purpose year-round use
Develop an indoor soccer facility
Foothill Park turf areas
Expand/renovate Cubberley football field area

Long Term Ideas
Co-develop new space on Stanford land
Use parking lots as potential space (ie, rooftops) - similar to east coast cities
Byxbee
Turf/lights on El Camino
Mayfield Site
Sun site on San Antonio, Vets Hospital (w/Menlo), Elks Lodge

D. Kreitz, D. Beltrami, C. Stirrat

Short Term Ideas
Web-based field scheduling & reporting for enhanced communication between city & users
Dedicated (year-round) soccer fields for advanced play – full-sized 120x60
Examine artificial playing surfaces
Lights wherever possible
ID parks that are underutilized for practice space
Mobile goals
Consistent marking policy
Examine natural turf options, more durable turf?
Control field usage – more stringent on who uses space – signs on field & fences
Work closely w/EPA on joint land and athletic programs

Long Term Ideas
Utilize Parking lots, roof space & other flat structures for field space
Work w/Stanford for more use of their fields – quid pro quo
Examine new real estate at baylands & byxbee park
R. Beckwith, B. Garvey

Short Term Ideas
Protect all existing field space
Continue to focus on maintenance of fields to allow for long term use
Direct building impact fees toward new & improved fields
Infrastructure fees toward field maintenance
Relocate JLS BB diamond to northeast corner of site
Stanford field space
Limit participation to PA residents unless non-resident cities contribute field space
Lights at fields (greer, cubberley, el camino, JLS)
Develop good school-city relations w/fields

Long Term Ideas
Use of artificial turf in existing & new fields
Develop byxbee park (lights and field)
Categorized Brainstorming Ideas from 5/7/02 Fields Committee Meeting

Subcommittees to explore:
- Ask the question: are there public properties whose current uses could be converted to playing fields
- Look for opportunities to partner with East Palo Alto
- Have staff do a City-wide study of every potential site for additional playing fields
- There is an open area of approx. 2-3 acres between Embaracadero Rd. East and the airport plane parking area. It currently only has weeds. It looks ideal for soccer.
- Jordan baseball field should be improved to have a grass infield, with multiple pegs to accommodate 54/80 and 60/90 (similar to Rosita Park in Los Altos). Such an improvement would allow top level teams to eagerly accept this venue for their games.
- Greer LL Field – infield grass & fence to enhance facility
- Look at the Daly City example cited previously where the 'roof' of a low-lying public facility did double duty as a soccer field
- Re-eval schedules vs use – do in subcommittees
- City wide study of potential sites (in short & long term and in subcommittees) including public properties & regional sharing
- Develop an indoor soccer facility
- Expand/renovate Cubberley football field area
- Dedicated (year-round) soccer fields for advanced play – full-sized 120x60
- ID parks that are underutilized for practice space
- Mobile goals
- Relocate JLS BB diamond to northeast corner of site

Lighting Issues & Artificial Turf Ideas:
- Lights at El Camino Soccer field
- Artificial turf at Jordan & JLS
- Lights at JLS
- Lights and/or Artificial Turf @ Greer Park, El Camino Park, Gunn and Paly HS, PALL diamond

Staff to explore:
- Byxbee Park
- Landfill
- Lights & artificial turf at Greer park
- El Camino Soccer field - Review configuration of park
- Approach Stanford/look seriously at Stanford lands/ Co-develop new space on Stanford land
- Explore Foothill College use
- Use Foothills Park
- Undeveloped corner of Greer Park
- Rent/work to develop space at twin Creeks or external properties
- There is an open area of approx. 2-3 acres between Embaracadero Rd. East and the airport plane parking area. It currently only has weeds. It looks ideal for soccer.
- Palo Alto property in EPA along golf course near friendship bridge/ Work closely w/EPA on joint land and athletic programs
- Land use development vs open space park
- Web-based field scheduling & reporting for enhanced communication between city & users
- Examine natural turf options, more durable turf?
- Control field usage – more stringent on who uses space – signs on field & fences
- Protect all existing field space
- Continue to focus on maintenance of fields to allow for long term use
- Direct building impact fees toward new & improved fields
- Infrastructure fees toward field maintenance
- Limit participation to PA residents unless non-resident cities contribute field space
Develop good school-city relations w/fields

**Ideas/Sites w/Potential Land Use Issues:**
- create a public policy that tests development approval against impacts on playing fields
- Mayfield Site
- Move District Offices/convert
- Renovate Baylands softball field by extending fence to allow soccer in OF & placing multiple pegs for multiple bases for multiple age use
- Convert Golf Course to playing fields
- All large new development projects should include playing fields
- Field space on top of parking structures/ Use parking lots as potential space (ie, rooftops) - similar to east coast cities
- Convert parking lots to playing fields & underground the parking
- Sun site on San Antonio, Vets Hospital (w/Menlo), Elks Lodge

**Gunn & Paly Site Issues:**
- Develop Gunn BB field
- Softball also
- Partner w/LL & BR to do so
- More use of HS's for alternative space
Appendix G

USE OF TURF FOR PLAYING FIELDS

This Appendix provides cost data for synthetic turf together with a comparison of the turf to natural grass.
About Synthetic Turf

A number of factors are important when considering synthetic turf as a replacement to natural grass. Sliding characteristics, ball action, playability, durability, resistance to injury are just a few. For high intensity sports such as soccer and football, synthetic turf has been tested to withstand constant use that otherwise places too high of a demand on natural grass.

The synthetic turf fields come with an eight-year warranty that covers fading, wearing and abnormal deterioration. A G-max (hardness) rating of “125” is included as part of the warranty for the full eight-years. Sport-Fields will provide maintenance training to staff as well as service programs based on field usage.

If portions of the field get vandalized or damaged, SportFields warehouses extra turf matched to our field specifications so that repairs can be made as needed.

The strands or grass fibers are designed to produce grip on the rubber in-fill system to ensure that consistency of the surface is maintained. The tips of each blade of fiber separate to help lock in the rubber so that it doesn’t shift during play. This is how SportFields guarantees the synthetic turf system even with extensive daily use.

A Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYNTHETIC TURF</th>
<th>NATURAL GRASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DURABILITY</strong></td>
<td>Withstands heavy and repetitive use, even during the heavy rain. No recovery time necessary between events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABRASION</strong></td>
<td>100% polyethylene eliminates any abrasions. NO RUG BURNS! Excellent for sports where unexpected limbs frequently come in contact with turf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALL ACTION</strong></td>
<td>Balls react, bounce and play similar to well-maintained natural grass. Especially soccer balls, footballs and baseballs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAFETY</strong></td>
<td>Does not produce 'foot-lock' or 'turf-toe'. Better shock attenuation (G-max), especially over time since little compacting occurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPEARANCE</strong></td>
<td>Always maintains a look of a freshly mowed lawn. Looks &quot;real&quot; unlike Astro-turf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REPLACEMENT</strong></td>
<td>Lasts up to and possibly beyond 12 years with the likelihood of replacing only worn areas such as in front of a goal box.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SportFields Perfecturf Return on Investment

*(Example: 80,000 sqft field)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Grass</th>
<th>Sportfields</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Design</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation and Grading</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage System</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Curbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Aggregate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation System</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>Include for grass also?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Preparation</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>Cost varies widely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeding &amp; Germination Care</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>370,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic Turf Installation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Yr. Maintenance Costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeping and cleaning</td>
<td>11,520</td>
<td>26,520</td>
<td>72 hrs/yr @ $20/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Mowing</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>@ 4 million gal/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizer and Aeration</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>@ 4 dressings/yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Patch Soddingyr</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>@ 1/1sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated 8 year total ($s)</strong></td>
<td>748520</td>
<td>576520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events/year for pristine field</td>
<td>150 (3/week)</td>
<td>1500 (30/week)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/event</td>
<td>$557.10</td>
<td>$48.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Income Potential ($s)

- **Field rental**: $0?
- **Concessions**: $X?

**Total Income Potential**: 

- **Field rental**: $0 (10 hrs/wk @ $100/hr)
- **Concessions**: **X + $640000**
BUDGETARY PRICING

El Camino Park Field:
Assume 200 X 320 soccer field, and standard field hockey field
83,453 square feet total field size
Base @ 2.25sqft = $187,770
Turf @ 3.55sqft = $296,258
Permanent soccer and field hockey lines/features @ .34sqft = $28,374
Total = $505,788

Greer Park Field #3
Permanent baseball foul lines with permanent soccer field optional (200’ X 320” Field)
82,768 square feet total field size
Base @ 2.25sqft = $186,228
Turf @ 3.55sqft = $293,826 (w/foul lines at no charge)
Total = $480,054
Add Soccer Field @ .17sqft = $10,880
Total with Soccer Field = $490,934

Greer Park Field #5
Assume 180” X 300” soccer field
Actual field size to be 190’ X 310’ with additional 10” X 30’ goal net areas
Additional 6,000 sqft of surrounding terrain to be graded, shaped to the field perimeter, and reseeded.
Curbing will be submerged type (turf will be adjacent the surrounding natural grass) with an exposed rubberized version optional.
59,500 square feet total field size
Base @ 2.25sqft = $133,875
Turf @ 3.55sqft = $211,225
Soccer Field @ .17sqft = $9,180
Grade & reseed 6,000 square feet @ 1.00sqft = $6,000
Total with submerged curbing = $360,280
Optional 3’ rubberized curbing @ 10.65sqft (including concrete base) = $32,333
Total with rubberized curbing = $392,613

Cubberly Park Stadium
Will use existing curbing (track inside curbing)
Assume maximum size soccer field (360 X 200)
Add football field and goal post footings as an option
Add rugby field and goal post footings as an option
Sweeper/groomer (for use on all 4 fields) included in the base price on this field
110,176 square feet total field size
Base @ 2.18sqft = $240,184
Sweeper/groomer = $17,000
Turf with soccer lines included @ 3.66sqft = $403,364
Total = $660,548
Football field and goal post footings = $18,128
Rugby field and goal post footings = $11,792
Total with football = $678,676
Total with football and rugby = $690,468
Appendix H

USE OF LIGHTS FOR PLAYING FIELDS

This Appendix provides a subcommittee report that explores potential locations for field lighting in Palo Alto.
Field Lighting Sub Committee
Report #1
July 10, 2002

Sub-committee members:
Dave Goldman, Doug Kreitz, Craig Laughton, Mike Piha (Chair), Chris Stirrat

The Field Lighting Sub-committee met on July 9th and reviewed all of the options we felt were available relative to lighting of fields for extending hours for practice and for evening/night games.

The group was unanimous on the fact that any field lighting initiatives should be "bundled" with replacing existing natural turf with the latest artificial grass/turf material (similar to the sample shown at a past Fields Committee meeting). From all indications, adding lighting would only cause increased wear to the already-stressed field surfaces.

It is the opinion of this sub-committee that the "bundled" option is truly the best long-term investment for the City of Palo Alto.

Fields that are good candidates for lighting—

Greer Park (Fields 1 & 2 area)
The Greer Park fields are the ideal candidates for a lights-and-artificial-turf installation. This would include not only the soccer fields, but the softball diamonds that share the same area. Parking is plentiful, residences are only on one side (Amarillo Ave.) and so the impact on neighbors would be minimized. The location is also excellent given the easy freeway access. This location also lends itself to many simultaneous team practices since the area is so large.

Tournaments could easily be accommodated at this location. Since drainage at this site is already problematical, the artificial turf solution presents an attractive option to any rehabilitation costs that might be borne by the City.

A further expansion to include Fields #3 & 4 in installing (at the very least) artificial turf, would make Greer a model sports venue.

El Camino Field
Given its location away from residences, this field is a good candidate for upgrade to lighting. The disadvantage cited for this location is the scarce parking. The lighted softball venue already uses this parking, so some parking solution must be addressed in this scenario.

JLS
Judicious placement of the fields away from residences (closer to Mitchell Park) makes this option worth considering. The school would enjoy benefit by having full use of this new facility. Some history with complaints from residents when the School District
proposed some “building for excellence” changes needs to be better understood before embarking on lights at this location. If these concerns can be overcome, JLS is a viable option.

Jordan Middle School
The fields at Jordan Middle School would be beautifully transformed with lighting and new artificial turf. The school would enjoy benefit by having full use of this new facility. The disadvantage of this option is the residences along California Avenue and the parking in the neighborhoods. We see this as a major hurdle.

Cubberly Football Field
This “sleeping giant” can be expanded to accommodate a full-sized soccer field if the bleachers can be re-located. Parking at Cubberly might present a problem, but more study is required. Residences on the south side of the field are a consideration as well. Cubberly is an often-used facility and lends itself to being an excellent sports venue. The addition of the lighted soccer field would be an asset.

The Mayfield Site
This land has the potential to be developed into several fields that would see heavy use year ‘round. The design needs to accommodate parking (underground?) that will not impinge on valuable real playing real estate. This location is ideally “central” in the City and will serve North and South very well. Access is excellent with public busses serving El Camino Real. Since this is a “green field” site, a creative approach can be taken to optimize the space to serve several sports.

Additional Space at the Baylands
This was an option the sub-committee felt it needed more information. We felt this needs more study before any recommendation can be made.

Next Steps:
This sub-committee will be arranging a “field trip” in the near future to at least two (2) sites in nearby cities to see lighting installations and to learn more from the managers of these sites about the pros and cons, costs, neighborhood issues, etc. The sub-committee will report on its findings at that time.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Sub-committee by Doug Kreitz
Appendix I

MINUTES OF FIELDS COMMITTEE MEETINGS

To date, the Fields Committee has met 10 times since its formation, beginning February 5, 2002, with the most recent meeting on October 2, 2002. This Appendix provides the minutes of those meetings.
MINUTES
FIELDS COMMITTEE, MEETING I
February 5, 2002

ATTENDANCE:
Community Members — Diego Beltrami, PA CYSA; Sandy Boyce, PA Tomahawks; Mike Cobb, PA Bobby Sox Softball; Kevin Coleman, PA Bobby Sox Softball; David Goldman, PA Little League; Rich Kelly, Penin. Green Rugby; Doug Kreitz, AYSO; Craig Laughton, West Bay/Legion; Paul Losch, PA Babe Ruth; Candace Maruyama, BAWSL; Diane Minasian, PAAAl; Mike Parsons, PA Babe Ruth; Mike Piha, Pop Warner; Chris Stirrat, Stanford CYSA ...
City of Palo Alto — Rich Beckwith and Bill Garvery, PA Parks & Recreation Commission; Dawn Calvert and Eric Christensen, PA Recreation Department.

GROUND RULES
The Committee agreed to the following ground rules:
1. Be on time,
2. Be open to all ideas/questions,
3. Full disclosure (surveys are needed),
4. Keep the discussion within the group, OBJECTIVES, and
5. Refer all press contacts to the staff with Eric C. as the designated spokesperson.

OBJECTIVES
The Committee discussed a large number of issues and objectives, ranging from specific and immediate and 'big picture, including:
— Development of a complete understanding of the current use of fields, including school fields.
— Determining the most efficient use of fields ... for all groups ... in the context of using fields both equitably, appropriately, and efficiently.
— The financial/operational health of organizations should not be jeopardized by recommendations.
— Development of an understanding of the issues ... and the limitations of the City.
— Determine if reallocation of the fields is an option.
— We shouldn't improve one group at the expense of another.
— We should seek new fields opportunities. (everything should be fair game: Foothill Park, Baylands, etc. ... leave no opportunities unexplored)
— We should explore new technology for managing/maintaining fields.
— We need to be sure that the City's efforts to meet housing requirements includes a parallel commitment to maintaining sufficient fields to meet the needs of both existing and new residents.
FIELDs COMMITTEE, MEETING I
February 5, 2002

— field accessibility for youth and adults.
— is there potential for use of regional fields by adults?
— enforcement?

Each group should provide details of current uses ... no of players, no. of seasons, how space is allocated, locations, and practice vs. playing (games) requirements and needs.

Field Maintenance
We need to know what is required for proper maintenance. Staff can show historic trends. Issues include:
— We need to know the costs of maintenance.
— Conversion of parks to athletic uses has created new burdens. (Some of these fields aren't suitable for athletic uses ... may create 'underparking' for residents not involved in sports.)
— Fields need to have recovery/rest time ... very difficult when use is so heavy.
— It would be helpful for groups to know the maintenance schedule for the fields (call: 496-6950)
... this information should be communicated to user groups.
— How we use the fields impacts maintenance. (Example was given of the location/storage of soccer goals.)

We should explore how technology could help. There was a discussion of the potential uses of artificial turf ... field turf, sports turf could have some advantages in environmentally sensitive areas ... would be used only for athletic fields.

Strategic Plan
It was suggested that the City needs to develop a strategic plan for the fields issue to assure that service levels are maintained.

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES

With this discussion, the issues and objectives that were raised to start the discussion were summarized as follows:

Support member organizations (users) needs.
Evaluate the supply.
Understand and provide for proper field maintenance.
Understand the demand for playing fields.
Develop a strategic plan for fields for Palo Alto.
INTRODUCTIONS
Staff welcomed the group, and introductions were made.

ATTENDANCE:
Community Members — Diego Beltrami, PA CYSA; Mike Cobb, PA Bobby Sox Softball; David Goldman, PA Little League; Tom Jacoubowski, Gunn HS; Rich Kelly, Penin. Green Rugby; Doug Kreitz, AYSO; Craig Laughton, West Bay/Legion; Paul Losch, PA Babe Ruth; Candace Maruyama, BAWSL; Diane Minasian, PAASL; Mike Parsons, PA Babe Ruth; Mike Piha, Pop Warner; Chris Stirrat, Stanford CYSA ...
City of Palo Alto — Rich Beckwith and Bill Garvey, PA Parks & Recreation Commission; Dawn Calvert and Eric Christensen, PA Recreation Department; Paul Dias and Don Piana, PA Parks Department.

MINUTES
Request was made for minutes to be available in advance of the meeting.

OBJECTIVES/ACTION ITEMS ... DISCUSSION
Specific action items will be identified in future meetings. Paul L. spoke about master plan and requested that a member of this committee be a part of the PAUSD master plan process.

SURVEY RESULTS ... DISCUSSION
Craig L. asked if kids really being turned away because of lack of field space ... would like exact numbers, for each sport. It was noted that soccer could double up on practice space. It was suggested that numbers should be spelled out by age groups ... the Committee agreed that it needs to understand, at each logical age group, how many youth are playing the various sports. Questions will be added to the original survey, and then distributed, to reflect this. We need to know how fields are used/delegated by different age groups, because the answers could impact supply/demand.

Questions were raised: which groups have tourneys and which would benefit from night usage. Also note the possibility of soccer showcasing their programs (like Paly vs. Gunn). Diego stated that lights would be utilized and games played in evenings.

Group would like information about how fields are being used and allocated. What is the situation today ... what can/should we anticipate in the years ahead? How many non-Palo Alto teams are taking field space needed by Palo Alto teams (soccer). Mike asked: are adult sports at risk of being cut back because of priority for youth sports? A:”Not yet.”

Some groups want to expand ... this needs to be factored into the equation. Doubling up ... where does this work ... and where does it not work.
PRESENTATION ON FIELD MAINTENANCE ... Don Piana
A presentation on field maintenance was provided with a complete handout (which handout is implicitly a part of these minutes). Don noted the perspective provided by his background, including as a player and a coach. The discussion generated by the presentation included the following points.

It was noted that, while the City's maintenance burden has expanded significantly over the years, that is largely because of taking on the maintenance of more and more school playing fields. The actual total supply available for the community has grown very little.

The wear and tear on the soccer fields was shown with photos ... the problem is severe around the goals. This is an annual problem that requires significant maintenance every year when the season ends. (Some of this damage could be mitigated by moving the goals around, where that is possible.) Photos also showed the renewed fields, after maintenance and some 'rest.' The rest period is not ideal for best maintenance.

It was noted that the Greer Park fields weren't designed for the level of use that they receive. Eleanor Park was an example of a neighborhood park that is used for team sports use. Adapting neighborhood parks for such use is done where it can be done.

There was a discussion of the compatibility of different sports using the same fields. There has been soccer damage at Hoover since joint use began. Typically, like at Cubberley, the field sports uses don't overlap into the softball/baseball infields. (Baseball fields are re-done every 2 years.) The presentation included El Camino, Hoover, and Baylands. Overall policies were reviewed together with expenditures relative to different types of uses.

There was some confusion relative to the dollar expenditures on fields. These expenditures are to be re-analyzed and re-presented to the Committee by the Parks staff.

An example of a new, better artificial turf was circulated.

It was suggested that we get benchmarking data from other cities ... how does Palo Alto compare in terms of:

- Maintenance expenditures per capita/by acreage
- Supply relative to demand.
- Percent of budget spent on fields and their maintenance.

The question was raised: how do other cities protect their fields in terms of non-resident use?
WRAP-UP

With the meeting approaching 10:00 pm, it was agreed to postpone the balance of the agenda:

Committee member presentations on needs, issues, and uses.

It was suggested that an additional meeting may be needed to complete the reporting, discussion of supply requirements, and brainstorming for ideas and solutions.

Mike C suggested that field users need to come together and generate a strong, unified lobbying effort directed to the Council ...so they can understand that we are already have a system that is strained to meet demand, stressed by maintenance that suffers from too much demand, and potentially unable to meet the demands of the future without service cuts.

NEXT MEETING

March 28th at 7:30 pm at Lucie Stern unless otherwise notified.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Cobb
MINUTES
FIELDS COMMITTEE, MEETING 3
March 28, 2002

INTRODUCTIONS
Staff welcomed the group, and introductions were made.

ATTENDANCE:
Community Members — Diego Beltrami, PA CYSA; Mike Cobb, PA Bobby Sox Softball; Rich Kelly, Penin. Green Rugby; Doug Kreitz, AYSO; Craig Laughton, West Bay Legion; Paul Losch, PA Babe Ruth; Chris Stirrat, Stanford CYSA ... City of Palo Alto — Rich Beckwith and Bill Garvey, PA Parks & Recreation Commission; Dawn Calvert and Eric Christensen, PA Recreation Department.

MINUTES
Corrected minutes will be provided.

SURVEY UPDATE ... DISCUSSION
Information came back quickly. Data will be sent out in graphical form. The benchmarking project is underway ... they will be reviewing data with other professional recreation groups in the area. It was noted that some other cities have groups similar to ours that are working on the same issues ... which prompted the suggestion that perhaps our Parks and Recreation Commission could meet with their counter parts in other cities. Right now, the study is being driven by Palo Alto.

Rugby noted that they lit their own fields in Menlo Park (using a portable generator and light standards) with no community protest. It was noted that lights mean more wear on the fields, and could lead to artificial turf. The question was raised: where are there neighborhood issues relative to lights ... i.e., are there candidate fields in Palo Alto for lighting? Also, what lighting technologies are available to mitigate neighborhood concerns? This issue will be reviewed on a field-by-field basis.

GROUP PRESENTATIONS
Groups represented at the meeting provided an overview of their activities. It was noted that growth projections should be included. (Please note that some of the information presented is included in the survey data, and thus not necessarily repeated here.)
GROUP PRESENTATIONS ... CONTINUED

STANFORD SOCCER CLUB
They have been operating for about 7 years. They have about 300 kids, from 15U to 10U, boys and girls ... 75-80% from Palo Alto. Essentially, these are CYSA traveling teams. Enrollment has been increasing. Some of the kids overlap into AYSO. There is a net growth in soccer participation. They aren't turning kids away. Age groups are evenly spread. They have some professional (paid) coaches. They expect continued growth.

Their base is Palo Alto. They practice locally, on weekdays, with games on weekends ... older kids play offsite so there is no home field advantage. No tournaments. Typical practices are 1.5 hours on 1/2 fields. They are willing to help maintain fields. Younger teams practice at Ohlone ... older teams practice at Greer. The older kids would benefit from lights. Artificial turf would make for a better game.

They may use fields in Morgan Hill. It was noted that the operator of Twin Creeks would develop soccer fields if there is sufficient interest.

AYSO

Participation currently at about 2,400 ... and they are growing. They expect the World Cup to increase interest and contribute to growth. They are 100% volunteer. Kids are 95% Palo Alto, 5% Stanford.

Ages are 4 1/2 to 18. They need more than 40 practice fields during the week. Schedule games from 8 to 2 on Saturday ... they could expand this time window. They have a real crunch on practice fields, and are very interested in finding 'real estate.'

This year they turned away 80 kids for lack of practice space ... caused in part by fields temporarily eliminated because of school expansion. They didn't do a walk-in registration ... again because of lack of field space ... which kept registration down by perhaps 100. They are at the max as determined by fields availability.

There was some discussion about moving goals around to ease the wear on the fields ... including having them off the fields at certain times to eliminate walk-ons.

Low-key tournament at the end of the year.
AYSO ... continued

Regarding lights, to contribute to the cost, they would raise registration fees. Lights would benefit the older kids (for practice). Moving adults to evenings could also help.

They are interested in the possibility of using Stanford Land ... space at the Menlo VA Hospital.

CYSA

Handout provided. They made the point that soccer fields need to be well maintained. They would support lights, and think night games would be good.

They have open tryouts with teams built around the coaching staff. Now, they take all that try out ... they aren’t eager to get more teams. Teams/staffs evolve over time. They have teams that go to Europe to play. Their issues are quality and supply. They want to group clubs together so paid staff can efficiently work with many teams.

They noted that it is hard for soccer, rugby, and football to coexist.

YOUTH RUGBY

All boys ... 19U and 13U (non contact). Regional program. Two practice fields in Palo Alto. Their season is Jan-April ... could change to Feb-May. Practices are 1/3 -2 hours. They anticipate growth to 8 teams. They are promoting Rugby as a high school sport. They have bid to get tournaments in May at Cubberley. Other cities have denied their request for field space (the excuse: no room).

TRAVEL BASEBALL

They have select traveling teams ... about 50% are Palo Alto kids, ages 13-15. Current total is 3 teams. They have experience big growth in Southern California.
BABE RUTH

About 200 boys, 13-15 ... 150 in the Spring ... 50 in the Fall. They have been very successful ... will host two tournaments. They have a capital drive program.

They use the Baylands and Palo Alto High School. Generally, they are very selective. ... they turned away about 50% of those interested, partly because of fields problems. They need a good quality field. Fall Ball will grow, but currently, they simply do not have enough fields capacity for the program. Question: Could Gunn be developed as a premier field?

BOBBY SOX SOFTBALL

All girls, 300 to 400 kids from 6 to 15 in various age groups. Virtually all activities, except for some practice, is at Cubberley where we have 4 diamonds, sized to different age groups, and one area for the little kids to play on Saturday morning. Games are during the week and on Saturday, and practices are during the week and on Sunday. Typically, practices are run double shifts (4:30 to 6:30 and the 5:30 to 7:00). During our March through early June season, the Cubberley fields are very tightly scheduled and used. There is one Menlo Park team in the older division ... virtually all the other girls are from Palo Alto.

Without Cubberley, we would be out of business. All-Stars practice at Cubberley into early July and we have traveling teams in the Fall which have half their games at home (Cubberley). We hosted an All Stars tournament in 2000 ... and had to do it at Greer because of a non-Palo Alto volleyball tournament at Cubberley. All of our equipment is at Cubberley, in two sheds, one of which we added. This includes pitching machines, a golf cart so we can groom fields, field lining equipment and supplies, and all the bats and other gear for teams at all levels. This year, we installed a batting cage at League expense.

Girls' softball is growing in popularity at evidenced by both high school and ASA participation. The league could grow, but where would they get the field space?

The league is all volunteer. We pay umpires, some of whom are high school players.
GENERAL DISCUSSION
One of the soccer groups noted the convenience and efficiency that obtains when activities located together. As the pitching coach for the league, I want to underscore this ... I can go to Cubberley in the late afternoon, and conveniently go from team to team to assist the coaches in developing their pitchers ... this only works because all the teams can be found somewhere at Cubberley.

NEXT MEETING
April 25th at 7:30 pm at Lucie Stern unless otherwise notified.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Cobb
MINUTES
FIELDS COMMITTEE, MEETING 4
April 25, 2002

INTRODUCTIONS
Staff welcomed the group, and introductions were made.

ATTENDANCE:
Community Members — Mike Cobb, PA Bobby Sox Softball; David Goldman, PA little League; Doug Kreitz, AYSO; Craig Laughton, West Bay/League; Paul Losch, PA Babe Ruth; Mike Parsons, PA Babe Ruth; Chris Stirrat, Stanford CYSA ...
City of Palo Alto — Rich Beckwith, PA Parks & Recreation Commission; Dawn Calvert and Eric Christensen, PA Recreation Department; Don Piana, PA Parks Department.

MINUTES
Minutes from meetings 2 and 3 approved.

COMMITTEE GROUND RULES
Dawn reviewed the Committee ground rules regarding speaking to the press ... the press should be told to contact the City Staff to make sure we speak with one voice. Paul L noted why he had commented to the press about the Council’s positive endorsement of the Committee’s work.

SURVEY RESULTS
Committee was asked to review graph and part 2 of results from the first survey. Dawn will be working with EPA, Menlo Park, and Los Altos officials about the lack of field space affecting those communities. Eric will get an image of the 26 acres of unused Baylands area which is primarily used for dumping.

Don P. noted that PWD has come forward about developing 26 acres in Byxbee Park ... PWD Director Mike Jackson said he would be willing to build fields at his cost if he can achieve his plans/goals.
It was noted that there are environmental, traffic, and other issues that could keep that development from happening. Perhaps the Parks & Recreation Commission could look into this. Doug K asked about bay front exposure and noted problems posed by the wind. (Could the design deal with the wind issue?) It was suggested that discussions with cities that have converted dumps to field space would help us understand the process. Craig asked how ‘locked in the Council is on environmental issues’. Rick suggested that a case could be made for putting playing fields at Byxbee ... he also noted the environmental sensitivity of the Commission.
PALO ALTO LITTLE LEAGUE

It is required that all players are Palo Alto residents. They have 63 teams with 825 kids. 25 kids were turned away this year because of a lack of practice fields. 40 kids who didn't make Babe Ruth will go to a new league. There will be more pressure on the fields next year. They could grow if they had the field space to accommodate that growth. They could also be asked to absorb approximately 100 kids from EPA if the league there cannot keep going on its own.

They own the field at Middlefield Park. They also use the Hoover site ... where they open the outfield for soccer in the off-season and helped with the maintenance of Hoover by not using it during the Fall season. They also spent $20,000 to raise a backstop. As an example of the maintenance need for baseball ... the infield they installed at Middlefield which was expected to have a five year life will need replacement in 2 to 3 years. They would like to put lights up at Middlefield ... they have the money and this could double the capacity.

They noted that the softball field at Baylands was originally put in as a baseball field.

DEMAND
Eric handed out and review data on demand. A question was asked about how much nonresident/ nonscheduled use impacts availability. A concern was expressed about the lack of space for casual, drop-in use.

The demand data back up the claim that we are at the limit.

SUPPLY
We are actually losing some supply. It was noted that the problem is somewhat seasonal ... and at its worst in the Spring. We should look at brainstorming ideas from the original minutes.

Don P. reviewed what we are spending on maintenance (volunteer time/contributions not included). Mike C. asked for benchmarking data from other cities. Mt. View, for example, spends more per acre than Palo Alto. Don will pursue more of such data.
INTRODUCTIONS
Meeting commenced at 7:50pm in room #2 at the Mitchell Park Community Center. Those in attendance included:

ATTENDANCE:
Community Members: Craig Laughton, West Bay Legion; Mike Piha, Pop Warner; Paul Losch, Babe Ruth; Dave Goldman, PA Little League; Diego Beltrami, PACYSA; Chris Storrit, STCYS; Doug Kreitz, AYSO

City of Palo Alto: Dawn Calvert, Eric Christensen, PA Recreation Division; Paul Dias, Don Piana, PA Parks & Golf Department; Bill Garvey, Rick Beckwith, PA Parks & Recreation Commission

MINUTES
As minutes from the 4/25 meeting were not distributed until shortly before the meeting, the group agreed to hold off on approval of minutes from 4/25 meeting until it has had time to review them & make any revisions, if necessary.

MEETING WITH LOCAL CITIES
Dawn Calvert reported on a meeting she had with Recreation Directors from the cities of Menlo Park, East Palo Alto, and Mountain View. The City of Palo Alto facilitated the meeting. Each city discussed its issues related to playing field space. Each city stated that it is facing fields issues similar to those faced in Palo Alto—particularly a lack of playing field space. The cities also discussed the possibility of taking on grant opportunities as a collaborative effort. Palo Alto stated it would take the administrative lead on such an effort. The cities agreed to meet again in one month.

Eric Christensen mentioned that a collaborative effort between the cities could be an innovative approach to solving such a problem if no such collaborative efforts in other cities had already taken place. It could be to our benefit to not have an example from which to learn.

Staff agreed to keep the committee in the loop regarding any future developments in this matter.
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-- ideas that could be implemented immediately. Paul Dias cautioned that process in Palo Alto would affect the time needed to get an immediate fix. There may be no such thing as an immediate fix. It could be many, many months before anything could be accomplished.

Doug Kreitz suggested compiling all the info gathered by this group over the course of its meetings and presenting it as a report that should move forward to the appropriate people. Staff agreed and stated that it will ultimately prepare a report. The report will be submitted to the committee before sending it forward.

NEXT MEETING

Thursday, June 6 at the Lucie Stern Community Center unless otherwise notified.

The meeting adjourned at 9:28pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Cobb
from minutes prepared by
ERIC CRISTENSEN
INTRODUCTIONS
Meeting commenced at 7:45pm at the Lucie Stern Community Center. Those in attendance included:

ATTENDANCE:
Community Members: Craig Laughton, West Bay Legion; Linda Shuman, Palo Alto Tomahawks; Doug Kreitz; AYSO; Chris Stirrat, STC YSA; Mike Parsons, Palo Alto Babe Ruth; Paul Losch, Babe Ruth; Mike Cobb, Palo Alto Bobby Sox Softball;

City of Palo Alto: Dawn Calvert, Eric Christensen, PA Recreation Division; Paul Dias, Bill Garvey, Rick Beckwith, PA Parks & Recreation Commission

MINUTES
Minutes for the meetings of 4/25 (Meeting No. 4) and 5/7 (Meeting No. 5) were approved.

ACTION OF CITY FINANCE COMMITTEE
Dawn reported that the City Council Finance Committee moved to allocate $73,000 from the Council’s Contingency Fund to the Fields Committee. It is anticipated that this item will be presented to the Council on 6/17 for approval.

ORGANIZATION/RANKING OF IDEAS
Taking the various suggestions and ideas that emerged from the discussion at the previous meeting, Dawn posted them on the wall on large sheets and organized in three basic categories:

- BETTER/IMPROVED USE
- COLLABORATIVE IDEAS (with other agencies, cities, etc.)
- FUTURE LAND AND OTHER USES

Each member of the Committee was then asked to pick their respective top five ideas. The votes were totaled, the various choices were organized and discussed ... and then both Committee members and staff selected various areas of interest where they would spend time before the next meeting developing the ideas for future discussion and action by the Committee. In effect, the three areas identified above became three subcommittees, with Staff taking on those areas most appropriate for and best served by their direct action and involvement.
DISCUSSION

The discussion relative to the posting and priority setting included the following points (this was a bit free-wheeling and broken up, so not all ideas have been captured).

Doug K was especially concerned about the lighting issue ... Mike C. noted that neighborhood reaction will be key. The question was raised about the status of the Mayfield site. Mike C. said it was a key site, and we should speak out for it now ... others noted that it was a very good location for turf/lights/a sports complex. Another question addressed the potential of land in East Palo Alto, ... and the undeveloped site at the airport.

It was noted that there is a potential trade off in some solutions ... play locally vs. quality fields — what is more important?

Web-based scheduling of fields was discussed ... it was noted that cooperation is the key. Some were skeptical that this could be workable. Rich B. suggested that this might become a project for students at the high schools.

Another question: how do we police nonresident vs. resident use of the fields.

It was noted that we need best practices maintenance of the fields.

These other discussion points were part of the posting of ideas and suggestions.
RANKING AND PRIORITY SETTING

Following the posting and the votes received (shown in parenthesis) were as follows — subcommittee/staff action areas are indicated in bold italic ... relevant discussion notes in light italic):

**BETTER/IMPROVED USE**

**Short Term**
- Lights and/or artificial turf at Greer Park, El Camino Park, Gunn and Paly HS, PA Little League Diamond. (8)
  
  *MPHA ... Dave Goldman, Chris Stirrat, Doug Kreitz*
- Use of undeveloped corner of Greer Park. (3)
  
  *Staff ... look at Master Plan ... pros/cons.*
- Web-based field scheduling and reporting for enhanced communication between the City and Users. (2)
  
  *Staff ...*
- Identify parks that are underutilized as candidates for practice space. (1)
- Continue to focus on maintenance of fields to permit long-term use. (1)
  
  *Doug Kreitz, Chris Stirrat, Rich Beckwith ... best practice ... improve financial support/maintenance.*
- Provide infrastructure fees for field maintenance. (1)
- Reevaluate field schedules with respect to use — to be done in subcommittees. (0)

**Long Term**

None.

**COLLABORATIVE IDEAS**

**Short Term**
- Approach Stanford/look seriously at Stanford lands/Co-develop new space on Stanford lands. (5)
  
  *Staff ...*
- Improve Jordan baseball field with grass infield and multiple pegs (54/80 and 60/90 like Rosita Park in Los Altos) ... to allow top level teams to use this venue for their games. (3)
  
  *Craig Laughton, Rich Beckwith ...*
- Look for opportunities to partner with East Palo Alto. (0)
- Relocate the JLS baseball diamond to the NE corner of the site. (1)
COLLABORATIVE IDEAS (con’t)

- Rent/work to develop space at Twin Creeks or other venues outside Palo Alto. (1)
- Look for opportunities to partner with East Palo Alto. (0)
  - Staff... already in progress.

Long Term

None.

FUTURE LAND AND OTHER USES

This area attracted considerable subcommittee interest — with Mike Cobb taking a lead role;

  Short term ... Mike Cobb, Paul Losch, Rick Beckwith
  Long term ... Mike Cobb, Paul Losch, Bill Garvey, Rick Beckwith

As noted below, Staff will have a key role throughout.

Short Term

- Have staff do a study of every potential site for playing fields in the City. (5)
  - Staff... survey.
- Evaluate the use of the Mayfield Site for playing fields. (4)
  - Staff...
- Evaluate Sun site on San Antonio Road, Veterans Hospital site (with Menlo Park), and the Elks Lodge site for potential playing field uses. (1)
  - Staff...
- Ask the question: Are there any public properties whose current uses could be converted to playing fields. (1)
  - Staff...
- Evaluate the open area of approximately 2/3 acre between Embarcadero Road East and the Airport parking area ... currently in weeds, it looks idea for soccer. (1)
  - Staff...
- Evaluate the Daly City example where the 'roof' of a low-lying public facility can do double duty as a playing field. (1)
  - Staff...
- Explore the playing field potential at Bixbee Park. (2)
  - Staff...
FUTURE LAND AND OTHER USES (con’t)

- Study additional control of field usage ... more stringent on who uses space, and signs on fields and fences.. (1)
  Staff ...
- Direct building and impact fees toward new and improved fields. (1)
  Staff ...

Long Term
- All large, new development projects to include playing fields. (3)
  Staff ...
- Evaluate land use development vs. open space park.. (1)
  Staff ...
- Convert parking lots to playing fields and underground the parking ... playing field space on top of parking structures (rooftops) similar to East Coast cities.. (2)
  Staff ...
- Dedicate (year round) full sized (120x60) soccer fields for advanced play. (5)
  Staff ... D Kreitz, Chris Stirrat

OTHER IDEAS AND SUGGESTIONS

A number of other ideas and suggestions have emerged from the discussions to date and from the staff. The are listed below to keep them part of the overall Fields Committee overall discussion and planning effort. It is noted that some of these items are part of Staff's on-going efforts, and others overlap some of the various action items listed above. These other ideas and suggestions include (in no particular order):

Subcommittees to explore:
- Greer Little League Field ... infield grass and fencing to enhance quality.
- City-wide study of potential sites (short and long term) including public properties and regional sharing.
- Development of an indoor soccer facility.
- Expand/renovate the Cubberley football area.
- Mobile goals for soccer fields.
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OTHER IDEAS AND SUGGESTIONS (con’t)

Lighting and artificial turf ideas and issues.
- Lights at the El Camino soccer field.
- Artificial turf at Jordan and JLS.
- Lights at JLS.
- Use of landfill area.
- Lights at the El Camino soccer field.
- Lights and artificial turf at Greer Park.
- El Camino soccer field reconfiguration.

Gunn and Paly site issues.
- Develop Gunn baseball field ... partner with Little League and Babe Ruth.
- More use of high schools for alternative space.

Ideas/Sites with potential land use issues.
- Create a public policy that tests future development approval against impact on playing fields ... goal: to preserve service levels.
- Move/convert District offices.
- Renovate the Baylands softball field by extending the fence to allow soccer in the outfield area ... and place multiple pegs to allow use by different age groups.
- Use of Palo Alto property in EPA along the golf course near friendship bridge ... work closely with EPA on joint land/athletic programs.
- Convert the golf course to playing fields.

Others
- Examine more durable natural turf options.
- Protect all existing field space.
- Explore Foothill College use.
- Examine use Foothills Park.
- Limit participation to PA residents unless nonresident cities contribute field space.
- Develop good City/School relations relative to fields.
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NEXT MEETING

Wednesday, July 17 at the Lucie Stern Community Center unless otherwise notified.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Cobb
INTRODUCTIONS

Meeting commenced at approximately 7:30 pm at the Lucie Stern Community Center. Those in attendance included:

ATTENDANCE:
Community Members: Craig Laughton, West Bay/Legion; David Goldman, Palo Alto Little League; Chris Stirrat, STCYS; Mike Parsons, Palo Alto Babe Ruth; Terry Tadlock, Palo Alto Babe Ruth; Mike Cobb, Palo Alto; Bobby Sox Softball;

City of Palo Alto: Dawn Calvert, Eric Christensen, PA Recreation Division; Paul Dias, Bill Garvey, Rick Beckwith, PA Parks & Recreation Commission.

MINUTES

Minutes for the meetings of 6/6 (Meeting No. 6) were approved.

SUPPORTING COMMUNITY SPORTS ACTIVITIES — GENERAL DISCUSSION

The residency issue was raised by Rick Beckwith ... it will be considered by the PAP&R Commission. It was noted that there is nothing current in the City code on this issue. The issue comes down to situations where PA residents are competing with nonresidents for use of PA fields. A potential minimum guideline could be to define a resident group as one having a majority of Palo Altans. Considerable discussion followed regard what % was appropriate, and the need for input from affected sports groups — those at the meeting all felt that their organization should have the chance to be heard. RB wants to get reference information from neighboring cities to see what they do. It was suggested that this might be an internal (to the respective sports leagues) issue.

Jr. Little League is a growing program.

A basic premise for our work was noted: we need adequate fields to support viable programs for our children.
— Stanford's position may be changing ... perhaps the door is open to greater accommodation.
— Re Bixbee Park: Other cities have converted landfill areas to recreational uses.
— Regional sharing (of facilities) is being considered.
— Re Gunn/Paly: PAUSD likes the idea of artificial turf.

Long range ideas

Mike Cobb noted that this subcommittee has not yet met. He prepared a set of working notes for the subcommittee looking at some long-term alternatives in terms of pros, cons, and potential approaches. Those notes are appended to these minutes.

COMMITTEE TIME LINE

Staff provided and distributed a draft time line for the Committee to complete and bring the fields issue to Council. It was noted that, when we do go to Council, we will need to assign costs to the various alternatives.

MC raised the issue of going to the press to begin to build wider public awareness of the issue. The sense was to try to get an article in the PAW or PADN after Labor Day. MC will pursue this.

NEXT MEETING

Wednesday, August 7 at the Little League Clubhouse at 7:30.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Cobb
FIELDS COMMITTEE
THOUGHTS ON POTENTIAL SITES
July 17, 2002

Stanford Lands ... Sand Hill Road area.

Pros: Some of this land will likely be long-term or even permanent open space.

Cons: Stanford will be reluctant to share these lands ... environmentalists would have to accept playing fields as an equivalent to open space. Location is not convenient, especially for youth sports.

Approach: Look for approvals that Stanford needs from the City that could be used to develop a quid pro quo. Work to get environmentalist buy-in to open space/fields equivalency.

Stanford Lands ... Research Park.

Pros: Conveniently located ... would be ideal to support industrial leagues.

Cons: Available space is very limited ... Stanford will be reluctant to share these facilities ... would need consideration so as not to lose build-out potential.

Approach: Look for approvals that Stanford needs from the City that could be used to develop a quid pro quo ... explore transfer of development rights.

City Lands ... Baylands area.

Pros: City already owns the land.

Cons: Environmentally protected area ... any development, even for sports uses, will create a war with environmentalists. Commute traffic compromises use during the week. Windy area has drawbacks for some sports. Location not easily accessed for youth sports.

Approach: Explore practical and political feasibility.

Acquire/convert commercial space.

Pros: Would represent a 'social' upgrade to older commercial properties ... some potential locations (Park Blvd near Fry's, East Meadow near 101, West Bayshore) provide good locations ... would slightly improve jobs housing imbalance.


Approach: Evaluate costs ... look for 'bargains' ... see if there are property owners who might be interested in trading some development rights.
SUBCOMMITTEE COMMENTS

The previous three pages represent the notes prepared by Mike Cobb and reviewed at the last Fields Committee meeting. Subsequently, the subcommittee (Mike Cobb, Rick Beckwith, Paul Losch, Doug Kreitz) met 8.5.02 to discuss the IDEAS and other ideas. The comments and ideas from that meeting included:

- We need a phased approach.
- We need a test plot to see how artificial turf could work.
- We shouldn't be using neighborhood parks for organized sports.
- Expansion of El Camino should be on the list.
- Maintenance can not be ignored.
- Consider co-use of EPA property/facilities.
- We should consider hybrid fields (a mix of grass and turf).
- We should sit down with other cities who have developed new facilities and learn from their experience.
- Our fields are suffering from neglect.
- Our fields aren't good enough to attract tournaments, and the dollars that those tournaments could generate for the City.
- We should take Council members to Burlingame so they could see a turn application firsthand.

A number of political forces in the community are, essentially, competing for financial and other resources ... those forces include:

- Sports advocates (that would be us)
- Housing advocates (who might prefer to build housing rather than playing fields on any open space we could identify).
- Environmentalists (whose agenda might conflict with ours ... for example, a possible opposition to turf and to any use other than open space for the Baylands area).
- Social services advocates (for example, the Library update supporters)
- Conservatives (those who worry about $$$)
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INTRODUCTIONS
Meeting commenced at approximately 7:30 pm at the Lucie Stern Community Center.

ATTENDANCE:
Community Members: Craig Laughton, West Bay/Legion; David Goldman, Palo Alto Little League; Chris Stirrat, STCYS; Doug Kreitz, AYSO; Paul Losch, Palo Alto Ruth Baseball; Mike Cobb, Palo Alto Bobby Sox Softball.

City of Palo Alto: Dawn Calvert, Eric Christensen, PA Recreation Division; Paul Dias, Don Piana, PA Parks & Golf Division, Rick Beckwith, PA Parks & Recreation Commission.

MINUTES
Minutes for the meetings of 8/7 (Meeting No. 8) were approved with spelling corrections.

VIDEO PRESENTATION
Staff presented a video on artificial turf ... the 'Field Turf' brand. It is claimed that this turf looks, feels, and plays like grass. Discussion followed the video presentation. The discussion raised the issue of surface temperature of the turf, which in some circumstances can get very hot. There is an issue of standing water in the rain. Plans were made to take a field trip to view new turf installations in Burlingame and Redwood City. The most likely date is 9/17 ... staff will coordinate the arrangements.

It was noted that turf might be a 'hard sell' because it isn't natural ... on the other hand, turf installations would allow funds to be freed for better maintenance of grass fields. It was suggested that a hybrid (turf + grass) might be easier to sell. Water savings is an environmental positive. Suggestions included a pilot program in a politically acceptable location. The trial could be expensive. It might also include lights.

SUBCOMMITTEES
Lighting.

Lighting companies are coming to Palo Alto on 9/9. One goal ... to learn about how neighbors can be protected with directional lighting.
"GOT SPACE" - FACT SHEET

1. DEMAND BY INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM

- Pop Warner: 150
- Girls softball: 400
- AYSO/CYSA: 2,600
- Baseball: 1,000
- Lacrosse/Rugby: 65
- YMCA: 175
- Adult soccer: 700
- Adult softball: 1,500

2. QUALITY OF FIELDS

High demand causes wear faster than it can be maintained...this is not saying staff isn't doing the job, because the wear is so high that proper maintenance is simply not possible. The result — PA no longer offers quality fields and the fields aren't up to the high standards of the community.

3. GROWTH OF USER PROGRAMS

Many of the programs are growing...and that growth is limited by lack of playing field space. We also need facilities for tournaments, which would bring business activity into the community.

4. GROWING POPULATION WILL ADD TO DEMAND

1,500 new family units mandated by the State. Add this the new housing desired and required by Stanford (they use our fields because they participate in both youth and adult sports programs).

5. NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS NEED TO BE RETURNED TO THE NEIGHBORHOODS.

Heavy use has caused neighborhood parks to be used for organized sports, which they aren't designed for; with the results that: (1) neighborhoods are deprived of their intended use and (2) they, too, are suffering great wear that is very hard to maintain. According to staff, the following neighborhood parks are used for organized sports are: Bol, Boulware, Bowling Green, Briones, Cameron, Eleanor Pardee, Hoover, Johnson, Mitchell, Peers, Ramos, Rinconada, Robles, Seale, Weisshaar, and Weery.

6. SOLUTIONS

We are working on the answers...looking at all alternatives, both short and long term. Issues that have been considered include: enhancing and leveraging current facilities, developing new facilities, and regional solutions.

One thing is sure. We aren't going away!
INTRODUCTIONS
Meeting commenced at approximately 7:40 pm at the Lucie Stern Community Center.

ATTENDANCE:
Community Members: Craig Laughton, West Bay/Legion; David Goldman, Palo Alto Little League; Doug Kreitz, AYSO; Paul Losch, Palo Alto Ruth Baseball; Mike Cobb, Palo Alto Girls Softball.

City of Palo Alto: Dawn Calvert, Eric Christensen, PA Recreation Division; Paul Dias, Don Piana, PA Parks & Golf Division, Rick Beckwith, Bill Garvey, PA Parks & Recreation Commission.

MINUTES
Minutes for the meetings of 8/27 (Meeting No. 9) were approved including the accompanying fact sheet.

COUNCIL BRIEFINGS
MC reported on the briefings (by Goldman, Piha, Kreitz, and Cobb) of the Council and the Palo Alto Weekly. The Fact Sheet was used as an outline, and the emphasis was on defining the nature and scope of the problem. For the Council, we briefed Mayor Ojakian and Councilmember Morton. The PAW was represented by Editor Jay Thorwaldson and Sports Editor Keith Peters. The briefings thoroughly covered all the issues we have been discussing over the past many months, and went very well. The two councilmembers were very receptive and supportive. The PAW feature story is scheduled for publication on October 2.

FIELD TRIPS
Little League will have a quote in a few days for a test installation of turf in their batting cage. They will also have quotes for other installations. The batting cage installation will give us an example right here in town.

The field trips were to three installations .. Redwood City, Menlo Atherton High School, and Burlingame. At MA, the vendor was present and provided a very good explanation. Officials in Burlingame are very enthusiastic about their turf installation.
PAUSD

PD said he left convinced, and believes that part of our problem can be solved with turf.

Some other notes and comments about turf: The heat (turf can get very hot) issue was discussed. Burlingame note that you can cool the turf with a spray. In Danville, a warmer climate, they like the turf. They have had a full season in Burlingame where it still looks great ... you can't tell it from real grass. Turf will also be installed at Carlmont.

The cost benefits of turf were discussed, including the payback timeframe. It was noted that a football field requires 5 million gallons of water per year. If injuries are an issue, anecdotal evidence shows fewer injuries.

Question: what about combining turf and grass. More research is probably needed on this idea .... group felt that an all turf installation was probably best.

PA Recreation will follow up with the Sports Turf people. Also, additional field trips to MA may be scheduled as needed for various individuals/groups.

EL CAMINO

PD discussed the proposed underground water storage project at El Camino Park. A focus group has been formed ... should entire Committee be involved? If we are digging up the field, we could take advantage of that and install turf. Could Utilities possibly pay for this? Perhaps lights could also be included. Invitation extended to those who might want to be part of the focus group.

DISCUSSION

What is Committee's focus ... lack of space, or a broader scope? Are we finished after report is issued? Group could become a political entity to address other issues and become a lobbying organization. Issuance of the report could help the Committee become more organized.

Interest was expressed in keeping the Committee together as a "Friends of the Fields" type of political entity. It was noted that this needs to be separated from the Recreation Division and the Recreation Commission...
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It was noted that there are two ways to move forward ... (1) continue work after the report is issued or (2) get more immersed in specific issues. Some thought we should continue to focus on fields for now and take on other issues later. It was observed that the Committee is becoming valued and may be asked to take on other issues.

REPORT TO PARC

The report isn’t ready yet. Staff will be working hard on it over the next several weeks ... there is a great deal of data to pull together. Information needs to be clear, concise, and direct. Committee needs to reach consensus on information, proposed solutions, etc. in the report. Question: should we have just a few, specific suggestions or more, general proposals. DC felt that the more information and choices we present, the better for us. It was noted that we should have specific reasons ... and locations ... for proposed solutions. We should be specific, with tangible proposals site-by-site, field-by-field. We could include an educational section with information on subjects like turf. We should also provide cost and payback information.

The way other cities have handled funding, maintenance, etc. of turf fields was discussed by DP. The questions was raised about user groups paying vs. the City. The potential role of development fees was also noted. The overall solution will require more space and/or the use of turf ... more space raises the need for more maintenance.

The need to brief the PAUSD Board was noted ... a formal briefing was suggested. There is a field at Paly where there could be an opportunity to work with the PAUSD to make improvements.

We also need to educate the public at large. (Note: the October PARC meeting is dedicated to the fields issue.

Stanford has indicated, in meetings with staff, a more open-minded attitude about sharing fields.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:15 pm.

NEXT MEETING

Wednesday, October 9 at Lucie Stern.

Respectfully submitted (largely from notes provided by Eric Christensen)

Mike Cobb
Appendix J

TEXT OF PALO ALTO WEEKLY STORY ABOUT THE PLAYING FIELDS ISSUE

The Palo Alto Weekly ran a feature cover story on the playing fields issue on Wednesday, October 2. The text of that article is reproduced here.
'Field space' contest looming in Palo Alto

Chronic shortage of play, practice fields building into a unified battle for more turf for child, youth and adult sports teams

by Keith Peters and Jay Thorwaldson

The bases weren't loaded but the fields were.

Three out of the four ball fields at Cubberley Community Center on a pleasant evening last spring were filled with girls' softball teams of various ages.

The fourth was occupied by two adult teams.

Two more teams stood more or less patiently on the sidelines, waiting for the next field to open up.

And as soon as one of the girls' games ended, the adult teams hustled onto the field to try to squeeze in a game before darkness terminated the contest.

That is one of nearly a dozen examples of a chronic -- and apparently growing -- field-space shortage in Palo Alto, cited by representatives of a Athletic Fields Advisory Committee that is about to unveil its findings after nine months of meetings.

Other examples include kids' teams having to shorten and "stack" practices in a race against the dusk, fields jammed with teams from several sports (with balls flying from a baseball game into a soccer game, or vice versa), occasional confrontations over scheduled vs. unscheduled use of a park or field space, and school bathrooms not being available to youth teams or game observers.
There was even a case where a woman who had rented two portable outhouses for a soccer match in a city park chained and locked them so football players and onlookers the evening before couldn't use them.

There are stories of an occasional "renegade" baseball coach who resorts to a line drive or two into other teams to clear a field for scheduled play.

The 21-member committee was formed late last year by Paul Thiltgen, Palo Alto's director of community services, in consultation with City Councilman Vic Ojakian, the council's liaison to the Parks & Recreation Commission prior to his becoming mayor in January. Its first meeting was Feb. 5, 2002.

While field-space issues have been an undercurrent in several significant city issues in recent years, the catalyst for creating the committee was a proposal to convert softball fields at the Baylands Athletic Center -- used by Babe Ruth teams and others -- into soccer fields, which became a heated and somewhat bitter confrontation.

The committee technically falls under the auspices of the Parks & Recreation Commission, and will be unveiling its findings -- and some short- and long-term recommendations -- at the commission's Oct. 22 meeting, 7 p.m. in the City Council chambers.

"We hope to move forward and reacap the City Council at its Nov. 18 meeting," committee Chair Dawn Calvert, the city's superintendent of recreation, said. "Our goal is to get the issue clearly on the table and define the problem, and make recommendations to address both the quality and demand issues."

What started last February as a mutual wariness and awareness of past turf wars -- both for space and place in city scheduling -- has evolved into a unified demand that the city finally address the fields issue head on.

"The bottom line is we're not going away," Mike Piha, one of the committee's designated spokespersons and a "Pop" Warner youth football league coach, said of the issue.

"The kids have a right to these fields and they're not getting them."
Piha is one of four designated hitters named by the full committee to speak on its behalf to City Council members and the public. Others include, Doug Kreitz of the American Youth Soccer Association (AYSO) and California Youth Soccer Association (CYSO); Dave Goldman, representing Little League of Palo Alto and other baseball, including Babe Ruth, and "travel teams"; and Mike Cobb, former councilman and mayor and a longtime coach, representing Girls' Softball officially, and unofficially all softball, including adult teams.

"These folks have done a fantastic job for the city," Cobb said of the full committee, which includes several city staff members. "It's been a positive and constructive process.

"We all came with different agendas, and I think now we're pretty much on the same page," he said.

The recommendations, not yet final, will include immediate fixes that are easy and relatively inexpensive, Cobb said.

But they also will include some long-term proposals that will spill over into general land-use questions facing the city, such as the future use of the six-acre Mayfield site at Page Mill Road and El Camino Real, and even into density of future housing developments (such as a 300-plus unit housing development proposed for the Rickeys hotel site) that "add demand" for field space.

"We're all working hard on solutions. It's going to be something we can all buy into," Cobb said.

"From my political experience, this is really an amazing group of people," he said of advisory group members. "But we're not going away. We're really serious and we're really going to press it."

He said he expects supporters of field uses, working with city staff, to form some type of coalition to push for change, "just like the library supporters and supporters of other issues, like transit."

Several committee representatives said field-use discussions should include Stanford and even possibly representatives of neighboring cities, as it's a regional problem. There has been some talk of a "strict
residency requirement," but the representatives said it's not that simple, as some older youth teams depend on non-resident players to fill out their ranks even though many younger teams are turning away wannabe players.

And possibly more than a third of adult softball players may be nonresidents who work in Palo Alto.

Ojakian, who for 15 years coached soccer, baseball and basketball, told the Weekly he will be most interested in the committee's recommendations. He said the space-shortage issue in the community extends to indoor athletic space, and that some basketball programs have been turning away up to 25 percent of the kids who want to join.

Ojakian has asked committee members to limit their advance briefings of council members to himself; Jack Morton, a member of the Park & Recreation Foundation board; Bern Beecham, a member of the City-Stanford Liaison Committee; and Judy Kleinberg. He said this avoids any possible complications with the state's Brown Act open-meeting law.

Ojakian said in his experience the problem encompasses:

* the need for more fields due to the "sheer volume of people playing -- for kids it's more a need for practice fields" because two teams play on one field during games;

* field maintenance because they "get chewed up" and need non-use time to recover; and

* finding a way to reduce use of neighborhood park space by organized teams.

Councilwoman Nancy Lytle, who long has made field space an issue in community politics and was also present at the creation/announcement of the advisory committee, said she has been following its progress with interest.

She said long-term solutions must include looking at the full scope of the problem, including housing-development plans that need to be balanced with expansion of city recreation and other services. She
said examining all areas to see if relocating fields, or even "rotating fields like rotating crops for agriculture," could provide additional space or improve field conditions in the long term.

Field space has been either a direct or indirect factor in several major city debates in recent years, including the abortive proposal in 2000 to relocate the Jewish Community Center to the school district administration site at 25 Churchill Ave. and relocate the district offices.

While not directly displacing field space, it would have precluded a possible return of the area to fields in the future should district offices be moved.

The fields issue was more directly connected to the rejection of the former Ventura School -- now the Ventura Community Center -- as a site for a proposed "intergenerational center" for seniors and child care, a proposal that initially explored moving to Mountain View and now apparently is dead. Allegations that it would displace a soccer practice field were a significant issue in the debate.

Use of Stanford fields or developing new fields on Stanford lands -- there already is some use of Stanford fields for practice in some sports -- is a continuing issue because of the participation by children and adults from Stanford in community teams. But university officials -- locked in a major debate on routing of trails in its foothills lands -- have reportedly been cool on opening such discussions.

There is discussion of exploring other locations in the baylands for additional fields, in dry areas of low environmental sensitivity.

There is also potential spillover into other city projects.

A proposed "emergency water supply" plan that envisions building a 2.4 million gallon reservoir under a large portion of El Camino Ball Park would cause a severe displacement of teams for more than a year during construction.

Keith Peters is sports editor of the Weekly and Jay Thorwaldson is editor. They invite your "field space anecdote," both examples of difficulties or of
cooperation and ingenuity. They can be e-mailed respectively at kpeters@paweekly.com and jthorwaldson@paweekly.com.

BOX SIDEBAR:

Fields issue on TV tonight

The "fields space" issue in Palo Alto will be discussed tonight (Wednesday, Oct. 2) on the Newswatch show of the Media Center, at 6 p.m. p.m. on Channel 27. The show is hosted by Mike Cobb, who is a leading member of a city Athletic Fields Advisory Committee that has been meeting since last February and will be unveiling its report on the problem and short- and long-term recommendations at the Oct. 22 meeting of the city's Parks & Recreation Commission.