



DRAFT

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

**MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
April 28, 2015
DOWNTOWN LIBRARY
270 Forest Avenue
Palo Alto, California**

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

15 **Commissioners Absent:**

16 **Others Present:** Council Liaison Eric Filseth

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

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

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

21
22 Chair Reckdahl: Does anyone have any modifications they want to make?

23
24 Commissioner Hetterly: I do.

25
26 Chair Reckdahl: Okay.

27
28 Chair Reckdahl: This is for the agenda.

29
30 Commissioner Hetterly: Oh, I don't have agenda changes. Sorry.

31
32 **III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

33
34 None.
35



36 **IV. BUSINESS:**

37
38 **1. Approval of Draft Minutes from the Special Retreat March 20, 2015 Meeting.**

39
40 **MOTION:** Commissioner Lauing moved, seconded by Commissioner Hetterly to
41 approve the draft Special Retreat March 20, 2015 Minutes as amended.

42
43 **MOTION PASSED:** 6-0, Crommie absent

44
45 **2. Approval of Draft Minutes from the Regular Meeting March 24, 2015**
46 **Meeting.**

47
48 **MOTION:** Vice Chair Markevitch moved, seconded by Commissioner Hetterly to
49 approve the draft Regular Meeting March 24, 2015 Minutes as amended.

50
51 **MOTION PASSED:** 6-0, Crommie absent

52
53 **3. Study Session on the Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Facilities**
54 **Master Plan to Include: Recreation Program Data Analysis Report, Survey**
55 **Summary Report and Matrix of Public Outreach and Data Collected with**
56 **Draft Findings.**

57
58 Peter Jensen: Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you very much for coming earlier
59 this evening. We do have a few things to get through tonight. Our Master Planning
60 project and connecting the data to the eventual recommendations that will be made.
61 Tonight we are going to discuss the matrix that's set up, which is a tool that we put
62 together to help cross-reference some of the data and to gather that in one location that's
63 easier to reference back to. From the review that we've had over the last week, I feel that
64 this tool is a good tool to use. It makes it a lot clearer for us to understand the analysis
65 that has been done, the data that's been collected. It will definitely help in our next phase
66 of prioritization. This tool, of course, is not the end or making any final
67 recommendations at all. It is a tool to help us cross-reference that data to those
68 recommendations that are going to be made and then to eventually help us prioritize and
69 make recommendations that will go into the Master Plan. We're going to go through that
70 matrix. Of course, tonight we have our team from MIG here, the consultants. Lauren,
71 Ryan, and Ellie will be discussing different aspects of the matrix. There was some data
72 given to you last week with your package. That is items for your binder of mostly
73 analysis and data items that are centered around the matrix and information that have
74 been put into the matrix. I'm hoping that you have had a little bit of time to look at some
75 of that stuff, because it will come up in some of the conversations with the matrix itself. I
76 think our goal here is to review the matrix, feel good about how it's going, and this line of
77 thinking along to get to this summary of the data that will then prepare and propel us to

78 the next phase, which is the prioritization and recommendation phase. I'll let Rob say a
79 few words as well, and then we'll dive right into it.

80
81 Rob de Geus: Thank you, Peter, for all the heavy lifting you've been doing. I'm
82 straddling two jobs here with Greg Betts gone and putting the department budget together
83 and other things and getting up to speed there. I've had to lean even more on Peter and
84 Daren and some of the other staff, so I thank them for that. I'd also thank the
85 Commission. You helped us create this matrix. This is new, you helped design it. What
86 you'll see this evening is still a work in progress, but this is an important meeting as we
87 work through the different elements of the matrix and start to look at the needs that have
88 been identified by MIG and the rationale that they've gone through to define those needs
89 which is a really fascinating discussion. I've had a chance to look at the matrix over these
90 last three days, and I definitely have some questions here and there. I think the logic is
91 really good. It's sound. I'm looking forward to this evening's discussion. Let's get into it.
92 I'll pass it on to MIG.

93
94 Ellie Fiore: I'm going to kick us off just briefly. Again, thank you for carving out some
95 extra time from your evening to be here today to devote some resources to this effort. As
96 Rob and Peter mentioned, our primary goal for the evening is to review and discuss the
97 Summary of Needs that we put together in this matrix. I think you folks saw the
98 framework a couple of months ago. It was an empty shell, but our initial thinking on how
99 do we draw that connective thread from the data, whether it's demographic data or data
100 from community survey or other community outreach efforts, how do we use that
101 information to come up with what we're calling a Summary of Needs. I think this is a
102 tool that, now that we've gone through and combed through all that information that's in
103 your binder and pulled it up to the surface, that we think we have hopefully outlined a
104 linear and logical path of those Summary of Needs. We want to spend some time tonight
105 getting you comfortable with the contents and the organization of the matrix. We have
106 until about 8:30. One of my jobs tonight is going to be keep us moving and keep us on
107 track as much as possible, because we do want to make sure that we devote time to each
108 of the three elements as we've structured the matrix, programs as well as recreation
109 facilities as well as parks, trails and open spaces. One process point, Ryan does need to
110 leave early tonight. He needs to leave at about 7:30, so if you see him leave the room,
111 don't be alarmed. We knew that was going to happen. Again, we want to talk about what
112 the data tells us and how that will be used when we get comfortable and start moving
113 forward. The data is not equivalent to recommendations, and it's not directive. It doesn't
114 tell us what the Plan will eventually say; it tells us what we've learned to date. I also
115 want to draw your attention to one thing in your data and needs summary. On page 2 is a
116 little graphic that outlines nicely what the major phases of this effort are. We are
117 essentially now in the second bubble, the second of two bubbles, so about half way
118 through the process, where we've paused to regroup and outline the data and needs



119 summary. With that, I'll turn it over to Lauren, who will give a bigger picture overview
120 of how this all fits together and where we go from here.
121

122 Lauren Schmitt: As Ellie pointed out, we're really about half way through. You
123 challenged us a couple of months, saying "Whoa. Look at this stack of information.
124 How can we as a Commission digest all of this and understand the way things are and
125 what the needs are in this community, so we can move forward and get behind
126 recommendations?" The last time I was here, I really tried to temper my expectations
127 about how connected those threads could be. Once we started doing it, I was surprised at
128 how many threads we could find. We talked about smoking guns and what those are,
129 maybe focus on those. We feel really good about where this ended up, but I want to point
130 out that this is an important step, right here in the middle. We have a lot of work ahead
131 of us still to do together, with staff, with you. to develop the recommendations. Once we
132 understand the needs, it's really getting our heads around what we want to do about them
133 and what the highest priorities are moving forward. This is a very, very critical step
134 tonight. We're really eager to hear your thoughts. Now, we're going to start with Ryan
135 reorienting you to the matrix, which we are now going to review again. Then we can
136 start digging in. As Ellie mentioned, as we broadly hit on each section tonight, we can go
137 as fast or slow as you want. This is really critical for you.
138

139 Mr. Jensen: Can you either (crosstalk). If you want your own, you can have your own.
140 At the end of the night, everyone should take one of these. I'm going to tend to the extra
141 ones. If you want one right now, you can have one. If not, at the end of the meeting
142 make sure that you take one home. I printed it out bigger so it's easier to read and look
143 at, but it is still a large matrix to look at. That's why we're not looking at it directly on the
144 screen.
145

146 Ms. Fiore: We might have to have Ryan walk through what the structure of this was and
147 then hit some of the highlights that jumped out at us as we analyzed it. Then we'll walk
148 you through what that logical, step-by-step process was in developing it and then talk
149 about the Summary of Needs. We obviously won't be able to get to every cell in every
150 line and that's not our goal. We do want you to get comfortable with what the contents
151 are, where they came from, and how it's being used.
152

153 Ryan Mottau: The updated file that you all got no longer says concept. It was asked of
154 me by a couple of the Commissioners, that being able to understand where the changes
155 were would be a helpful thing. We can pass along a redline copy of that, if that's useful
156 to you. We'll try to make sure that it's clearer as we're intending to update and replace
157 pieces in your binders. This one is a replacement. The earlier one was really a proof of
158 concept document so that we could show you what we were thinking. This one is what
159 we actually used as we were filling the document. If you remember, the first part of this
160 hasn't changed dramatically. We talked a little bit about the process and this goes



161 through and explains the elements, which are the three largest divisions of the overall
162 system. You'll see those divided on the matrix there. The top one being parks, trails and
163 open space. The middle one being recreation facilities, and the bottom one being
164 programming. We're calling those elements mostly to keep them straight. It's not
165 necessarily a scientific term. It's more a useful term for us to differentiate between those
166 and the one more level of detail that we felt was appropriate for this system-wide Master
167 Planning effort. Those we are calling components. Each of the rows essentially is a
168 component as you talk about the different pieces of the overall puzzle that we have
169 assembled here. I want to emphasize one other thing up front as we're looking at this and
170 getting oriented to it. One of the things that we heard across the process from you, from
171 staff, from the community as a whole, is that the focus here should really be primarily on
172 local needs, that we understand we are part of a region, that we have a connection to the
173 region, but that we are planning essentially for the park system in Palo Alto. If we were
174 to decide we were going to serve a larger audience than just the residents of Palo Alto
175 intentionally, then that really does change some of the end-of-the-day picture here. Just
176 to run you through really quick again. The rows, as I said, are the components broken
177 down between each of the elements. Across the column headings here are a whole series
178 of topics essentially that are tied to data points and data sources which are listed there in
179 the second row. Each of those references as well as the individual references that are
180 listed within cells are all keyed to your overall binder. The front of your binder has a
181 document that's just a couple of pages that has the sources that are in there. It describes
182 which document is which. When we say Document 5, this is what the full title of it is.
183 We'll try to stay consistent with that, because we really want between this matrix and this
184 binder and one additional source to be able to pin back. Where did we hear this
185 information? How do we backtrack it through the levels of summarization? As Lauren
186 said, you challenged us to make sure that we could show our work. This is what we're
187 trying to do here: give you guys access to the highest level of summary in this matrix,
188 the main level of summarization and analysis, which is the information that's represented
189 in your binder, as well as one more of level of detail. For those who are really, really
190 interested, we've also provided the raw data in a number of cases. On the project website
191 now, there are at least two of the main sources of raw data that were essentially more
192 paper than we would have ever wanted to produce for each of you for the binders, but
193 things like the program data export that we summarized and analyzed in the summaries
194 that you've been provided. Raw data behind the survey open-ended results, I believe, was
195 available. One final piece was additional appendices on the demographic report which
196 included the school district's latest update of their demographics overall, so the entire
197 report behind that which is another 40 pages or so, providing you the opportunity, if you
198 really want to dig down through our sources. Those were some key ones that we wanted
199 to make sure were available. For each of these columns, what we're essentially doing is
200 trying to provide you the bite of information, the most relevant piece of information or a
201 rating scale that gives us a sense of how intense this particular element or component
202 rated in terms of those topic areas, the level of control, geographic distribution, etc. For



203 each of those columns, there is a set of rating criteria in this document. I want to point
204 you to those, because we had a lot of discussion when we presented this concept about
205 the high, medium and low as a scale, the below, at, over. What do these mean in the
206 context of this matrix? Each of those is described. We tried as best we could where the
207 information existed to tie those to data points. We could use the natural breaks in that
208 data to really show why did this say this was high versus medium or why did we say this
209 medium versus low. When we started digging into the program data, one of the things
210 that we wanted to make sure we understood, where we have that real hard number
211 information, was where are we saying we are below, at or over capacity. Each of one of
212 those corresponds to, in the program analysis Part 2 you'll see references to that
213 throughout that section of the matrix, the tables that summarize the program data by
214 program area and really looking at do we have classes that are not meeting minimums,
215 are we over a third of the classes that we're offering not meeting the minimum
216 enrollments, which was one of the critical data thresholds that the staff has been using to
217 evaluate that program data. Also looking at the classes that were indicated as full or
218 waitlisted as the other side of that criteria. We're using a mix of those and hard cutoffs.
219 If it was 34 percent, then it falls into the next category. We're really trying to keep it at
220 that point, that those are not arbitrary numbers. Where we use those specific numbers,
221 we really used the data to tell us where should these cutoffs be, where do these make
222 sense based on what we're seeing overall, so that we can divide these into meaningful
223 categories. That's one of the things I wanted to point out. In some cases, because the
224 data varied by element, we had a couple of different criteria that would float into there
225 depending on where we were at. We tried to keep it as clear and simple as we could to
226 define these. The final piece on that overall orientation, I want to emphasize that high,
227 medium and low does not mean good, okay and bad. This is high, medium and low as
228 defined in these criteria. Probably the most important one to look at, because it pops out
229 visually as you're reading across this, is the second to last column which is projected
230 demand, Column K. These tend to have a high, medium and low with no sources. This
231 column is largely about our professional judgment and our tracking of what's going on.
232 We've talked that there would be some of that going on in this. It's an important part of
233 this overall process. High, medium and low here does not mean that this is a high need or
234 a medium need or a low need. This means exactly what it says here. High means that
235 there is a lot of opportunity in the future to see new user groups or populations to expand
236 those services, to expand that area. Medium means there is some opportunity, some new
237 user groups. Low is that we didn't see much opportunity to serve new user groups. This
238 is not saying, if there is a low projected demand, that you should stop doing this right
239 now. We're not making those value judgments at this stage. What we're saying is line-
240 by-line do we see in the future opportunity to grow this area. That was a good example
241 of both how the high, medium and low works as well as how we want this information to
242 be read at this stage. We're really looking at the needs overall.
243



244 Commissioner Hetterly: By opportunities to grow, this is really more about projected
245 opportunities to grow as opposed to demand. It's not related to demand at all. Or are you
246 talking about capacity of the system to add on in that area? Are you talking about
247 expected changes in user groups that will make the demand greater in the future?
248

249 Mr. Mottau: Yes, the last.

250
251 Commissioner Lauing: (inaudible)

252
253 Chair Reckdahl: Say that again.

254
255 Commissioner Lauing: It's (crosstalk).
256

257 Mr. Mottau: The projected demand column is about the changes in the overall
258 environment, the way that things are going, that we see the potential to increase the
259 overall user base if additional opportunities were offered as it evolves. I'm sorry I'm
260 tripping over that. Overall the concept is that there is going to be in the future an
261 opportunity you could serve more people with more activities in this area.
262

263 Commissioner Hetterly: You're not saying you expect a greater demand in these areas
264 that have an H there in the future?
265

266 Ms. Schmitt: Yes, we are. There's either a recreation trend that's happening or there's a
267 population segment ...
268

269 Commissioner Hetterly: The first one is an expectation of greater demand. That would
270 get a high if there are also opportunities to expand usage of that particular element.
271

272 Mr. Mottau: There's also the capacity column which is essentially addressing the first
273 part of your point there, which is that there is room within the system as it exists today to
274 ...
275

276 Commissioner Hetterly: This Column K is only about demand.
277

278 Mr. Mottau: Yes.
279

280 Commissioner Hetterly: It's not about capacity to grow.
281

282 Mr. Mottau: Yes.
283

284 Commissioner Hetterly: Thank you.
285

286 Council Member Filseth: Let me see if I can try it. What you're saying is that if it's high,
287 that means you see a lot of potential for demand in the future. If it's low, you don't see
288 potential for a lot more demand than there is today. That doesn't mean you should stop
289 doing it, because it might be fully utilized today.

290
291 Mr. Mottau: Yes.

292
293 Commissioner Lauing: It is demand, because we were talking originally about what all
294 these opportunities might bring us and why do we care about the opportunities if there's
295 not much demand.

296
297 Mr. Mottau: It is demand. It is demand looking forward. It's not a realized demand at
298 this point. Because we aren't offering them now or we aren't offering them at a scale, we
299 need to be able to look beyond what we have the data for. Your Chair pointed this out. If
300 we only look at the things that we can measure right now, how are we ever going to know
301 what the next thing is, how are we ever going to know how to look beyond that. It is
302 demand, but it's a perspective demand.

303
304 Commissioner Lauing: On the same point, I didn't quite get how you said it was
305 quantified. There was a cutoff between low, medium and high based on ...

306
307 Mr. Mottau: On this one, there is not. This one is pretty much purely a professional
308 judgment call. On other columns, there are specific quantifications such as the capacity
309 of talking about the program data. If you look at Column F, where below capacity would
310 equal 33 percent of the classes in that area are not meeting their minimum enrollment
311 which means, according to the overall structure of pricing and enrollment setting, they're
312 not meeting their cost recovery goals.

313
314 Commissioner Lauing: When you get over to G, sorry, yeah, the G Column (inaudible)
315 walkability and that's H and the next one's N. You're saying that is quantitative?

316
317 Mr. Mottau: In Column G, there are some parts of that that we were looking specifically
318 at quantitative data that was provided in the Mapita input. When we were looking at the
319 overall quality of parks, we were using the scores that people gave for those parks
320 overall. There's also an element of that that is about the number of times that it was
321 referenced. If there were deficiencies noted over and over again, then the process is
322 working its way down that rating.

323
324 Ms. Fiore: The data and needs summary beginning on page 5 with the description of the
325 criteria and wherever possible based on the available information and data, we set some
326 quantitative boundaries to those or parameters for having been (inaudible) impossible for
327 every single element and every single component. When you get to Column K, it's our

328 roll up of all of the things that came before overlaid with our professional judgment to
329 come up with the high, medium, low. The next column is the narrative summary
330 providing a little more detail of what that means.

331
332 Mr. Mottau: What we feel the need overall is stated at. The final column there is
333 ultimately the summation of how we read these data points, where that thread led us as
334 we worked through the information.

335
336 Chair Reckdahl: When you measured demand back on Column K, you're measuring this
337 in the users, you're not measuring this in dollars or demand for money to maintain. When
338 Rob and I were walking through this earlier, the special (inaudible) in the departments.
339 Lucy Evans I'm thinking of now in the Baylands, that's not as useable as we would like it.
340 There's a big public demand to bring that to what it used to be. Even though we wouldn't
341 be adding facilities, it would take a significant amount of money to bring that up to what
342 the community wants it to be. When you're talking about demand in that case, are you
343 talking about demand for money to be allocated to these rows or is it just the gross
344 number of people that are going to be going in?

345
346 Ms. Schmitt: This is definitely the people side, looking at what people want to do. The
347 next step in terms of criteria and prioritization is where we start to bring in decision-
348 making criteria, like what is the capital cost, what is the long-term operating costs. You
349 are going to help us set criteria because you may have different financial criteria.

350
351 Chair Reckdahl: I just want to clarify that this is just users. It has nothing to do with
352 money or anything like that.

353
354 Ms. Schmitt: Yes, yes.

355
356 Mr. Mottau: Those other criteria is the next layer of information that we're going to
357 adding over the top of this.

358
359 Chair Reckdahl: It would be useful for me if you would walk through some of these
360 columns. Some of these columns aren't clear exactly what they're measuring.

361
362 Mr. Mottau: Okay.

363
364 Ms. Schmitt: One of the things that we are planning on doing is actually walking across
365 on these shaded ones, because they're really illustrative. I guess a process question for
366 you is do you want some time to just sit back and soak this in for a couple of minutes
367 before we start on that or are you ready to dive in.

368
369 Commissioner Lauing: I think the specific of examples as we're asking about them.

370
371 Mr. Mottau: Great, great. I'm going to following along on my own copy here, because I
372 want to be able to read it a little bit. One of the places that we wanted to start overall was
373 a message that you've heard us talk about as we've gone through different analyses,
374 different summaries, the first of the rows that is highlighted in your matrix. It's Row 11,
375 experience nature as a component of the overall system. I'm going to walk you across the
376 columns here, with one or so examples of each of the pieces. We're going to walk
377 through this experience nature as a starting point to explain where we're at and where our
378 thinking is. The first couple of columns are just identifying it. You've got the component
379 name. As you get to Column C, what we're trying to identify is what's in the inventory.
380 Let's just get strictly facts. What's the volume of what's in our system currently? The
381 next column is level of control. What we're measuring here is really how much authority
382 or ability does the City have to change things or to influence how things will change on
383 that site. There's two big factors in this that we use primarily based on the information
384 we have available. I'm going to stop repeating that over and over again, because I'm just
385 going to make that a blanket statement. All of this is based on the information we have
386 available. We're happy to hear about other sources you think might be relevant. Level of
387 control is primarily based on two major factors. One is ownership of property, whether
388 or not the City owns that property or has control through a contractual obligation. The
389 other that we wanted to acknowledge and recognize was sea level rise, because there are
390 changes that will be beyond our control at some of our sites as a result of sea level rise.
391 It's a relatively small part of the overall sites, but it was something that was definitely part
392 of our analysis. A high level of control would indicate that the City can basically choose
393 what it is that we want to do. There are, of course, policy and legal limits and everything
394 like that, but overall we can decide. If we want to have programming, this is what it's
395 going to be. The next column, E, is geographic analysis. What this is really looking at is
396 the spread of features across the City. We did a couple of different ways of looking at
397 that. You'll see Source 9 listed here. Source 9, if you go back to your handy dandy
398 reference from your binders, is the site-by-site analysis and existing conditions maps.
399 We've got a map in your binder for each of the individual sites. We've also done, as you
400 all know, a set of maps that are referenced in other places that are about the geographic
401 analysis, a kind of breakdown of how far different parts of the system are from the
402 average residents across the City. That's another piece that falls into that geographic
403 analysis column. Capacity and bookings for this item is not available. We know that
404 ultimately there probably is some capacity, but we have no way to measure it. There's an
405 n/a in this column for experience nature. You'll see as we get down into some of the
406 more measureables that that is an important column. The next column is perception of
407 quality. We did not make a decision about absolute quality; we aren't going to make that
408 judgment. What we are measuring here is what people told us about how they see the
409 quality of these sites. In this case, we have a mix. The median is a mixed result
410 essentially. One of the things that is referenced here, specifically where we tried to
411 reference things, was where we heard something that really felt like it pointed in the



412 direction. It's not necessarily the be-all and end-all of our decision, but it was something
413 that was the most clear point on it. In this case, it was Source 13 which is the workshop
414 summary. We heard a lot of things back-and-forth about the desire as well as the mixed
415 availability and opportunity to experience nature in the park system especially outside of
416 the preserves. Looking at expressed need, again this actually goes back to some of the
417 same sources. Sorry, 13, yeah, 13 was the workshop summary. In expressed need, what
418 we're talking about here is not how good it is, but how much do we need it, how much do
419 we need more of it. The criteria there were set up around are we hearing this message,
420 are we hearing that we need more of this particular component in the system across
421 multiple modes of input, across multiple different forms of communicating with the
422 community.

423
424 Chair Reckdahl: Expressed need relative to the current capacity.

425
426 Mr. Mottau: Yes. Not "we love it and we want it to stay." It's "we want more of it. We
427 need more opportunities." Dog parks is a great example of this. We heard over and over
428 again in different forums across the community, "We need more. We need more." We
429 need more of something. Here we're referencing particularly the survey and, I believe,
430 the ...

431
432 Commissioner Hetterly: Stakeholder summaries.

433
434 Mr. Mottau: Stakeholder summaries, okay. Continuing on then, that's an important
435 column. That's one that draws in survey results. It draws in Mapita results. It draws in
436 the individual interviews that we held with folks which are summarized in one of the
437 documents you were provided today as part of your update. The next column, Column I,
438 is about demographic trends. This is really about how we see the trends impacting the
439 overall demand. Thinking about is there based on population growth, based on shifts in
440 the way that people are using parks and recreation across the country, can we see an
441 expectation that demand will be growing as a result of those trends. Or is it going to be
442 basically stable or it's going to be in decline. Overall, because of population growth,
443 we're really seeing most things to either be in a stable situation, essentially growing with
444 population growth, or overall in a growth mode. There really weren't any that we were
445 identifying that were really in decline. I think that what you're seeing there ultimately is
446 that those that have been in decline are essentially getting squeezed out of the system in
447 the first place. It's a natural selection process.

448
449 Chair Reckdahl: If we look at Column I on this experience nature one, we're citing
450 Source 7 that we have growth. Can you explain why we have growth in that one and
451 maybe on Line 6 we're stable for play for children?

453 Mr. Mottau: Source 7 is going to be the primary source for this because that's our
454 document on demographics and trends. In that document on pages 10 to 11, we describe
455 the overall trend which is a very large push nationwide right now to increase the access to
456 nature for youth and families and adults and everybody else, because of disconnection.
457 There is a very strong push in that that is beyond just a growth with population change. I
458 would say that play for children as an access point is going to grow as the population of
459 children grows, which is fairly stable based on the school-age demographics and
460 everything else. We're seeing an increase in the push, so more of those kids and more of
461 those adults are going to be involved in experiencing nature as a result of this overall
462 push across the country right now.

463
464 Chair Reckdahl: On page 10 we're talking about this core plan. They're saying they're
465 spending more and more time with electronic media, and they shouldn't be. They should
466 be playing more with nature. Are you saying that they should be playing? Is that how
467 you get growth here or that we actually have seen that children ...

468
469 Mr. Mottau: We are seeing a trend shift. We're seeing the upward swing of that, but
470 we're also expecting a greater upward swing overall. It is again a little bit perspective.
471 Overall we are both seeing and expecting a larger shift towards this. Much like we've
472 seen in the last five to ten years in the obesity epidemic, we could have said five or ten
473 years ago everybody's getting fatter. The reality is that through concerted efforts and
474 national attention we have actually stabilized that trend and shifted it in a lot of places. I
475 think that it's a very similar and a parallel reasoning.

476
477 Chair Reckdahl: I look at the data, and it doesn't seem to support the conclusion. The
478 conclusion certainly from adult standpoints could well be true. It's just the data that
479 you're citing doesn't seem to support the claim.

480
481 Mr. Mottau: Okay. That's part of the push back that we're totally open to here, Keith. I
482 want to make sure that you don't take this as the honest Gospel truth here. We are trying
483 to interpret data, and we're trying to summarize it at a level that will work.

484
485 Chair Reckdahl: I'm not saying you need to change your conclusion. What I'm saying is
486 in this section I would want some explanation why you would expect growth. If you add
487 another paragraph in here saying we expect more growth because of X, Y, Z, I think that
488 would back up your statement in the matrix. That's the point I'm giving.

489
490 Mr. Mottau: I appreciate that. I do. It's a good point. I think that we do want those
491 connections to be visible.

492
493 Ms. Schmitt: There's also a lot of this external industry research about what the different
494 age segments want to do. Things like bird watching, hiking, you're seeing that increasing

495 rapidly in the older adult population, which also happens to be the population that is
496 increasing rapidly here. That's also one of the other factors in that.

497
498 Chair Reckdahl: That's a good point.

499
500 Ms. Schmitt: That is one of the other factors there. Bird watching is an activity. When
501 you look at national participation data and California specific participation data, it's gone
502 woo, like that. It has really tracked with the population. Now, at some point it's going to
503 plateau unless you're building new bird watchers or whatever. Trying to be attuned to
504 some of those things that happen in more of a natural setting, some of that tracks with
505 your population segments that are projected to grow most rapidly. I think the two that
506 you brought up, the play for children is more stable because your child population is
507 more stable. Older adults, the trajectory seems to be more like that. In addition to the
508 push for the more natural experiences for kids, there's this overall potential growth in
509 those types of activities. That may be better suited to Column K.

510
511 Mr. Mottau: Just to round out the discussion of this particular row here, I want to point
512 out the barriers to participation. In most of the top element here in the parks and
513 recreation element, the barriers to participation are really about access. They're really
514 about do we have the places to experience this near the people who are living there. In
515 this case, we cite Source 10 which are those geographic analysis maps. I just want to
516 point out we're actually reading it a little bit in inverse. It's the map that shows where the
517 opportunities to experience, relax, and enjoy the outdoor environment are. One of the
518 things that we noted in reading those maps overall is where most of the opportunities to
519 experience nature are. We saw this in our side-by-side evaluation as well. It exists
520 around that periphery and is difficult to access on foot or by bike. There are barriers to
521 people just getting there. That's Column J. Column K, as I said, is a little bit of a
522 summary, a little bit of professional judgment. As Lauren is saying, there's definitely the
523 two big demographic segments of the youth and the elderly or the active adults where
524 we're seeing potential for growth in that area. There's a lot of audience that could be
525 served but is not yet being served. Our summary overall of the need for that area then
526 reflects that. It's really talking about needing additional spaces to relax and enjoy the
527 outdoors. This citing is critical. Oh, right, I'm looking at the wrong one. Sorry. The
528 integration and natural process is in features in parks and potential to support this. Parks
529 with tree fringe are an interesting opportunity. As explored in the visual preference
530 survey across the workshops, the opportunity to integrate natural features and experiences
531 into the more urban parks was something that is an expressed need as well as a need that
532 we think is borne out by the overall data set.

533
534 Chair Reckdahl: There's a park in Los Altos where there's a creek flowing through it and
535 the kids can actually go down and play in the creek.

537 Mr. Mottau: Touch the creek, yeah.
538

539 Chair Reckdahl: I've had a lot of the people comment saying, "I wish Palo Alto had
540 something like that." Unfortunately, most of the creeks in Palo Alto are concrete, so it
541 makes it much harder. I would concur, but there seems to be a (inaudible).
542

543 Mr. Mottau: Yeah.
544

545 Commissioner Ashlund: Bol Park has creek access.
546

547 Commissioner Lauing: Clarification on this Column J. I'm just trying to stay with a
548 specific example so we can understand conceptually what you're doing. You've got J as
549 being high and your reference there was because the nature areas, I presume that means
550 that you identified in C, are on the outer rim of the City. I'm going to ask the quantitative
551 question then. Is there some sort of mileage number that you have in there? Let me
552 explain why I asked that. You've taken out 30 parks for this description, because you
553 want only natural parks. You've taken out most of the inventory of the City, because you
554 say there's difficult access. On the other hand, if somebody really wants to get into
555 nature, then maybe a 10-minute drive to get to Foothills Park is not so tough. I'm just
556 trying to figure out how you're making these quantifications here.
557

558 Mr. Mottau: In terms of the first part of your question, in terms of there being a specific
559 mileage, no. What we were analyzing is really how people were responding. There were
560 a variety of points here. People saying, "We know that this stuff exists out there, but we're
561 not able to get to it." There's an assimilation of a variety of points that are feeding into
562 that. The second point really of how do we define what that experience of nature looks
563 like, why do we rule out 30 parks, is a very valid one and a difficult one to pin down.
564 Specifically, we heard overall that the people of Palo Alto do not believe that their typical
565 park experience in the City parks represents that natural experience.
566

567 Ms. Schmitt: The reason that first column says you can experience nature at four park
568 sites as well as the preserves is really about is it a manicured setting. Your parks are
569 lovely, but mostly every piece of ground has been developed as a landscape. There are a
570 few parks where it's more of what was there before and it's more of a wild (crosstalk).
571

572 Commissioner Lauing: I think we get the differences, and I think that's a fair statement.
573 I'm just saying how hard is it to do a 10-minute drive to get to nature. I look at it the
574 other way. Imagine this goes to Council and they say, "We're really pleased that what
575 our citizens want to do most is experience nature." But the source says that's really hard
576 to do. What we have to do now is put in some more. We're trying to do that to please
577 them. (crosstalk) It's a moot point.
578

579 Ms. Schmitt: Here's the thing. This is where we're getting to on the priority setting. You
580 can decide how to respond to that. You can say, "You know what? What we've heard
581 from the community is it's really most important to get out in real nature." It might take a
582 little longer, but you can have a couple hour experience and it's a great experience. That's
583 okay. You might decide, based on what we heard, to reintegrate, as we suggested as a
584 need, some natural spaces into appropriate developed parks, so people have something a
585 little closer to home. There could be a big expense if you wanted to monkey around with
586 a creek, but there could also be some benefit. The point here is to try to give some data
587 points on which you can make those decisions as we develop criteria together. Some of
588 those are going to be cost-benefit and what the return on investment is. Yeah, they're not
589 exactly the crux of the problem, but the crux of what we need to do next together.

590 Commissioner Ashlund: What were the four sites that ...
591

592
593 Mr. Mottau: I have a file that specifies, and I believe that what we came down to was El
594 Palo Alto Park, which while small is a much more natural experience. There were, I'm
595 trying to remember.

596
597 Commissioner Crommie: Probably Bol Park.
598

599 Mr. Mottau: Yeah. It was a mix of the inventory and the individual site analyses. I have
600 this list, and I'm trying to remember what they are off the top of my head and I don't
601 remember them off the top of my head. Basically there were four sites that were called
602 out as a result of our site visits and the inventory work that basically were highlighted
603 there.
604

605 Commissioner Ashlund: When you're saying (video break) the existing condition maps
606 and all the maps are here, so there's no indication in the binder of what four sites you're
607 referring to?
608

609 Mr. Mottau: That is a real possibility actually. I know that we had made references to
610 specific ones in the existing condition maps and that's not referenced which is a good
611 point. Where it's not all of the preserves or all of the parks, getting those numbers
612 clarified would be a good clarification for us. We've got that backup. We thought we
613 were referencing something that may have been more in our collective minds than on
614 paper.
615

616 Mr. de Geus: What I found to be helpful with the matrix and trying to understand the
617 thinking, one of the things in particular was to take out this sheet for the data needs
618 summary report and keep reminding myself how is that defined and then reread that and
619 then look at this and then look at the data. I was able to make the connection a little
620 easier. Ed had a couple of questions here about a number of these headings and these are

621 just headings, the way they're described and what does high really mean and low really
622 mean in this context is helpful to me. There's so many data sources, it's helpful to be
623 reminded by having this with you as go. That's what I found helpful.

624
625 Ms. Fiore: Two points. One, I just want to remind you this is a working draft, so this is
626 an evolving document. We're going to refine it based on what we hear tonight, and we're
627 going to refine it based on questions you come back to us with. Don't think this is a static
628 be-all end-all document by any means. Please give us those questions. The other point is
629 on the time and process. We've got about 10 more minutes before I'm going to shift to
630 the programs element particularly while we still have Ryan here. Would it be helpful to
631 walk through another example that we highlighted in this section? Was that a useful
632 exercise?

633
634 Chair Reckdahl: I think that would be (crosstalk) another row (crosstalk).

635
636 Mr. Mottau: Sure, sure. I'll do this one a little bit quicker. We've got a few of the
637 questions starting to sort out a little bit here as we go. Let's go down to Row 14.

638
639 Mr. Jensen: I think we need to change the tape.

640
641 Mr. Mottau: Okay, we'll pause for a moment while we change the tape. We're on. I'm
642 going to zip through real quick one that I know is near and dear to everyone's heart which
643 is the availability of restrooms, Row 14. This one was particularly called out because it is
644 an absolutely essential function of parks in some settings. I'm not trying to make a value
645 judgment that you should have a restroom in every single park and every single place in
646 the community. That is the component that more people commented on, that more
647 people noted in terms of quality, in terms of everything else. It is high in people's minds
648 in terms of park usage. Working across here, inventory. This one is a little bit more
649 explicit. It's called straight out in the inventory, where they exist, where they do not. The
650 level of control, these are all in sites pretty much that the City owns. We can decide
651 whether or not there are restrooms in those sites. There are of course caveats to that. The
652 geographic analysis, while we did not run a map-based analysis of it, we definitely made
653 an observation here essentially that what we heard overall was that there was a
654 dissatisfaction with the availability of restrooms across the system. The capacity in both
655 observation of the site as well as overall from the input, we're really saying that the
656 existing facilities are over their capacity to support the overall system. That is not
657 necessarily true at individual levels. Thinking about the system as a whole here, we felt
658 that it was. Perception of quality overall, this was something that ...

659
660 Chair Reckdahl: I have a question. Over means we have more capacity than need.
661

662 Mr. Mottau: No. Over is over capacity essentially. There's not enough capacity to
663 support the need.

664
665 Chair Reckdahl: If you go down to community gardens, which is four lines lower, we
666 have a big waitlist on community gardens and there you say below.

667
668 Mr. Mottau: We actually don't have a wait list on community gardens any more.

669
670 Chair Reckdahl: We don't?

671
672 Mr. Mottau: No. This year there are available community garden plots currently,
673 according to the data that we were given two months ago. We were talking with the
674 gardeners. They've cut down the size of plots; that was a functional decision not a
675 capacity decision. The demand has fluctuated a bit, but currently we are actually below
676 the overall capacity.

677
678 Chair Reckdahl: Over means that we have a shortage?

679
680 Mr. Mottau: Yes.

681
682 Chair Reckdahl: At the top of the column it says capacity divided by bookings.

683
684 Mr. Mottau: No, it's capacity or bookings. I would say that it's because we don't have
685 bookings data specifically for all points. We wanted to talk about capacity or bookings.

686
687 Chair Reckdahl: It would be nice if someone could put a key up there that said over
688 means shortage or something like that. It wasn't obvious to me that over means that we
689 have a shortage.

690
691 Mr. Mottau: I agree that it's a little awkward language-wise. I think we can try to clarify
692 that, maybe choose some different language. The perception of quality overall, these
693 were out of, double checking my guess here, out of the intercepts. The availability as
694 well as the overall quality of the facilities, we were seeing people often comment on these
695 as low quality. I don't think that that is an absolute statement. Because of the sources of
696 this information, it is probably commenting more again on the availability of the facility
697 than the actual cleanliness on any given day; although, people are wont to comment on
698 that as well. I want to just point that out. Expressed need, this is one where we have not
699 only multiple sources listed. In our previous conversations about this matrix and trying
700 to identify data points that really do feel like a smoking gun, we have a survey result
701 specifically about the desire for restrooms. It's cited here. Citywide it was listed as one
702 of the highest supported features to overall support the usage of parks. We have a very

703 strong result there as well as supporting results from multiple inputs. Again we heard a
704 consistent message across lots of different input points. Demographic trends ...

705
706 Commissioner Hetterly: I have a question.

707
708 Mr. Mottau: Oh, sorry. Please.

709
710 Commissioner Hetterly: That's one in particular that I think if you drill down further you
711 might come to a different conclusion. While overall across the whole system there is
712 high demand, high expressed need for bathrooms. On a site-by-site basis, there's very
713 mixed and inconsistent opinion about whether any particular park should have a
714 bathroom or not. That may be helpful to capture in some way.

715
716 Ms. Schmitt: I think we can get some of that possibly through Mapita. I think what it
717 gives you a counterpoint to is when you do a site-specific Master Plan, the folks who tend
718 to come out are going to live right nearby and they're going to have their own particular
719 opinions based on "I live right next door." It's really hard to capture is there a need or
720 not. I think this helps give you a picture of where that priority is across the City and
721 might help you set policy based on a level of park use or we want to do this, we don't
722 want to do this, here's one we do. That might help you go into design processes later on
723 with some better foundation and grounding.

724
725 Mr. Mottau: In the demographic trends for this, we decided ultimately we were not going
726 to make a statement about demographic trends, because it felt as though it was a universal
727 point. It pretty much changes with population. Barriers to participation again, most of
728 these lines reference back to the overall availability. Because of the type of facilities
729 we're talking about here, the type of amenity that we're talking about here, it's a little bit
730 less differentiated in terms of the way that those points play out. We definitely have, as
731 I've said here, more times where we're citing the availability of the restroom as the issue.
732 Overall I think that this one as a whole rests largely on where they are distributed and the
733 overall expressed need across multiple inputs.

734
735 Chair Reckdahl: I'm still confused about the barriers to participation for public
736 bathrooms.

737
738 Mr. Mottau: If it is not ...

739
740 Chair Reckdahl: Does this reflect the current design or is this inherent in public
741 bathrooms?

742
743 Mr. Mottau: I would say that barriers to participation across the board is reflective of the
744 current situation.

745
746 Mr. de Geus: How many bathrooms are available (crosstalk).
747

748 Mr. Mottau: Are they where we want them to be?
749

750 Chair Reckdahl: Isn't that capacity as opposed to barrier to participation?
751

752 Mr. de Geus: You can look at it that way too. They both talk to one another. In this
753 case, if there's a park and it doesn't have a bathroom, it's a big barrier.
754

755 Mr. de Geus: There's a lot of parks that don't have bathrooms; therefore, the barrier is
756 going to be high. I think that's what you ...
757

758 Mr. Mottau: Yeah. That's generally the thinking here. One other thing that I would add
759 which isn't cited specifically here, it actually creates a barrier to participation in other
760 things. For example, the sports users made a very big point of it is almost impossible for
761 them to use a park that has no restroom, because they're going to be onsite with a whole
762 bunch of very small children for an extended period of time. It really does create a
763 barrier to using that site. I have personal experience as well as a lot of anecdotes about
764 the barrier that it presents for parents of very small children in general to use their
765 neighborhood park without a restroom available. That's not really how we intended that
766 category to be applied globally, but it is something that relates specifically to this element
767 or this component. Overall we see that projected demand, there's a lot of potential to
768 serve a larger set of the population. Ultimately the summary of our need there, restrooms
769 at more sites potentially provided as a standard feature at Palo Alto parks. I know that is
770 potentially a controversial statement. We want to emphasize again that this is not the
771 recommendation. We think, based on everything we've heard, it probably should be
772 considered as a standard feature. That's where we came out with the summary on that
773 point. We're a little bit over our desired time to make sure that we get into the programs,
774 but I do want to make sure that any other final comments got captured here.
775

776 Commissioner Crommie: I'm sorry I came late. I just wanted to capture a comment. I
777 know that people really want more experience of nature in parks. I think by putting in an
778 artificial creek in a park, in my view, that meets that less well than preserving (inaudible)
779 in the park. I just wanted to make that comment.
780

781 Mr. Mottau: It's a lower quality obviously of experience. It could even be detrimental in
782 some situations where it's not related.
783

784 Commissioner Crommie: Right. I would just put an emphasis on conservation and
785 protection of what we have. I think it feeds that desire more adequately.
786

787 Mr. Mottau: Yeah, please.
788

789 Commissioner Ashlund: Can I ask one more clarification about these barriers. I'm
790 talking physical barriers. Capacity is capacity. Is it redundant to that? When we have
791 high barriers for swimming pools, for example, does that mean that we have some ...
792

793 Mr. Mottau: I think that's an interesting point, a good point to focus on. I would say the
794 difference between capacity and barriers there, the capacity would be I got to the pool
795 and I couldn't get in because they had no more room in that pool for me to swim or no
796 more life guards or whatever. A barrier would be I cannot get to that pool because it's on
797 the other side of town and I don't have transportation.
798

799 Ms. Schmitt: Or it costs too much.
800

801 Mr. Mottau: Or it costs too much, yeah. They are related, of course, but I think they are
802 worth considering separate if possible.
803

804 Ms. Schmitt: As Rob pointed out, definitely refer back to the criteria, because the
805 barriers to access and participation say these could include costs, location, physical
806 accessibility. Around park sites we heard feedback from people for transportation
807 availability and to the specific facilities maybe less so with your system than with some
808 places where "Our recreation centers are open from 9:00 to 3:00 Monday through Friday.
809 Isn't that convenient?" That could be a barrier. Here this is reported, and it's a lot of
810 different sources. In using Mapita people could actually report specific barriers to
811 movement. In some cases, those are what is cited. In other cases at public meetings,
812 people talked about physical accessibility or perceived costs or transportation barriers.
813 The sources are pretty important there, because it's a real mixed bag because there's a lot
814 of different types of barriers.
815

816 Chair Reckdahl: I'm still trying to wrap my brain around this. On one hand, if you have
817 something like golf that takes a long time to learn and it's expensive, that would be a
818 barrier to participation. Even though we might look at it and say we're considering
819 expanding the golf course, you'd say is this something that we should spend our money
820 and then say well there's barriers to participation that the people in the City don't know
821 how to play golf. It'll be hard for them to take advantage of this, so it makes it less
822 attractive for us to (crosstalk).
823

824 Mr. Mottau: I would clarify that I don't think that the length of time to learn and the cost
825 could be a barrier. I think you might address that in either programmatic or budgetary
826 decisions about that course. I understand the thought exercise, and I'm having a hard
827 time jumping back to where would we put another golf course or expanding the golf

828 course. I think the barriers would be an influencing factor to how or why you would
829 enhance ...

830
831 Ms. Schmitt: In the way that barriers are defined here though, the fact that it takes a long
832 time or you need a lot of equipment, that's really not factored in. The fact that your golf
833 course is one side of town and you have to go across a number of streets to get there, it
834 may be that somebody cited particular barriers along the way. We couldn't really
835 measure people's opinion on every single activity, like is it too much of a barrier for you
836 to learn how to play golf. That's really a programmatic decision of the golf course
837 operator about how to encourage play. We're not talking about barriers in that particular
838 way.

839
840 Chair Reckdahl: I see a high barrier. Does that mean it's more attractive to add that
841 facility or less attractive to add that facility?

842
843 Ms. Fiore: It's not a one-to-one. I think that's (crosstalk).

844
845 Ms. Schmitt: In some cases it's difficult to get to certain facilities. If you jump up to line
846 9 that activity aspect of gathering together, there's low barriers to participation because
847 you provide it in a lot of places. There's a lot of places throughout the City to do that.
848 People didn't report that they had a hard time going someplace to do that activity. That
849 got low; whereas, if you have fewer facilities or their location is something that people
850 reported as problematic in getting to or the facilities don't exist. According to Daren, his
851 staff sees the issue about not having restrooms at certain parks, because if little kids have
852 to go, their parents are sending them in the bushes. They either don't go to the park or ...

853
854 Chair Reckdahl: The barriers to participation, how am I going to use that in park
855 planning? We already have a column over here that talks about capacity. If you look at
856 the restroom one, the fact that we don't have enough restrooms has already been reflected
857 in Column F. What is Column J telling me that I don't already know?

858
859 Ms. Schmitt: Maybe restrooms would make sense to say n/a, because it's addressed
860 enough in capacity. In terms of many of these columns though, there's a lot of policy
861 decisions that affect how people might take advantage of your system and services that
862 you're providing. I think that is where it's really going to help you, as we get into the
863 policies around fees and charges and where you locate facilities, where you do
864 programming, where you encourage certain types of activities and where you allow
865 bookings of certain types of activities. They will be an input that will help you think
866 about how those policies play out (crosstalk).

867
868 Chair Reckdahl: I don't want to (inaudible) so let's move on to the recreation programs.

869



870 Mr. Mottau: We're going to jump down to Programs. Part of that is accommodating me,
871 and I your appreciate willingness to do that. We're going to jump into that because I have
872 a lot of the accumulated knowledge and thinking of this in my head. I'm going to have to
873 depart in 15 minutes. I want to give you guys an orientation to this. I want to emphasize
874 two of the pieces that you received that went into your binders today that really played
875 heavily in this one. The first one is Part 2 of the recreation analysis. We heard very
876 strongly from you all that you wanted to get more detail about how the current
877 programming is rolling out, what are the stats showing, what is the data behind this. This
878 Part 2 which is meant to be added behind the first part, which talked about generally what
879 programs are offered by who, what kind of barriers might we be facing. This one is very
880 specifically about the recreation registration data across the City of Palo Alto. This one
881 goes into each of the program areas that are listed here on the matrix. There is a table
882 that shows the number of classes, the number of participants, the participants per class,
883 etc. The number of classes that have waitlists, I want to emphasize that one because it is
884 the number of classes that have waitlists, not the number of people on waitlists. That is
885 an important distinction, because sometimes there is one extremely popular scenario. For
886 example, there's one swimming slot that obviously is the perfect swimming slot for the
887 entire City of Palo Alto, because there's like 400 people on the waitlist. That was a total
888 outlier in most cases. We counted them by the number of individual sessions that had
889 waitlists, not by the number of people on that waitlist.

890
891 chair Reckdahl: If you go to page 29, I don't understand how we get more than 100
892 percent (crosstalk).

893
894 Mr. Mottau: That's a good point. We didn't use that in a hard sense. Basically using the
895 data that we have, classes that were indicated as full could also have been indicated as
896 having a waitlist. The final column was the percentage of classes that were indicated
897 either as full or with a waitlist. Basically what we were doing was intentionally giving a
898 little bit of a double count to the classes that had a waitlist. Because it's 100 percent and
899 the other one is 150 percent, it's not meant to be that one's better than the other. It was
900 mean to acknowledge the fact that you have classes that fill and you have classes that
901 have standing waitlists.

902
903 Chair Reckdahl: Do you have two columns and have percentage of classes full and
904 percentage of how long approximately the waitlist is?

905
906 Mr. Mottau: We didn't break that down.

907
908 Commissioner Crommie: I agree with that. Does that relate back to the criteria that you
909 set on page 22? I had a comment on the last criteria. You have four bullets on page 22.
910 Do you know what page I'm talking about? I think it relates to this over 100 percent. Is
911 it this bullet point here?

912
913 Chair Reckdahl: Yes.

914
915 Commissioner Crommie: I'd like to comment on that bullet point. Is this the time to do
916 it?

917
918 Mr. Mottau: Sure.

919
920 Commissioner Crommie: I agree with Commissioner Reckdahl. We are not well served
921 by seeing something that's over 100 percent, because it doesn't give us a granular
922 (inaudible).

923
924 Commissioner Hetterly: If you have the number of classes and the number of classes
925 with waitlists listed separately, I actually liked the double count because it stands out
926 more.

927
928 Mr. Mottau: It gave us a simple metric. I agree that percentages over 100 make people
929 antsy. I get that; I do. Maybe it's the fact that it's a percentage ...

930
931 Ms. Schmitt: It got extra credit.

932
933 Mr. Mottau: It skews it because you're naturally trained to not want it to add up to more
934 than 100. The intention there was definitely to give that extra emphasis.

935
936 Chair Reckdahl: I guess as long as we have the raw data there, then it's not quite as
937 important.

938
939 Mr. Mottau: The information that it's calculated on is presented right there. If you're
940 comfortable with that, I understand the comment. In a lot of ways I would prefer not to
941 go back and rerun 27 tables or whatever to break that out. I have the Excel sheet; I could
942 do that fairly quickly. It's just getting back into a document and getting back out and
943 distributed is a little bit more production that may not be worth it.

944
945 Chair Reckdahl: I don't know, but my personal opinion is that as long as the raw data is
946 there, then I guess it's okay. It's not as clear as I would like, but it's good enough.

947
948 Commissioner Crommie: Can I just ask about the bullet point on page 22? I don't
949 understand it.

950
951 Mr. Mottau: Okay.

952

953 Commissioner Crommie: There's a group of four bullet points on page 22, and it's the
954 fourth one in the group of four. You have percent of classes full or waitlisted, and then
955 you give how you calculate that. It seems to me that you should be saying percent of
956 classes full and waitlisted. I'm a little bit confused about the use of "or" there. Is it "or"
957 or "and?" They mean two different things.

958
959 Mr. Mottau: It's not "and," because there are classes that are full but not waitlisted. It
960 would be "or," because it would need to be inclusive but also allow for either option.

961
962 Commissioner Crommie: Right. Some of them are both?

963
964 Mr. Mottau: Some of them are both.

965
966 Commissioner Crommie: And some of them are not?

967
968 Mr. Mottau: Some of them are both; some of them are just full; some of them are neither.
969 There are none that are waitlisted without being full as far as I saw, and that shouldn't
970 happen unless it was a coding error. Yes, there are some that are both and some that are
971 not and some that are one.

972
973 Commissioner Crommie: I personally found that confusing, and I would like to see it
974 parsed out. Again, you may need the whole Commission to weigh in on it.

975
976 Mr. Mottau: Okay. If we're all clear on why that is what it is, I'm happy to field your
977 comment. I understand where you're coming from; I really do. I don't want to hang up
978 this conversation on that point for now.

979
980 Commissioner Hetterly: While we're on that point, can I just ask another question about
981 one of the charts on page 28?

982
983 Mr. Mottau: Sure.

984
985 Commissioner Hetterly: Table 7 of day camps, you have number of full classes taught,
986 the number of classes with a waitlist. For debate and freshman leadership and possibly
987 some other, the number of full classes is smaller than the number of waitlist classes. Is
988 there (crosstalk).

989
990 Mr. Mottau: You're proving me wrong there. No, that's an interesting point. I will look
991 into that. Like I said, it could either be a coding error or it could be that they were for
992 some reason creating waitlists intentionally for classes that were not indicated full. I will
993 clarify that with the program staff. That is Table 7. Can you note that for me? Thank
994 you. Sharp eyes.

995
996 Commissioner Ashlund: The example on Table 8 on the top of page 29 for basketball. If
997 there's 12 classes, 4 are full, 3 are waitlisted, and yet 0 are under the minimum. It doesn't
998 add up for me.
999

1000 Mr. Mottau: That's a good clarifying point. Thank you. There is a difference between
1001 meeting the minimum and being full. Does that make sense? If you ...
1002

1003 Commissioner Ashlund: Can you walk through one of those lines and explain?
1004

1005 Mr. Mottau: Sure. Basketball, we're all on Table 8 on page 29. Basketball has 12
1006 sessions offered. The number of participants registered are 288, which makes the
1007 average participants per class 24. There were 0 classes canceled in that program area.
1008 None of those 12 classes that were originally offered were cancelled, so there's a 0
1009 percent canceled out in the classes that were scheduled. None of those classes were
1010 under the minimum and not canceled. That would mean that we didn't meet our
1011 enrollment minimum, but we continued to offer it anyway. We were close or we decided
1012 to offer it for one reason or another. That's an important number, because those are the
1013 marginal or the rule breaker programs. They're right outside of the envelope that we're
1014 supposed to be in. The envelope would have been essentially if it was under the
1015 minimum, it got canceled. The number of full classes, there is a field of registration date
1016 that indicates, "This class is now full. We're done." There is also a waitlist number, and
1017 we counted how many classes had a waitlist. Again just clarifying, not the number of
1018 people on that waitlist. There were 4 full classes out of those 12 basketball classes;
1019 presumably 3 of the classes that were full have a waitlist, so 58 percent of the overall
1020 classes, 7 out of 12, were full or waitlisted overall. It gives a little bit of that double
1021 count. We've talked about that a little bit, but that's the breakdown across one of those
1022 rows.
1023

1024 Mr. de Geus: Just on the question. I would have to look at the detail behind this to
1025 understand it. With some of these academic classes, what can happen is parents can sign
1026 up their kids for a program and then, after the first day of class, the kid doesn't want to go
1027 anymore, not going back to that. We had waitlists already, so you can end up having a
1028 class that ends up not being full in the final analysis of the data, but does have a waitlist.
1029 I don't know if that happened here, but that happens more often in the academic classes
1030 than some of the other ones.
1031

1032 Chair Reckdahl: They don't get billed?
1033

1034 Mr. de Geus: They don't, because the class has already begun and we don't prorate.
1035 More importantly, parents need to organize their summer way in advance, so when it

1036 comes time to that child not coming back to that camp, it's too late. The parent that was
1037 on the waitlist now is (inaudible).

1038
1039 Mr. Mottau: Where we've taken a year out of data and said this is what the most recent
1040 year looks like, the problem with snapshotting something that is that flexible is that you
1041 run into a lot of those things. One of the things that was clarified for us, and I want to
1042 bring up real quick even though it's not one of our highlighted lines, is adult aquatics, a
1043 very small program as you can see from the numbers in the summary. On top of that, the
1044 instructor who is responsible for a lot of the classes had a medical issue that essentially
1045 prevented the person from offering those classes. This was an outlier year out of a small
1046 program. We decided ultimately we weren't going to try to adjust numbers or rule it out
1047 or anything, because it's such a small item in the grand scheme of things. We did get that
1048 clarification from our aquatics section director. He offered that suggestion, and I believe
1049 that I had clarified that in the bullets in the document. Just really quickly, I want to run
1050 through the columns here that are particularly interesting. What we're touching on right
1051 now is the critical one, which is the capacity of booking. In the data needs summary that
1052 was handed out this evening, if you're looking at that table for day camps and you look at
1053 the number, this will dictate essentially are we over or are we at or are we below our
1054 capacity overall. The numbers on that, I think I touched on. If it's below capacity, more
1055 than 33 percent of the class (video break) they're getting canceled. We're canceling a
1056 third of the classes that we're offering. We have capacity in that program obviously.
1057 These, by the way, are based on natural breaks in the data that we were observing. As we
1058 went through, we break these out into categories pretty well. At capacity, we were saying
1059 "It's less than a third of the classes not meeting minimums that actually end up jumping
1060 up."

1061
1062 Commissioner Crommie: Where are you?

1063
1064 Mr. Mottau: I'm looking at the criteria on the data needs summary document.

1065
1066 Ms. Schmitt: Row 36 and then on day camps, Column F. This is why day camps is over
1067 because ...

1068
1069 Mr. Mottau: Because they had more than 33 percent of their classes full or waitlisted and
1070 less than 10 percent of their classes were canceled. We gave a little bit of credit for the
1071 fact that sometimes things get canceled for reasons that are beyond anybody's control.
1072 Usually you can't get to 100 percent utilization in any venue. You look at room
1073 bookings, you look at real estate, you look at whatever, you're going to have some
1074 capacity left. We're not going to get to 100 percent, but we said less than 10 percent and
1075 that we were seeing a third of our classes go over that waitlist or full criteria. That's a
1076 really important one as you look through these. Overall there were several that were
1077 definitely over. Day camps was one of them. Interestingly, day camps, as you move

1078 through these, the expressed need was very low. We did not hear much at all about day
1079 camps. We know from the program data and from the professional opinions of the staff
1080 and the overall enrollment, these are actually a very critical and a huge part of the effort
1081 of what the recreation group is working on. As we pulled those two things together, we
1082 definitely see the demand for that has the potential to increase, but also that there is a
1083 high need for that evolving variety. It's like there is going to be an ongoing need for day
1084 camps.

1085
1086 Commissioner Crommie: When you said you didn't hear an expressed need, what are
1087 you referring to?

1088
1089 Mr. Mottau: The expressed need, again back in the data needs summary, it talks about
1090 did we hear about this as an area that needed to be expanded across multiple different
1091 inputs.

1092
1093 Commissioner Crommie: From who?

1094
1095 Mr. Mottau: From the community, from the community.

1096
1097 Commissioner Crommie: How? How?

1098
1099 Mr. Mottau: We have half a dozen or more public involvement efforts that we resolved
1100 over that. Each of the sources is listed across the top of the matrix. We looked at did we
1101 hear about it in the intercepts? Okay, that's one. Did we hear about it in the workshops?
1102 That's another one. Did we hear about it in Mapita? Did we hear about it in the survey?
1103 As we started racking those up, if we were hearing a consistent message across multiple
1104 areas, that's where it got to be high.

1105
1106 Ms. Schmitt: In the case of day camps, it really just didn't come up. It really didn't come
1107 up. It may be that at the beginning the people (crosstalk).

1108
1109 Mr. Mottau: Just think it's going really well.

1110
1111 Ms. Schmitt: So it just didn't come up. There weren't write-in comments whereas many
1112 other things people would bring it up, they would write in comments. We just didn't hear
1113 a lot about it. I think what Ryan is trying to illustrate is just because we didn't hear a lot
1114 about it doesn't mean that people don't want it. They're clearly signing up for the many,
1115 many camps that are offered.

1116
1117 Mr. Mottau: The one other piece that I want to bring your attention to is the additional
1118 meetings log. The additional data that we provided here is the key points from a variety
1119 of meetings we've been holding with your professional staff as well as stakeholders that

1120 are related to particular topics. This is an effort that we've been doing partly in response
1121 to your question, partly at the suggestion of your staff, and partly because it just needed
1122 to be happening to clarify individual details. We didn't provide great depth of detail.
1123 What we were really looking for was what were some of the key points that we heard
1124 from each of these groups. This is referenced in several places under Source 17. It's one
1125 of the updates that you'll be receiving regularly. I just wanted to note that in the
1126 programming area, there were a couple of groups that were really relevant here. The
1127 aquatics group which was users, coaches, as well as your aquatics staff. There was the
1128 sports field users and there were Cubberley Community Center tenants. We also had
1129 middle school athletics. We had a group that was the middle school athletic directors, the
1130 programming directors. We had a conversation with the Boost program, both the staff
1131 and the folks that are participating in that class and some of the instructors. Each of those
1132 pieces is really fleshed out. Some of our inputs, we're not taking that like, "It was said
1133 once in this meeting. That's absolutely the gospel." We see these people that we invited
1134 to these conversations as being experts in the area that they are talking about. We wanted
1135 to make sure that their opinions and everything else got documented with some
1136 credibility across this process. Thank you all.

1137
1138 Ms. Schmitt: With day camps, as I mentioned, this really highlights the extensive use of
1139 existing programs, even though it's not being mentioned a lot by the public. When we
1140 look in Column I at demographic needs, you've got again a pretty stable youth
1141 population. We're not looking for a spike in the youth population, so we see the demand
1142 that you have is probably going to continue at about the same level. Barriers to
1143 participation seem to be low. Looking at Source 5, you're offering programs in a lot of
1144 locations at a lot of times. When you just look at the list of them, the staff really provides
1145 many offerings tailored to a lot of different interests. There's something for just about
1146 anyone at a location that they can get to, so low on that one. Projected demand, because
1147 these things are selling out and because of the interest in this community in making sure
1148 youth have positive activities, there's going to continue to be a strong demand for the
1149 level of programming that you have now. Therefore, our summary statement is that
1150 there's going to be solid demand and there's going to continue to be a need to evolve
1151 those day camps, because the same static set is not going to continue to meet the interests
1152 of that youth population. I think Rob illustrated it with the "my parents signing me up for
1153 something that I hate" example. That is very illustrative of the youth population. Any
1154 thoughts on that one? We thought that was really pretty interesting.

1155
1156 Commissioner Markevitch: Yeah, let your kids pick the camps.

1157
1158 Ms. Schmitt: Yeah.

1159
1160 Ms. Fiore: Part of this process is going to be a gut check of whether the Summary of
1161 Needs sounds right to you based on your experience. That adds another data layer, if you

1162 will, of what you hear from people who know that you're on the Parks and Rec
1163 Commission, what you hear anecdotally day-to-day, your lives as parents and residents of
1164 Palo Alto. That's not necessarily reflected here, but that's why we wanted to walk
1165 through this. Is the process based again on the information we have here that we describe
1166 as a Summary of Need. From there, does that sound right? Does that sound absolutely
1167 wrong? If it sounds wrong, we have this paper trail that we can dig back into. That's
1168 why we have this enormous binder ourselves. Maybe we did it wrong or maybe it's just a
1169 difference of opinion that showed up. I worked out (inaudible) day camps. Overall
1170 questions, concerns, comments at this point?
1171

1172 Commissioner Hetterly: I have a question about the youth and team sports. I'm trying to
1173 find it in the program analysis Part 2.
1174

1175 Ms. Schmitt: Youth and team sports are ...
1176

1177 Commissioner Hetterly: For both adult sports and youth sports. For example, page 25,
1178 Table 5 is adult sports, and you list the number of classes for basketball (inaudible). Are
1179 these classes to learn how to play the sport or are these teams?
1180

1181 Mr. de Geus: They're teams.
1182

1183 Commissioner Hetterly: (crosstalk) bunch of teams.
1184

1185 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, adult sports leagues.
1186

1187 Commissioner Hetterly: Soccer, obviously we have, oh, they're leagues as opposed to
1188 teams?
1189

1190 Mr. de Geus: No, these are teams. It's not participant. We run adult sports leagues and
1191 people sign up by team.
1192

1193 Commissioner Hetterly: This is different from the passive soccer?
1194

1195 Mr. de Geus: Yes.
1196

1197 Commissioner Hetterly: That is different. I didn't even know that the City had a soccer
1198 team.
1199

1200 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, it's just one. It's a bit of an outlier, that one. I think we did one, and
1201 this isn't an ongoing one. This must have been pulled from a specific season, maybe last
1202 fall, where staff tried to (crosstalk).
1203

1204 Ms. Schmitt: That is an important clarification. All of the programs in the program
1205 section are the programs that are offered by the City of Palo Alto. When we jump back
1206 to recreation facilities and we talk about your sports fields, there's a lot of other user
1207 groups and leagues who can buy programming, who are booking time on those particular
1208 facilities. In the programs, it's specific programs that Rob's staff is offering, advertising
1209 and people can go on your website and sign up.

1210
1211 Commissioner Hetterly: On page 30, Table 11, youth and team sports. Are those also
1212 teams then and not classes?

1213
1214 Mr. de Geus: Let me take a look here.

1215
1216 Ms. Schmitt: Really what we think of in a class and that's (crosstalk).

1217
1218 Mr. de Geus: Is this Table 10?

1219
1220 Commissioner Hetterly: Table 11. For basketball, soccer and tennis, I guess. Are those
1221 teams? We have 80 tennis teams? Tennis is lessons, right? I need some clarification.

1222
1223 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, these are classes.

1224
1225 Commissioner Hetterly: All of them are?

1226
1227 Mr. de Geus: Yes, they are.

1228
1229 Commissioner Hetterly: Including basketball and soccer?

1230
1231 Mr. de Geus: Yes.

1232
1233 Commissioner Hetterly: They're different from the summer camps?

1234
1235 Mr. de Geus: They are.

1236
1237 Chair Reckdahl: Different from the middle school?

1238
1239 Mr. de Geus: Not middle school athletics either. These are special interest classes
1240 related to sports for youth.

1241
1242 Commissioner Hetterly: I'd just like a little bit more clarification in the document for
1243 both of those (crosstalk).

1244
1245 Mr. de Geus: Some of these tables have a description underneath them.

1246
1247 Commissioner Hetterly: Another question I had on that same document is on the adult
1248 special interest classes. Did you have a separate break out for senior classes? I don't
1249 remember. My question is, are the items listed primarily offered through Avenidas, the
1250 ones that are available to seniors or do we have a separate list of programs that the City
1251 does for seniors as opposed to what Avenidas does with whatever grant they get from the
1252 City?

1253
1254 Mr. de Geus: It's separate. There isn't anything in these tables that is run by Avenidas.
1255

1256 Commissioner Hetterly: We don't yet have any data in any place of what Avenidas is
1257 doing?
1258

1259 Mr. de Geus: There should be, because we met with them (crosstalk).
1260

1261 Ms. Schmitt: Actually in the thing that Ryan referenced ...
1262

1263 Commissioner Hetterly: It's (crosstalk) the list, but it's not in any of the data sources.
1264

1265 Ms. Schmitt: It's actually referenced in the table in a few places. When we get to
1266 facilities, Avenidas reported about what the demand they see for the programs that they
1267 offer and for the use of their facilities. In the additional meeting log, there is some
1268 findings from that meeting that start to present information about their programs and
1269 what they find with their user base. We learn also quite a bit about the percentage of
1270 programs, where their focuses are, because they have certain focus areas. What is more
1271 drop in and what is more of a day-to-day program.
1272

1273 Commissioner Hetterly: That's reflected in the conclusions in the matrix.
1274

1275 Ms. Schmitt: Not for senior programs, because those are City of Palo Alto programs.
1276

1277 Commissioner Hetterly: Yeah, not in the capacity (crosstalk).
1278

1279 Ms. Schmitt: In the facilities, yeah.
1280

1281 Commissioner Hetterly: In this big chart.
1282

1283 Ms. Schmitt: Yeah. In the facilities in particular, yes.
1284

1285 Mr. de Geus: I understand what you're saying. Let's assume that's there a need for low
1286 impact aerobics for seniors. Where does that get drawn out? It gets drawn out from a
1287 conversation with our major senior provider, Avenidas, we talked about earlier. Where

1288 does that percolate to so that it can be represented as a need? It's not in this stuff, in what
1289 we're looking at right now, because this is just looking at City programs and it's not
1290 looking at senior programs. I think it's a fair question. I know we have it, because we've
1291 had these focus group meetings. We've gotten from Avenidas where they see the trends
1292 going for programming for senior services. It's a really interesting conversation. Where
1293 is that in the binder?
1294

1295 Ms. Schmitt: It'll be on Source 17. For example, on page 4 of that additional meeting
1296 log, the top column is the meeting with Avenidas which Rob and I both attended. They
1297 had quite a bit of data about the need for a second senior center on the south side of Palo
1298 Alto. They have data on where their participants are coming from. They know the way
1299 people use space and know at their current center there's a need for social gathering space
1300 and that would be needed in the new center.
1301

1302 Commissioner Hetterly: Have they shared any of that data with you or have they only
1303 shared their conclusions based on their data?
1304

1305 Mr. de Geus: We asked them for the data. They do a, I want to say it's a biennial survey
1306 that has hundreds of seniors participate. They sent us the most recent survey that they
1307 did. It talked about programs and services and other things. Yeah, we have it. They sent
1308 it to us.
1309

1310 Commissioner Hetterly: What about data on capacity? Can I just back up for a second?
1311

1312 Mr. de Geus: They took a lot of our capacity. They're trying to rebuild Avenidas.
1313 Actually it's a City building that they lease, and we have a long-term contract with them.
1314 They want to fund a \$15 million capital improvement primarily for increased program
1315 space for that particular age group, because it's growing so much and it's expected to
1316 grow over the next 20 years.
1317

1318 Commissioner Hetterly: Can you just take a second to explain to us what is the
1319 relationship between the City and Avenidas? It's my understanding that the City
1320 provided most of its funding that's targeted towards seniors to Avenidas to provide the
1321 services. Is that correct?
1322

1323 Mr. de Geus: It is correct. There's a long history with Avenidas. Many years ago the
1324 City ran programs for senior services, but this was like in the early '70s. I want to say it
1325 was 1977, somewhere around there, where we entered into an agreement and established
1326 a nonprofit called Avenidas to run senior programs and services for the community. We
1327 provided the initial seed money to get them started. We've done that ever since.
1328

1329 Chair Reckdahl: What is the advantage of having a separate nonprofit as opposed to the
1330 City?

1331
1332 Mr. de Geus: There's a number of advantages. Not the least of which is a nonprofit can
1333 raise money whereas a city really can't. They're more nimble because they can make
1334 decisions maybe a little quicker and adapt a little bit quicker than a city can. At that time,
1335 the thought was they would provide a better set of services than the City could with the
1336 same amount of money. We've been funding Avenidas throughout those years, and I'm
1337 sure it's gone up over those years. At this point, I think we're paying, I want to say
1338 something like \$0.5 million to Avenidas annually. It may be a little more than that.
1339 What they do is leverage that \$0.5 million, and now they have a \$4-plus million program
1340 that they run.

1341
1342 Chair Reckdahl: Do you just give them a chunk of money or do you give them so much
1343 per class or so much per person?

1344
1345 Mr. de Geus: We give them the funding and then our Office of Human Services, Minka
1346 van der Zwaag and staff, work closely with their executive director. There's some
1347 evaluation process of the programming and services they provide. The evaluation
1348 determines how satisfied Avenidas participants are. Within the contract, there is that
1349 evaluation process that happens. They've been able to leverage the City funding
1350 significantly to the point where now in terms of the program, the City funding is maybe
1351 10 or 15 percent of their actual program. Did that help?

1352
1353 Commissioner Hetterly: I think that helps. The thing I keep struggling with is they are
1354 our primary service provider to seniors, and the capacity bookings is unknown on our
1355 chart. We don't know how their services break out in terms of adult aquatics, adult
1356 fitness, adult special interest classes, all these things we have broken out from City-
1357 offered services. We don't know what role Avenidas plays in meeting that need. When
1358 we look at the need on this chart, that's just based on what we offer. If what we offer is
1359 over-subscribed, we're going to have a high need indicated here. We don't have a bigger
1360 picture across the community whether seniors' needs are being met.

1361
1362 Ms. Schmitt: In some cases in the Summary of Needs, seniors would be a good place to
1363 maybe consider doing something like. When there are either a number of other providers
1364 like in the health and fitness realm or where there's one really heavy hitter, we're noting
1365 their existence. It's something to think about when you get to the next step, about how
1366 you prioritize things. I think that's a really, really good point, because you may decide,
1367 like you did in the past, you're actually more effective if you work through them. I will
1368 say their focus is not recreation. They were pretty clear on that. They offer some
1369 recreation programs. They have the drop-in seniors who are more mobile and who may

1370 come for a personal finance class. Then they have the people that are there every day for
1371 food programs who are much less mobile and really need more social support.

1372
1373 Mr. de Geus: It's bridge that's the big player.

1374
1375 Ms. Schmitt: Yeah, that was another one, the bridge program.

1376
1377 Commissioner Crommie: In relationship to that, where are the conditioning classes for
1378 seniors? I know my own family members are taking conditioning classes at Cubberley.
1379 Once you get to be old, you want to work with weights and condition your body. That's
1380 really important, but I didn't see it reflected into these tables. Is that because Avenidas is
1381 covering body conditioning classes? Am I missing them?

1382
1383 Mr. de Geus: There are others like Avenidas who are providing those programs too. The
1384 JCC has a whole series of recreational programs targeted to senior services. So does Palo
1385 Alto Family Y; they have lots of programming targeted for seniors in that area.

1386
1387 Commissioner Crommie: It seems confusing to me. If you're a senior in this community
1388 and you need a conditioning class to keep your muscles strong and let's say your primary
1389 care doctor says, "Your muscle tone is getting low. I'd like you to go to a conditioning
1390 class." It's a very common experience of people hitting their 70s. Where do they go to
1391 find a conditioning class? If they're a Palo Alto resident, they might go first of all to our
1392 recreation handouts.

1393
1394 Mr. de Geus: Then we would send them to Avenidas most likely. Avenidas really does
1395 understand the needs of seniors and have relationships with a lot of these partner
1396 organizations like the JCC.

1397
1398 Commissioner Crommie: If they go to the schedules that you publish for Palo Alto
1399 classes, are you going to list all the Avenidas classes within that?

1400
1401 Mr. de Geus: We do list in the catalog our partner organizations. We don't list all of
1402 their classes, because it's a lot and the catalog would be large.

1403
1404 Ms. Schmitt: It would be difficult.

1405
1406 Mr. de Geus: We list their organization and a web link and a phone number.

1407
1408 Commissioner Crommie: It comes down to envisioning where we want to put our
1409 resources as a City. Right now those are almost contracted out. The concept is we
1410 contract it out. I just didn't see basic muscle conditioning classes listed in our charts here.
1411

1412 Mr. de Geus: Yeah. We wouldn't be the primary provider of that. If someone calls us,
1413 we would talk to that resident, tell them about Avenidas, that they're the repository for all
1414 senior services. Not that they do them all, but they have a relationship with the Y, they
1415 have a relationship with the JCC. They do things with the City that we do together. That
1416 would be the first place to start for someone who would be interested.

1417
1418 Ms. Schmitt: To your point, Deirdre, again as we move into that next stage, is that the
1419 right role for the City? Is the City ...

1420
1421 Commissioner Crommie: A broker.

1422
1423 Ms. Schmitt: Yeah. A referral service. Bringing it down to the reality of as an
1424 individual what do you experience? It's an issue that you see in a lot of places. It makes
1425 so much sense when we do it this way and that way. When you're just a resident out
1426 there, it's like, "Where do I go?" There is actually a pretty robust way of connecting
1427 people to Avenidas, but you may decide as a Parks and Recreation Commission you want
1428 to take that further or you want to go in a different direction.

1429
1430 Commissioner Crommie: I would want good data. If we have our average residents who
1431 are in their 70s, is it at their fingertips that they know where to go for conditioning
1432 classes? If we just polled people in their 70s, do they know how to hook in already? Is it
1433 just a done deal for them? Or is there a gap there in our aging population? They don't
1434 know where to go. That's all I'm concerned about. In some ways I don't really care who's
1435 providing it. I just want to make sure that when someone hits their 70s, they go to their
1436 primary care doctor, they're told "Go find a conditioning class. Your muscles are getting
1437 weak." They know how to do it.

1438
1439 Mr. de Geus: I think there's an answer to that, Deirdre. They'll be working with Pam, for
1440 instance, and with Lucille at Stanford Hospital, with primary care physicians so that
1441 actually when they want to prescribe exercise, they actually hand out material to
1442 Avenidas, to the JCC, and to some extent to the City of Palo Alto for programs that we
1443 provide. There is that link. To this point, which may be a bigger question, it might be
1444 helpful to have the executive director of Avenidas come to a Commission meeting and do
1445 a little 10-15 minute presentation on all they do.

1446
1447 Chair Reckdahl: That would be good to have. We're a little off topic here, because this
1448 doesn't directly apply to (crosstalk).

1449
1450 Mr. de Geus: I think it's a good topic because ...

1451
1452 Commissioner Crommie: I looked for it; I just didn't see it, so that's the origin of my
1453 question. I didn't see it in our charts here. Like what Commissioner Hetterly might have

1454 been getting at. That was my question. I don't see these types of conditioning exercise
1455 classes for seniors that I hear through my own family members. I think they're hooking
1456 in with them.

1457
1458 Mr. de Geus: Is that the gap? If we have some resources, do we focus it there? That's
1459 what I (inaudible) with senior programs. I don't know if we have all the answers here.
1460 As we look at the City's recreation programs and the City's park system, what is it that we
1461 should focus on for filling a need there? Recognizing that Avenidas does some part, JCC
1462 does. Where is that gap? We're trying to get some of that with these focus group
1463 meetings.

1464
1465 Vice Chair Markevitch: He's got to change the tape.

1466
1467 Chair Reckdahl: Change the tape.

1468
1469 Mr. de Geus: ... now reflecting on some of the conversations we had with Avenidas.
1470 There was a strong interest in not having senior programs be called senior programs.
1471 Their interest was having adult programs generally more accessible to people ages (video
1472 break) age span. That was really an important take away.

1473
1474 Commissioner Ashlund: The JCC no longer calls them seniors; they call them adults
1475 again. Can I ask what the six highlighted ones indicate?

1476
1477 Ms. Fiore: Those are the ones we're walking you through. (crosstalk)

1478
1479 Ms. Schmitt: As you can see when Ryan was on the un-highlighted one, you lose track
1480 as you're going across if you're not keeping your fingers there.

1481
1482 Commissioner Ashlund: Those are examples as opposed to the topics?

1483
1484 Ms. Schmitt: Yeah, exactly.

1485
1486 Chair Reckdahl: I have one comment that I want to get in before we move on. On page
1487 20, on the bottom.

1488
1489 Commissioner Hetterly: Of what?

1490
1491 Chair Reckdahl: Of the new handout, new materials for (inaudible) session. I'm sorry.
1492 This is the Part 2 of the recreation and programming analysis. On page 20 there's a
1493 comment that is just left there. I think there's a lot of meat there from a planning
1494 standpoint. It says, "Youth and adult sports programs are not easily expanded regardless
1495 of popularity due to facility and instruction/coach constraints." Then it refers us to the

1496 tables. The tables don't talk anything about the constraints at all. They just talk about the
1497 demand. Knowing what constraints are preventing us from fully meeting the demand is a
1498 very important topic.

1499
1500 Ms. Schmitt: And it's a great segue to recreation facilities. One of the highlighted ones
1501 we wanted to talk about was sports field needs.

1502
1503 Chair Reckdahl: Also you mentioned coaches too. It would be very good to have it
1504 expand that topic. If it's just a coach issue, then we have options. We can go out and hire
1505 third parties to come in and act as coaches. Whereas, facilities we have less leeway.

1506
1507 Ms. Fiore: I agree that that was a key finding. In the data and needs highlight that you
1508 received tonight, we did flag that as an issue that was impacting capacity. (crosstalk)
1509

1510 Commissioner Crommie: When you get on this topic, can you frame it for regional need
1511 versus resident need? That plays in hugely (crosstalk).
1512

1513 Ms. Schmitt: Before you got here, Deirdre, that's one of the framing pieces. Because of
1514 your past policy directions and because of the pretty clear direction from Palo Altans
1515 through the survey, this is really looking at the need generated by Palo Alto residents, not
1516 the regional need. We understand and recognize that your residents may be going to Los
1517 Altos to play on a field and their residents may be coming to yours and that balances out.
1518 We're not looking to capture the entire Santa Clara County thing with a magnet facility,
1519 because you could build the biggest thing in the world and probably fill it up from around
1520 the region. This is really targeted at the need generated by your residents, trying to match
1521 that, and then realize it'll balance out across the region if everybody carried their share.
1522

1523 Chair Reckdahl: For time, we have 1 hour left and we have 30 minutes that we're
1524 allocating towards facilities and then 30 minutes towards the framework of policy
1525 questions. Is that still your ...
1526

1527 Ms. Schmitt: We were told we had until 8:30 with you, and that you had a few points of
1528 business you needed to take care of.
1529

1530 Chair Reckdahl: With them?
1531

1532 Ms. Schmitt: Yes.
1533

1534 Vice Chair Markevitch: (crosstalk) the rest of the agenda.
1535

1536 Ms. Fiore: Our plan of attack as of right now is to spend about 20 minutes on the
1537 recreation facilities and then 10 minutes on wrap-up and just touch real quickly on what
1538 we'd identified there as the introduction to the framework and policy questions.

1539
1540 Ms. Schmitt: Then we discuss next steps.

1541
1542 Ms. Fiore: Then set the stage for next month's meeting and what we hope to accomplish
1543 there. Does that sound okay?

1544
1545 Commissioner Hetterly: Can I ask you a question before we go on?

1546
1547 Ms. Fiore: Yes.

1548
1549 Commissioner Hetterly: I do have some comments on the stuff that was in the packet.
1550 Should I hold those until next week or should I email them to staff?

1551
1552 Ms. Fiore: If you could get those to Peter, and he will communicate those to us. Thank
1553 you.

1554
1555 Commissioner Lauing: It looks like you did some additional analysis on (inaudible) and
1556 (crosstalk).

1557
1558 Ms. Fiore: We did. Another memo you received was the survey follow-up based on
1559 (crosstalk).

1560
1561 Commissioner Lauing: Can you tell us tonight how many you went out to and the
1562 process for it?

1563
1564 Ms. Fiore: We did not do additional survey work. We did initial number crunching on
1565 the survey data we had before. I don't think we have room in our agenda tonight to talk
1566 about that, but you can talk about it next time. It is reflected in this matrix. It has been
1567 rolled up into that or we could talk about it in May if there's specific questions.

1568
1569 Ms. Schmitt: Looking at recreation facilities, the two we wanted to highlight were
1570 diamond sports fields and rectangular sports fields, because I think they're an interesting
1571 counterpoint. We also wanted to walk through special purpose buildings and parks.
1572 Those are things like we talked about earlier, the Baylands Interpretive Center, the
1573 Foothills Nature Interpretive Center. Let's start off with diamond sports fields. When we
1574 look in Column C. your inventory is 19 total and that includes the school district facilities
1575 that you program. One of the important things around sports fields is you as a
1576 Commission worked with staff to develop a policy that has some pretty clear priorities
1577 about how you allocate the field space that you have, given that it's a limited resource and

1578 how you balance the use of that. You're booking the time that you have. As we move
1579 across this, we'll see that. Your level of control is high, because you either own your
1580 fields or you have an agreement with the school district that allows you to use the fields
1581 that you use. When we look at the geographic analysis, these are concentrated at
1582 particular sites. There's a particular map around that. There's also a map around sites
1583 where there's flat graphs that you're doing practices and things on and that people can
1584 also drop in at. In terms of capacity and bookings, you're at capacity. The reason you're
1585 at capacity is because of the policy that you developed to allocate that field use. If you
1586 authored more field use and more field space, you provide more space and it would get
1587 filled up. Right now, because your policies are set to balance the use of what you have,
1588 you're at capacity. It's not showing as over, because you're taking all the time and you're
1589 dividing it out based on the availability that you have. I think that's a really important
1590 one when it comes to your diamond sports fields. If you look above that at rectangular,
1591 you're actually over in the case of that one, because you're getting more requests from
1592 additional groups than the time you have available. Even though you set the policies,
1593 you're sharing time, there's documented more requests.

1594
1595 Chair Reckdahl: I don't understand. You said we're at capacity, because we have not ...

1596
1597 Ms. Schmitt: Because you've developed a policy that says, "We've got a certain amount
1598 of field time. Here's how we're going to prioritize assigning out that field time."

1599
1600 Commissioner Lauing: You've allocated everything (crosstalk).

1601
1602 Chair Reckdahl: You said if we had more fields, we would fill those fields.

1603
1604 Commissioner Lauing: Because of insatiable demand.

1605
1606 Commissioner Hetterly: Only if we changed our policy.

1607
1608 Ms. Schmitt: Only if you changed your policy, yeah. If you were going to allow regional
1609 demand or you were going to allow 40 percent Palo Alto residents rather than ...

1610
1611 Commissioner Crommie: It's always this calendar, the use is always a biggie. Is it in the
1612 season or out of the season, pre-season, post-season?

1613
1614 Ms. Schmitt: It's in the season.

1615
1616 Commissioner Crommie: Right. We're basing it on in-season use.

1617
1618 Ms. Schmitt: In-season use, yes.

1619

1620 Chair Reckdahl: Can we achieve policy and allow more non-residents?
1621

1622 Commissioner Hetterly: No, allow more practice days a week for example for a change.
1623 Instead of having them holding practice twice a week, if we let them practice 5 days a
1624 week, we would be well over capacity because many teams would prefer to practice more
1625 than twice a week at that (crosstalk).
1626

1627 Ms. Schmitt: Exactly. In the case of diamond fields, you have effectively managed
1628 demand for those. You're meeting it based on the policies you set out. The perception of
1629 quality is medium. People have mixed opinions. It's pretty good, but certain things could
1630 be better. There's data from several sources around that. If you look to Source 13, there's
1631 one in particular that we pulled out. Then you get to expressed need. In Source 14, that
1632 is the survey results, you see that reported as a high. Again this is different from being at
1633 capacity. This is about "We'd like to practice five times," or "We'd like to have a couple
1634 of games a week." That is reflecting the expressed need, but it is not showing up as being
1635 over capacity because of how you're managing demand through your policies. When you
1636 look at demographic trends, we are predicting a decline because nationwide you see a
1637 decline in diamond sports. (video break) debate that, but as a professional I would say
1638 that we're not going to see an increase in that. Really there's a downward trend.
1639

1640 Chair Reckdahl: If you look in the past 5 years, we're serving more baseball and softball
1641 players now than we did 5 years ago. Whether you're looking 10 years in the future,
1642 that's another story. The trend certainly is up.
1643

1644 Ms. Schmitt: The overall trend though nationally in terms of baseball participation is on
1645 a downward trend, in softball as well.
1646

1647 Vice Chair Markevitch: But we're still just looking at Palo Alto. It's pretty high demand.
1648 They would build the space if we had more.
1649

1650 Ms. Schmitt: Yeah, your thoughts on that are that's it either stable or increasing.
1651

1652 Chair Reckdahl: If you look at the past 5 years, it has been increasing.
1653

1654 Ms. Schmitt: A question I would ask you, because we see this in some communities.
1655 What you see is a small percentage of people who want to play more and more and more
1656 leagues, so I think that's also an important part of teasing apart that trend.
1657

1658 Commissioner Hetterly: Part of that, Keith, also in the past 5 to 10 years, elementary
1659 enrollment has been increasing. As we look forward, we expect it to decline.
1660

1661 Chair Reckdahl: Yes, that is true.

1662
1663 Commissioner Hetterly: That will affect the usage trend as well.
1664

1665 Ms. Schmitt: Yeah, because then all of those team sports, the 13 and under, is where you
1666 have your peaks and then it drops off because you either continue playing in high school
1667 or you stop. Barriers to participation, medium from Sources 8 and 9. That's about where
1668 the fields are located and the existing conditions, the configurations.
1669

1670 Commissioner Crommie: Just on the baseball diamonds, we do have the Babe Ruth
1671 League that uses our fields. Like you're saying, it can fall off, but then we have this
1672 specialized club structure within our City that has some regional draw. Did you put that
1673 in your analysis? We have a whole diamond dedicated to that, the Babe Ruth.
1674

1675 Ms. Schmitt: We did not do some kind of Babe Ruth specific demand. What we're
1676 looking at is the overall bookings using your system, how does that work.
1677

1678 Commissioner Crommie: Is that system that you analyzed outside of the Babe Ruth
1679 system or does it include it? I just need a point of clarification there. The data you ...
1680

1681 Ms. Schmitt: No, in the diamond sports fields, it's anybody that's booking your time. It's
1682 outside leagues, it's tournaments. You have real specific guidance about how much each
1683 of the user groups can do in terms of turning ...
1684

1685 Vice Chair Markevitch: Can I re-ask that question?
1686

1687 Ms. Schmitt: Yes.
1688

1689 Vice Chair Markevitch: The 19 total diamond fields, does that include the Babe Ruth
1690 field?
1691

1692 Ms. Schmitt: I'll look on the inventory.
1693

1694 Mr. de Geus: It should, yeah.
1695

1696 Vice Chair Markevitch: I think that might get to your question.
1697

1698 Commissioner Crommie: They're rolled into this analysis?
1699

1700 Ms. Schmitt: Yeah. Yeah. The fields that are counted will be right on this inventory
1701 sheet.
1702

1703 Commissioner Crommie: They're self-contained. They have their own dedicated space.

1704
1705 Commissioner Lauing: High schools are included in this number as well. Generally
1706 those are not available for use. That's what it says.

1707
1708 Vice Chair Markevitch: Yeah, they're currently not available for use.

1709
1710 Commissioner Lauing: That overstates it, but ...

1711
1712 Mr. de Geus: I'm not sure that's exactly right. The high schools use those fields. The
1713 high schools themselves rent out those fields. They don't use the City of Palo Alto's
1714 program process to make them available to the public.

1715
1716 Vice Chair Markevitch: They keep the money.

1717
1718 Mr. de Geus: They make it available along the same criteria.

1719
1720 Vice Chair Markevitch: They also don't rent (crosstalk).

1721
1722 Commissioner Hetterly: They don't prioritize residents.

1723
1724 Mr. de Geus: They don't.

1725
1726 Vice Chair Markevitch: They don't. They rent to outside teams.

1727
1728 Commissioner Hetterly: I don't think we can count that as ours.

1729
1730 Ms. Schmitt: If you look on the physical inventory, the baseball and softball fields, you
1731 can see the school inventory is there. Yes, Palo Alto High School, those fields are
1732 included. Do they count in the inventory, that would be a really good feedback point that
1733 they shouldn't count.

1734
1735 Commissioner Crommie: I've always felt that they should be folded in. They're a
1736 resource. I don't understand why they can generate all this revenue on their property
1737 when there's this whole relationship between the City and schools.

1738
1739 Vice Chair Markevitch: They're not in the original agreement of the shared-use spaces.

1740
1741 Commissioner Crommie: I would question whether we should evaluate that as a
1742 Commission. (crosstalk)

1743
1744 Vice Chair Markevitch: That's not in our purview. That's school district property. It's
1745 not us. We can't.

1746
1747 Commissioner Crommie: Whereas, the middle schools are different.
1748

1749 Vice Chair Markevitch: No, the middle schools have a brokered system with an
1750 agreement with the City. The high schools do not.
1751

1752 Commissioner Crommie: I'm saying can the City ever formulate an agreement if
1753 necessary with the high schools?
1754

1755 Commissioner Hetterly: (crosstalk) hope they would.
1756

1757 Chair Reckdahl: Yes.
1758

1759 Mr. de Geus: If the school district wanted to do that. We're in a contract with the school
1760 district to maintain the elementary schools and the middle schools. In exchange for this
1761 relationship, we get to broker those spaces outside of school hours.
1762

1763 Commissioner Crommie: We benefit.
1764

1765 Mr. de Geus: The public benefits. The school district has not been interested in doing
1766 the same thing for high schools, largely because they have a very robust athletic program
1767 and the athletic directors at the high schools really want to have the ownership of those
1768 fields and who gets on those fields. Do they rent them out themselves and they generate
1769 revenue? They do. I don't know enough about that to speak to who actually gets on
1770 those fields and what criteria they use. I'd like to know more about it. I'd love to have
1771 more access, because we certainly have the need for fields.
1772

1773 Commissioner Crommie: How do we learn more about it?
1774

1775 Vice Chair Markevitch: That's not related to this though. We're getting into the weeds
1776 again.
1777

1778 Ms. Schmitt: We'll flag that as an issue. I think it brings up a point. You can use the
1779 plan as a tool. You as the Commission could say, "We should have a recommendation in
1780 here that we should seek enhanced access at the high schools, because there is a need in
1781 the community. The community doesn't see a difference. We have this data, and we
1782 would like to see those brought into the system." You can't make the school district do it,
1783 but you can say, "We'd like that to happen, and we would like Council's buyoff of that as
1784 a direction." The plan can be a tool to try to move in those directions, keeping in mind
1785 you can't control what they do. Yeah, I think it's a great point.
1786

1787 Commissioner Hetterly: I would argue strongly for removing the school district deals
1788 from this particular representation, because I think it is a misrepresentation of what's
1789 available to (crosstalk).

1790 Ms. Schmitt: Mm-hmm. Because they're different from the elementary sites.
1791

1792 Vice Chair Markevitch: You can even footnote it saying high schools not listed.
1793

1794 Ms. Schmitt: Yeah, they're there, but we can't (crosstalk).
1795

1796 Commissioner Crommie: It's good to have an inventory, but you might have to separate
1797 it out. I think visibility is good though to see what the inventory is.
1798

1799 Ms. Schmitt: I think it would be good to footnote perhaps which ones are subject to the
1800 agreement or it may be just because it's the two high schools that are outside of that, to
1801 footnote that those are outside of the agreement and you don't book time on those.
1802

1803 Vice Chair Markevitch: Yeah.
1804

1805 Ms. Schmitt: Make sure that's reflected in the discussion. Okay.
1806

1807 Vice Chair Markevitch: I actually had a comment. It was Column E. You have off-
1808 leash dog areas and then right below it community gardens. In community gardens, you
1809 have them all clustered in the north end. I'd like to see that same thing in the off-leash
1810 dog areas as all clustered in the south end. It spells it out more and it's consistent.
1811

1812 Ms. Schmitt: That's a good point, because that was specific feedback from the Palo Alto
1813 dog owners group, that they're all clustered, we really need them spread out.
1814

1815 Ms. Fiore: Lauren, do you want to make a couple more points about diamond versus
1816 rectangular fields (crosstalk).
1817

1818 Ms. Schmitt: There are some of the same patterns, some of the same issues around the
1819 sports fields. We should make that same footnote and consider taking the high schools
1820 fields out of the inventory. What we did hear from multiple sources on trends is the
1821 increase in rectangular sports, so there's some higher demand there because there's more
1822 sports that are playing on rectangular fields for more parts of the year. On that one,
1823 there's a higher need, however, that can be accommodated in a number of ways, whether
1824 it's by increasing playable time on your own fields, getting access to other fields. I think
1825 it's important to look at both rectangular and diamond fields and also understand the
1826 seasons of the year where those are played which this does not capture that as much.
1827 Because we're getting really close, I'd like to move on quickly to the special purpose
1828

1829 buildings. That came up right at the beginning. This is the Baylands Nature Center,
1830 Foothills, Arastradero. Those special purpose buildings for which the City has a high
1831 level of control in Column D. When we look at those, they're really located at the
1832 preserves. There's a few other special purpose buildings, but the most significant ones
1833 are those centers that are on the preserves. We don't have any data on capacity and
1834 bookings. There is a perception that the quality of those is low and they're difficult to
1835 program as they are now, just because of their configuration and their age. There is a
1836 medium expressed need. Again some of this is through those follow up meetings,
1837 because there's a desire to do outdoor programming and interpretive classes, yet not
1838 really the space to do it because the spaces aren't suitable. There isn't really data on the
1839 demographic trends, because those programs aren't really offered, so we don't know
1840 who's participating in them. In terms of the barriers to participation, because the ...

1841
1842 Commissioner Ashlund: Are you talking about the buildings themselves or the
1843 programming in the buildings or both?

1844
1845 Mr. de Geus: The buildings.

1846
1847 Ms. Schmitt: The buildings because they're a place for programming. They only exist
1848 because you want to do something with them. Otherwise, they'd be like a storage facility
1849 or something like that.

1850
1851 Commissioner Crommie: I want to know that I can get the (inaudible) that you're citing
1852 on additional need and see that data. When I go to your additional meeting log, I don't
1853 see anything on these centers. Where is (crosstalk)?

1854
1855 Ms. Schmitt: The meeting with John Aiken on page 3. You know him well from his role
1856 at the Junior Museum and Zoo. He's been a wonderful source in a variety of areas. One
1857 of them is around the outdoor programming. We met with him specifically about these
1858 special purpose buildings. On page 3, there's key points that are summarized from that
1859 discussion. He has a vision for how they would program, using some of the educational
1860 initiatives and curriculum that they have in place. As an example with Baylands, there's
1861 two classrooms. Neither of them works really well for the types of classes that they
1862 would offer. It doesn't really work well for their needs, but it also doesn't really function
1863 as a museum space. He sees a need at all of these sites for his volunteer programs staging
1864 areas which these buildings could potentially function as. People need a place to have
1865 lunch, to get oriented in the morning, to have tool storage, have a place to use the
1866 restroom. One of the things that he also brought up is there's a lot of things you could
1867 interpret at any of these sites. Really thinking about what you wanted to interpret and
1868 how you wanted to interpret it rather than being scatter shot would be pretty important to
1869 determining the facility configurations because it would have an implication there. He
1870 was a really great source on that and has thought a lot about how can he do more to meet

1871 the demand that he's seeing, because he said, "I can fill programs. I just don't have
1872 basically a platform from which I can do it using these buildings."
1873

1874 Commissioner Ashlund: Are the interpretive centers reserveable by the public?
1875

1876 Mr. de Geus: Yes. The gateway facility at Arastradero I don't think is, but the meeting
1877 room at Foothills Park is and the Baylands Interpretive Center, the main room.
1878

1879 Commissioner Ashlund: It says n/a for capacity. We don't have any information? If
1880 they're bookable, we should have that information somewhere.
1881

1882 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, they're bookable. That's online; you can make a reservation. It's in
1883 the list of fee schedule.
1884

1885 Council Member Filseth: The Baylands Interpretive Center is closed, isn't it?
1886

1887 Mr. de Geus: It's open 3 days a week, minimal hours.
1888

1889 Commissioner Markevitch: Not during high tide.
1890

1891 Mr. de Geus: We have a lot of classes that go there, and we program that space with
1892 John through the Junior Museum and Zoo. There isn't enough staff and resources to keep
1893 it open on a regular basis. It is closed a lot.
1894

1895 Commissioner Ashlund: That booking data information is available? We can get it into
1896 the matrix?
1897

1898 Ms. Schmitt: Yes and no, because there's the class booking times which would appear in
1899 class data. Then you walk in and you do a ...
1900

1901 Commissioner Ashlund: Facility space.
1902

1903 Ms. Schmitt: Yeah, the facility space. I'm Audubon and I want to rent this facility. We
1904 can inquire about that, but ...
1905

1906 Commissioner Crommie: I just think in your table you should reflect that John Aiken
1907 was talking about those facilities. They're not even listed on the table. Just to make it
1908 (crosstalk).
1909

1910 Ms. Schmitt: Okay. Rather that it ...
1911

1912 Commissioner Crommie: He is the (inaudible) information.

1913
1914 Ms. Schmitt: I think that's a really good clarification. He wears a lot of hats, and it's tied
1915 to the Junior Museum and Zoo, but in this case he was (crosstalk).

1916
1917 Commissioner Crommie: His focus is really the Junior Museum and the Zoo. I don't
1918 think he has a strong focus at the Baylands.

1919
1920 Mr. de Geus: No, he doesn't.

1921
1922 Ms. Schmitt: He doesn't.

1923
1924 Mr. de Geus: His focus really is the Junior Museum and Zoo.

1925
1926 Commissioner Crommie: It's about need, and we don't have anyone who's really focused
1927 there.

1928
1929 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, you're right. Ideally we would have a naturalist on staff and has
1930 their office there (crosstalk).

1931
1932 Commissioner Crommie: That's a self-fulfilling prophecy. If you don't have the staff,
1933 you start to not have the time. The facility is no longer open. The need falls off.

1934
1935 Commissioner Ashlund: There was an extra category besides facilities and
1936 programming. When the Interpretive Center was open, if it was a hot sunny day or you
1937 needed a drink of water or a bathroom, or you wanted to look at the exhibits and talk to a
1938 naturalist, you could do that. It wasn't programming and it wasn't reserveable space. It
1939 was accessed by the public.

1940
1941 Mr. de Geus: Prior to 2008, we did have that staffing and the Interpretive Center was
1942 open a lot more.

1943
1944 Ms. Schmitt: That's actually one of the reasons for high barriers to participation. It's not
1945 open very much. When a class is in session, it might be open, but not necessarily when
1946 you happen to be there and maybe needed to get a drink.

1947
1948 Commissioner Ashlund: Barriers are high.

1949
1950 Commissioner Crommie: That's why this projected demand thing, though I don't quite
1951 understand that.

1952
1953 Ms. Schmitt: This would be a point of discussion.
1954

1955 Commissioner Crommie: How did you come up with that?
1956

1957 Ms. Schmitt: We came up with that because we were thinking about these buildings. If
1958 they were achieving what they're supposed to do as what they are, you don't need more of
1959 them. If you look at the findings, there's no need for additional facilities. You wouldn't
1960 build four more of these things. However, the facilities that you have are not meeting
1961 expectations, and we see a real need for them to meet expectations, because people really
1962 want to connect to nature and they want to have preservation of nature. If you look up at
1963 Rows 11 and 12 there's a high need for both of those. There's the rub.
1964

1965 Commissioner Crommie: You have two bullet points. One says no need for additional
1966 facilities. The other one, need exists for facilities. Then you came up with a low. Is that
1967 based on buildings? I think you already talked about this maybe. What is the category of
1968 projected demand based on? Is it facilities or programming?
1969

1970 Ms. Schmitt: When we get to facilities, it's both. There are factors of both for certain
1971 facilities. The projected demand, the reason we put a low is because of the criteria here.
1972 This is debatable. You may make a different judgment. We don't see you capturing new
1973 user groups; however, we don't think those buildings are functioning as they should and
1974 that they need investment. You could make an argument that you would capture an
1975 expanded use. It's slicing it fine. We just don't ...
1976

1977 Commissioner Crommie: Can you point me to where the criteria is written out? I'm
1978 sorry. I lost it.
1979

1980 Ms. Schmitt: Absolutely. Page 9 of the data and needs summary for projected demand.
1981

1982 Commissioner Crommie: That's the one you handed out today?
1983

1984 Ms. Schmitt: Yeah. It's an updated version of the one that you received before.
1985

1986 Commissioner Crommie: If you have it in the criteria, I'm sorry to confuse that.
1987

1988 Ms. Fiore: That's a good place to stop, not because we're almost out of time but because
1989 we want to talk about what we're going to do next. Overall as an exercise, I'm going to
1990 start to answer some of your questions. Do you feel like you're getting a little more
1991 confidence in how the needs are based on the data that we have available to us?
1992

1993 Chair Reckdahl: I feel much better. I told Rob I feel much better now than I did a month
1994 ago.
1995

1996 Ms. Fiore: Great.

1997
1998 Ms. Schmitt: Good, that's what we were looking for. We're trying for that.
1999

2000 Ms. Fiore: What we want to propose to move forward is to give you all more time to
2001 digest this. Obviously there's questions. There's things you want to dig into and look up
2002 probably to varying degrees. We were going to suggest, as a small homework
2003 assignment, between now and two weeks from now, if you would take your top three
2004 areas of interest, things that jumped out at you, pick three rows from this matrix, spend a
2005 little time going through it, do that gut check, see if it makes sense, see if it seems
2006 accurate to you, and then see if the Summary of Need makes sense. If not, flag that for
2007 us. What questions does that trigger for you? What would you like to do about what
2008 we've found here? That's going to lead us into the next step of the planning process,
2009 which is developing these actions and criteria and priorities and recommendations and the
2010 policy questions that you all need to answer in order to come up with those
2011 recommendations.
2012

2013 Commissioner Lauing: You're saying top three off of this (inaudible)?
2014

2015 Ms. Fiore: Top three off of the matrix.
2016

2017 Ms. Schmitt: Top three rows. If you want to do more, that's fine. We'll provide you a
2018 way to give your feedback to Peter electronically so it's just consistent. We can pull all
2019 of that together and have for you what you all have to say about your top three, so you get
2020 it in your packet for your next meeting. At the next meeting, we can talk about that and
2021 see where we get and if we're ready ...
2022

2023 Commissioner Lauing: This is on a policy basis. We're not going to say we want more
2024 bowling classes.
2025

2026 Ms. Schmitt: No, no.
2027

2028 Commissioner Lauing: We're going to keep it as a need here. You said high demand
2029 (inaudible).
2030

2031 Ms. Schmitt: Yeah, based on the data that you're seeing here, that I track back to these
2032 threads. I disagree here. I found this statement from this other thing and I really think it's
2033 this direction. Even a comment, this doesn't jive with what I heard from either meetings
2034 at the PRC or in the community of people who I interact with in Palo Alto.
2035

2036 Mr. de Geus: Can I just add?
2037

2038 Ms. Schmitt: Yes.

2039
2040 Mr. de Geus: The most important thing though is to focus on the needs summary in the
2041 far right, and not focus on any one particular data source and cell, if you think maybe you
2042 have a different opinion on how to read the data. What we want to do is move in this
2043 direction to seek the need you describe and to set a truth test. Is there enough information
2044 here and data that supports that need? There's a couple of things that are surprising to me
2045 a little bit, that I would want to look into more closely. Most of it seems about right from
2046 what I'm hearing from the public. I would encourage you to look at those or those areas
2047 that you're particularly interested in, a topic, and dig deeper to see if it makes sense. As
2048 you come back next month, we have seven Commissioners each looking at three, we'll
2049 capture a lot of the questions that you may have. Hopefully we can start to shift to what
2050 is really a lot of work. That is the prioritization of needs, because what you see here, it's
2051 something that jumped out at me which is not surprising either. There are a lot more
2052 needs than there are resources that we can apply to these needs. People love their parks
2053 and their recreation in our community. The fact that most of these are high and medium,
2054 mostly high, is not surprising. The next and much harder job is then how do all of these
2055 needs as described stack up with one another in a prioritized fashion. We've got to apply
2056 resources and a timeline to do that. That's going to be tricky. The other piece to it is, this
2057 is a description of needs, but it doesn't really describe how we address those needs.
2058 Deirdre brought up the point about nature and experiencing nature. There are a lot of
2059 different ways you can do that, and some of them are more effective than others. That's
2060 the real meat of the Plan itself, because that's going to define how we're going to work on
2061 our park system in the future and the choices we make about how we design them. We
2062 need to get past the description of needs.

2063
2064 Ms. Schmitt: Also there's a lot to ponder here. When you're looking at these sites, you
2065 can start to see if you move one piece, in some cases you also move some of the other
2066 pieces. To pick off that experience nature, there's a number of ways you can do that. In
2067 trying to meet that need, you might pick off some other needs. As we talk about that
2068 prioritization as a Commission, thinking about the criteria you want to use, how we
2069 prioritize things is going to be important. You may decide a lot of different things are
2070 important. We may try out different sets of criteria and see how things shake out.
2071 Multiple benefit in some communities is an important criteria in deciding what to do first.
2072 It's the start of a lot of work, but it is the place where we all want to go. What are we
2073 going to do?

2074
2075 Commissioner Ashlund: Can I ask two quick clarification questions before our
2076 homework?

2077
2078 Ms. Schmitt: Mm-hmm.
2079

2080 Commissioner Ashlund: The first question. On line 38, open space and outdoor rec, it's
2081 under programs. That's with regard to open space and outdoor recreation as opposed to
2082 the experience nature up on line 11.

2083
2084 Ms. Schmitt: Exactly.

2085
2086 Commissioner Ashlund: This is programming.

2087
2088 Ms. Schmitt: This is a program area that ...

2089
2090 Commissioner Ashlund: The other question is under the geographic analysis, Column E,
2091 it points out difficult to access on foot or bike, yet the barriers is considered medium.
2092 Would that change its status? The other ones don't talk about their difficulty or
2093 accessibility in that column.

2094
2095 Ms. Fiore: My guess would be that accessing the spaces is difficult by foot or bike.
2096 Because these are structured programs, there is some transportation support. We could
2097 dig deeper into it.

2098
2099 Ms. Schmitt: Because they're being offered at the preserves or locations like that, not
2100 dispersed or in central Palo Alto, that might be why there's that comment. If you feel like
2101 that comment is off mark, that's a really good piece of feedback, that it's not consistent.

2102
2103 Commissioner Ashlund: Is public transit in that category of access along with foot or
2104 bike?

2105
2106 Ms. Fiore: Public transportation is normally included. I'm not sure (crosstalk).

2107
2108 Ms. Schmitt: There certainly is not at this point an analysis of is there a transit stop by
2109 the park. That's certainly something that could be looked at in the future. I would
2110 recommend it as a data point now. If you wanted to go in certain directions, you could
2111 say, "Is there transit there? If there's not, we should focus this type of thing at sites with
2112 transit or work on getting it there."

2113
2114 Commissioner Ashlund: Okay, great. My last real quick one was on Number 26. Row
2115 26 is called recreation centers. Lucie Stern and Cubberley, I always hear them referred to
2116 as community centers. When I think rec center, I think there's like a racquetball court and
2117 fitness centers. We don't have any of that. I mean we do have some of that access at
2118 Cubberley, but I just don't hear it referred to that way in our community.

2119
2120 Ms. Schmitt: Okay, so a title change there.

2121

2122 Commissioner Ashlund: Those are not my three points. Those are prior to my three
2123 points.

2124
2125 Commissioner Crommie: We're going to do this homework. Do we have any data
2126 source on how many people are using the Baylands in our City?

2127
2128 Ms. Schmitt: No, there's not counts.

2129
2130 Mr. de Geus: Lauren?

2131
2132 Ms. Schmitt: Yeah.

2133
2134 Daren Anderson: The ranger staff in the last year or so have monitored the counting
2135 devices at several entrances to the Baylands. We're getting increasingly accurate
2136 numbers for visitation in the Baylands.

2137
2138 Ms. Schmitt: But we don't have past data on those, that's been reflected in any of this
2139 material.

2140
2141 Mr. Anderson: We have past data too. It's not contiguous. There is a break in time, but
2142 we've got data going back a ways. It's evolving as we're getting better and better at it.
2143 When we used to track it, it was one entrance to a preserve that has ten, so it's flawed
2144 data. It was the best we could do at the time, and now we've gotten better. We're getting
2145 more and more accurate data. I guess you're right; it's not apples to apples if you were to
2146 compare our 2000 to this new data. We do have for Foothills very clean numbers.

2147
2148 Commissioner Crommie: It would be interesting to see it.

2149
2150 Ms. Schmitt: You can look in Mapita and some of the survey data. People are self-
2151 reporting which sites they're going to, and you can extrapolate from that also.

2152
2153 Chair Reckdahl: I have two comments here. Some of these are nice and crisp and I
2154 understand what went on. Some of them are not presentable. The demographic trends,
2155 for example, it's stable for gathering together, but it's increasing for picnic shelters. I
2156 don't quite understand exactly why. The source is citing growing population. It has
2157 nothing to do with the shelters. Some of these growth things are just very arbitrary. The
2158 other thing is Column K, the projected demand, that's a pretty important column. It
2159 would be worthwhile to, when you get to the end, have a paragraph on each one. Some
2160 of this is professional judgment. Some it's not numbers. It would be good to have an
2161 explanation of why is that an H. Granted that's going to be a few pages of writing, but
2162 that would be very useful for us. That's one of the columns we're going to be really
2163 looking at, projecting forward and looking at the demand going forward.

2164
2165 Ms. Schmitt: That's a nice piece of feedback. If there's one place to put more verbiage,
2166 focusing it there makes a lot of sense.

2167
2168 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you very much. We appreciate the work.

2169
2170 Ms. Fiore: Thank you.

2171
2172 Ms. Schmitt: We really appreciate the excellent discussion tonight.

2173
2174 **4. Recommendation for a Park Improvement Ordinance for Pilot Batting Cages**
2175 **within the Former PASCO Site at the Baylands Athletic Center.**
2176

2177 Daren Anderson: Good evening. Daren Anderson with Open Space, Parks and Golf. I'm
2178 here tonight with an action item seeking your recommendation to Council to adopt the
2179 Park Improvement Ordinance authorizing the addition of two batting cages and
2180 converting one standard parking stall to a handicap-accessible parking stall within the
2181 former PASCO site at the Baylands Athletic Center. Staff has brought this project to the
2182 Commission on February 24th, and the Commission generally supported the project, but
2183 suggested there should be a public meeting. On March 23rd, we held a public meeting at
2184 the Baylands Athletic Center and discussed the project. Six members of the public and
2185 two Commissioners attended the meeting. All members of the public supported the
2186 project. There was a request to include a gate on the west end of the site to allow more
2187 efficient access to the batting cages. After a little further examination, there is an existing
2188 gate there that will provide the requested access. I don't have a lot to add since the
2189 previous presentation covered the bulk of the project and there weren't a lot of
2190 outstanding questions. If there are any questions for me, I'm glad to answer them.

2191
2192 Commissioner Lauing: What was the public comment?

2193
2194 Mr. Anderson: The public comment was that on the west end, over here, if we had a gate
2195 that would allow for easier access from the other field.

2196
2197 Commissioner Lauing: I got that. Was there anything else?

2198
2199 Mr. Anderson: We support the project. It was nothing but support. It was largely
2200 athletic field supporter proponents, Babe Ruth, little leagues. Maybe the Commissioners
2201 who attended that would like to chime in if you have any thoughts on how that public
2202 meeting went from your perspective.

2203
2204 Chair Reckdahl: It was fairly non-eventful. The people there were all baseball people,
2205 and they supported the batting cages. Do you have any comments about it?

2206
2207 Commissioner Hetterly: That's right. It was all baseball people, and they were all very
2208 supportive, from all the different venues of baseball. I understand, Daren, you also sent
2209 an email notice about the public meeting to all the stakeholders including all the
2210 environmental groups. No one came or submitted comments.

2211
2212 Mr. Anderson: Correct.

2213
2214 **MOTION:** Commissioner Hetterly moved, seconded by Vice Chair Markevitch that the
2215 Commission recommend to the Council approval of the Park Improvement Ordinance.

2216
2217 Chair Reckdahl: Any discussion? Okay. Let's vote.

2218
2219 **MOTION APPROVED:** 7-0

2220
2221 **5. Staff Update on Drought Response for Parks, Open Space and Golf.**

2222
2223 Daren Anderson: Thank you so much. Bear with me just a moment. We're pulling up a
2224 PowerPoint. I'm here to give you an update on our drought situation and how it's
2225 affecting the City and what kind of things we'll be facing in the near future. As you
2226 probably already know, California is facing one of the most severe droughts on record.
2227 Governor Brown declared a drought state of emergency in January and directed State
2228 officials to take all necessary actions to prepare for water shortages. This drought is
2229 going to have profound effects on open space to some degree. We have a few irrigated
2230 areas that will be impacted. Parks, to a great degree and the golf course to a great degree.
2231 We'll have to change the way we do business to address these demands and restrictions
2232 that will be coming our way. This next slide gives some of the numbers. You've
2233 probably seen a number of these different percentages on the news. Which ones pertain
2234 to us? The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, this is our water provider, has on
2235 the books, and hasn't changed it, a 10 percent voluntary reduction. That's still in place.
2236 The Santa Clara Valley Water District is calling for 30 percent; although, we do not get
2237 our water from Santa Clara Valley Water District. Statewide, the Governor has issued a
2238 call for 25 percent water reduction. This is potable water, not recycled water. Though
2239 the Governor's is 25 percent, it is on a sliding scale per community. The State Water
2240 Board looks at each community and allocates water reductions. Some were low; some
2241 were in the 20s; some were higher in the 30 range. Ours is for the moment at 24 percent.
2242 That's the bucket we've been allocated for now. It does seem that things are in flux and
2243 can change and have been changing. I don't know exactly what it will be. It's draft form
2244 right now, and everything I can tell you is we're in this moment in time and subject to
2245 change. We hope to know more soon. We'll be back in May to give you an update. On
2246 May 11th, the Utilities Department is going to bring a report to City Council on the
2247 drought and discuss the City's water shortage contingency plan. This plan will discuss

2248 the 24 percent reduction and what that means for the City and where we'll be making
2249 some of the restrictions to conserve that much water, how much we've made in previous
2250 years and what we have left to do. There's also other restrictions. This is just a small
2251 snapshot of some of them coming our way. Using potable water to wash sidewalks and
2252 driveways. That does have implications for the parks department. In the past and in our
2253 maintenance contract with Gachina, as a best management practice we cleaned tennis
2254 courts with a water broom. It gets deeper cleaning of the tennis courts and prolongs the
2255 life of the court itself as opposed to using a blower or a broom or anything. That's just
2256 not a best management practice in the drought. We've discontinued that for some time
2257 now, and we'll continue to discontinue that as well as other places. The runoff when
2258 you're getting potable water. This is one we get a lot of complaints unfortunately. We
2259 have a lot of citizens keeping their eye out for this, which is great. It doesn't take much.
2260 when you have hundreds of thousands of sprinkler heads scattered throughout the City,
2261 for one sprinkler head to be either kicked, clogged, or broken off by somebody and then
2262 water pours down onto the sidewalk. You'll see that. Unfortunately, it gives us a black
2263 eye, as if we're not monitoring it closely. It just can happen so quickly. It's really
2264 incumbent upon my team to be on it, to be looking at it, to be really responsive when we
2265 get those complaints and fix it the same day. Oftentimes we get it within the hour.
2266 We've got a really responsive manager in charge of irrigation, comes in on his days off
2267 and on the weekends to shut off valves and fix things like that. We're doing the best we
2268 can. Using potable water in decorative water features that do not have a recirculating
2269 function. Just for the record, Lytton Plaza has that fountain that is recirculating, so we
2270 have continued that practice. We're probably going to add some signage that explains
2271 we're cognizant of the drought, this is a recirculating fountain, that's why we're allowing
2272 it to continue. The Cal Ave fountain will also be recirculating. It's not up and running
2273 yet, but that will be recirculating which is permissible under these restrictions. Outdoor
2274 irrigation during 48 hours following measurable precipitation. This is another one of
2275 those restrictions that will require us to be very cautious. Sometimes you'll see maybe in
2276 the news, agencies making mistakes. It rained yesterday, and they come out and test the
2277 irrigation. Can't do that anymore. We'll have to be careful on ensuring that we're
2278 compliant with these. As I mentioned, this is going to heavily impact my division
2279 especially, the Open Space, Parks and Golf areas. We're going to have to bear a lot of the
2280 burden, because we're such a big user of the outside irrigation in the City of Palo Alto.
2281 We need to help achieve that City goal of 24 percent, possibly more. We don't know at
2282 this point. We've been working on a plan that's going to reduce significant amounts of
2283 irrigation. I want to share with you the methodology of the initial thinking that's behind
2284 this initial draft. We put a lot of work into it, and it's been evolving. We're still
2285 massaging it into place, so bear with me when I show you what I'm about to and
2286 understand it's in the preliminary phases. What we're doing is a park-by-park analysis,
2287 looking at all the irrigation that goes there. We're identifying the ornamental sections or
2288 aesthetic pieces of turf and recommending them for elimination. That would mean
2289 stopping irrigation wholeheartedly there and cover it with wood chips, let it go



2290 completely brown, maybe come back and plant some drought-resistant plants in some
2291 cases. One of those three options. At this particular site, the Baylands Athletic Center,
2292 you can see we've got a couple of different colors. Forgive me if you can't quite make
2293 out the colors. We've outlined them. You can see orange is to reduce irrigation to two
2294 times per month. There's a little sliver of the park where we have got turf, and it's got
2295 trees in it. We'd like to eliminate irrigation but not entirely, because we don't want to kill
2296 the trees. They're still dependent on it. We're having this back-and-forth with our tree
2297 department to say, "Are these trees the type that you think would make it?" If they say,
2298 "No. They need supplemental irrigation, because that's how they've been sustaining
2299 themselves because they're turf trees." then we're going to continue to irrigate, but very
2300 minimally. Two times per month is more than enough to sustain those trees. The turf
2301 will die, and it will look different. Another area you'll see is outlined in green. That's
2302 eliminate entirely. That's not without any impact. There's an aesthetic impact. As you
2303 drive into this major athletic facility, we have these three strips of turf there, closest to the
2304 parking lot. While not used for active play, they have been used for warm-up, certainly a
2305 place where some people congregate. If we don't make these changes, we don't believe
2306 we're going to be able to realize that 24 percent reduction. We've got to make hard
2307 choices like this. What we've done in this initial pass is to say, "These areas, we're going
2308 to have to cut back." What you'll see is the larger section, the actual playing fields
2309 identified in yellow, we're going to need to irrigate them a little bit more. It's one we
2310 can't quite let go. It's an athletic field. It's highly brokered. It's highly used. There's a
2311 safety component. If you were to let it dry up, what would happen to it? That's a
2312 question we've been getting asked quite frequently. What's that going to look like if you
2313 went to two days a week or one day a week? It's really difficult to answer, because every
2314 site is different. There's micro differences in the soil makeup, the irrigation system itself,
2315 the history of the field on how much it's used and brokered. This particular site, our
2316 hunch is it's not going to exceed five days. We will probably dial it back, and that's going
2317 to put some constraints on it. We think we can keep it safe. We can still grow grass on it
2318 at five days a week, which will allow us to save some water. We would still be a little bit
2319 more than some other parks like this one, Cameron Park. This park we've outlined
2320 completely in light blue, which is to irrigate no more than two days a week. Basically
2321 we'll irrigate that entire park just two times a week. That would result in changes. It's a
2322 big cutback. I can't say lots of questions have come up. How often do you typically
2323 irrigate it? It fluctuates with the season. During the winter, we're irrigating maybe not at
2324 all. If we have a dry winter, it's a couple of days. In the peak of summer, it could be six
2325 to seven days a week. In the peak of summer, that would turn mostly brown. In some
2326 areas we'll probably lose turf, is my guess. Little spots here and there where the turf will
2327 die away. The ability to grow grass is possible irrigating two days a week. A site like
2328 this, if we implement a two-day-a-week restriction or something like that, what you could
2329 expect in the long term is some dead patches, lots of brown areas during the summer, and
2330 with luck it would come back each year. We'd do our best to make it look as good as we
2331 can, make it safe for people to play on. That's the ideas of what we're doing. Every



2332 single site in the City where we irrigate, we're starting this. We started with the parks and
2333 preserves. There's not a lot in the open space preserves. Mostly it's native landscaping
2334 which is irrigated to establish and then it's pretty much left on its own. The next steps
2335 again. I mentioned that there's going to be a staff report going to the Council on May
2336 11th. After that we hope to know more. We'll get some feedback from Council, get
2337 some direction, and continue working on our site-by-site analysis. Hopefully we'll get a
2338 more firmed up figure of what our cut is going to be, and then we can use some of this
2339 analysis to say, "Okay, we can eliminate so many square feet of turf. How much water is
2340 that going to save us? Will we realize a 24 percent reduction based off the 2013
2341 baseline?" Again, I hadn't mentioned that before, but that's our baseline year, 2013, for
2342 my first slide that talked about those different percentages. They're all predicated on the
2343 2013 baseline.

2344
2345 Chair Reckdahl: Are you also doing this for the golf course?
2346

2347 Mr. Anderson: Yes.
2348

2349 Chair Reckdahl: There will be some areas of the golf course that don't get watered as
2350 much.
2351

2352 Mr. Anderson: Correct. Mainly the outer rough. We have got a great relationship with
2353 Valley Crest. The Superintendent there, Brian Daum, is working closely with us. We
2354 really have a good plan at the golf course. I feel confident. It'll be good to make great
2355 strides there. We've got a 70/30 blend right now, 70 percent recycled/30 percent potable.
2356 The same is true for Greer Park and Baylands Athletic Center. Long term there'll be
2357 hopefully more parks coming online as the recycled water line gets extended. I don't
2358 have a lot of information on that right now. I hope to have more for you soon.
2359

2360 Rob de Geus: The idea is to extend it all the way down Middlefield to south Palo Alto.
2361 In fact, the new Mitchell Park Community Center is all plumbed to accept recycled water.
2362 Installed accelerated networks would be a good strategy, because that's money spent now
2363 for the current drought but it's ongoing.
2364

2365 Vice Chair Markevitch: Long term, that recycled water, does it hurt the plants or does
2366 not have any impact to them?
2367

2368 Mr. Anderson: In the site-by-site analysis, it really depends on the soil profile. If we
2369 look at a park like Greer where it's been irrigated with recycled water for some time, I
2370 hear mixed opinions on whether it impacts certain trees differently, less salt tolerant
2371 because the recycled water has a little higher salt content. Ours is getting better and
2372 better. By ours, I mean our City provider said the water has dropped its TDS or total
2373 dissolved solvents significantly in the last couple of years. It's getting closer and closer

2374 to the point where we feel that turf and plants can almost take 100 percent recycled water
2375 and do okay. We've pushed the limits periodically, both at the golf course and at the
2376 Baylands, and ran it for periods of time at 100 percent. At the golf course, eventually we
2377 see accumulation of salts rising up, and it starts to distress and kill grass. I don't know
2378 that that will transfer to every other site necessarily.

2379
2380 Female: It's also the closest to the Bay.

2381
2382 Mr. Anderson: That's right. With a very shallow water table right there with salt water.

2383
2384 Commissioner Knopper: What's the expectation as to when as a City we will be at the 24
2385 percent reduction with regard to a date, timeline?

2386
2387 Mr. Anderson: I believe we're going to be required to start the process June 1st, is my
2388 understanding.

2389
2390 Commissioner Knopper: Have you noticed in the preserves where we don't irrigate, do
2391 the native plantings and trees, have you guys started to notice changes?

2392
2393 Mr. Anderson: We do. We've got indicator species like Buckeye trees, for example, that
2394 will turn the quickest during drought years. This isn't too new, because these are all un-
2395 irrigated areas. In the past, we'll see those indicator trees that turn the fastest, like the
2396 Buckeye, and others will dry out a little faster. It'll probably have implications for us for
2397 an extended fire season. Luckily we've made good strides with our wild land fire
2398 protection plan and made some improvements that protect us there. Still my expectation
2399 is that we'll have definitely drier habitat.

2400
2401 Commissioner Crommie: What set of guiding principles are you using when you decide
2402 which parks to cut back on or not?

2403
2404 Mr. Anderson: That's an excellent question. We've been under the gun to move quickly,
2405 because of the amount of parks to go through. Every single one of those we had to pour
2406 through and say, "Is this on a continuous irrigation zone or valve where I could turn all
2407 this in one shot or do we have to reconfigure things?" There was a lot of analysis in
2408 every park. We followed the basic criteria of is it a heavily brokered or used piece of
2409 turf. I'll give you an example. The area I showed you was the Baylands Athletic Center
2410 where we had athletic fields, and it was highly used, highly brokered. We selected that as
2411 a criteria that we continue to water a little bit more. We used the aesthetic ornamental
2412 turf as the areas where we say either let go or did it lend itself to be isolated easily. Did it
2413 have trees on it that we have to do something different with? If I leave the irrigation
2414 system off for a very long time, the cost of getting it back running again is expensive.
2415 We're trying to be as judicious and intelligent as we select these areas. The main criteria

2416 is, is it ornamental and aesthetic? Then we have flexibility in either eliminating or
2417 reducing. Is it highly brokered and is there a safety component to it like an athletic field
2418 or a highly brokered area? For example, the internal courtyard at Lucie Stern where we
2419 have weddings. A lot of the special events or rentals are predicated on having an internal
2420 courtyard where there's grass to recreate and use. It's almost part of the rental in many
2421 ways. There are a few areas like that. Basically, is it highly used? Is it highly brokered?
2422 Does it usually lend itself to, in our criteria, extending the irrigation to a little less water
2423 use?

2424
2425 Commissioner Crommie: You're not using a criterion that has to do with amount of
2426 resource in dollars that are lost through death.

2427
2428 Mr. Anderson: Death of turf, you mean?

2429
2430 Commissioner Crommie: Yeah. Well, death of trees, plants.

2431
2432 Mr. Anderson: We're not going to let the trees go. We haven't identified any areas yet.

2433
2434 Commissioner Crommie: You'd already established that you will not let trees die.

2435
2436 Mr. Anderson: That was one of our criteria for tree areas. This was the good example.
2437 In the turf area that did have trees, we changed it to a different color, that orange color
2438 you saw, and said two times per month.

2439
2440 Commissioner Crommie: You're going to present on this on May 11th.

2441
2442 Mr. Anderson: I won't. The Utilities Department will be bringing the staff report to the
2443 Council.

2444
2445 Commissioner Crommie: Is that the same report you're going to give back to us? I'm just
2446 wondering how we coordinate with Council. Often on a topic like this, we would hear it
2447 before it goes to Council. Then they might want to look at our feedback. This seems a
2448 little backwards to me.

2449
2450 Mr. Anderson: I think that May 11th won't be getting to the degree of detail that you see
2451 here. This is very much a draft. Council won't be seeing this. This is just the staff
2452 document to let us know where we are in our capability to reach a 24 percent reduction.
2453 Because we are such a big water user, I can't arbitrarily say, "I think I can get rid of most
2454 of my aesthetic turf to meet that 24 percent." I need to be reassured, because the
2455 penalties are stiff and the need to meet it is huge. I believe we're one of the dominant
2456 water users. It's incumbent upon us to be confident of whatever percent we're saving
2457 with the belief that we can meet it. This is the only way I know how.

2458
2459 Commissioner Knopper: From a percentage perspective, of the 24 percent, you may not
2460 know and this might just be way into the weeds, what percentage of the 24 percent do
2461 you think Parks and Rec will have to reduce versus other City agencies?
2462

2463 Mr. Anderson: We don't have that.
2464

2465 Mr. de Geus: That data is still being analyzed.
2466

2467 Commissioner Knopper: I would imagine it would be hard for Daren to go through this
2468 exercise (glitch).
2469

2470 Mr. de Geus: This is a lot of sites too. There may be additional executive orders from
2471 the Governor and other things for further restrictions. Actually, we expect that in the
2472 next couple of months. There's going to have to be even more work. To your point, the
2473 24 percent is the goal for our City, but our parks division and our parks system is going to
2474 have to take a greater load, carry a heavier load. We've heard as much as 35 percent that
2475 we're actually going to have to do. With some of the buildings and indoor uses, there's
2476 only so much you can do to get to 24 or 25 percent.
2477

2478 Commissioner Knopper: Of that 24 percent though, is any of that being kicked to the
2479 residents?
2480

2481 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, the whole City has to come with the 24 percent total.
2482

2483 Commissioner Knopper: When the City's going through this exercise, are you ...
2484

2485 Mr. de Geus: City and community. Not just City or community.
2486

2487 Commissioner Knopper: They're going to come in for the residents. I went for a walk
2488 the other day. Gorgeous rose gardens and beautiful green, luscious lawns. I wanted to
2489 knock on the door and bop the homeowner on the head. Like, hello, beautiful garden, but
2490 what's going on here, people? The cost to the City has to be spread through everyone, the
2491 residents as well as the City and commercial people. That's why Daren's going through
2492 this horrific exercise of what can I let die. As Deirdre just said, what death are we
2493 allowing to happen without residents taking some responsibility?
2494

2495 Mr. de Geus: Everyone in the community, residents, businesses, the public, we all have
2496 to take ...
2497

2498 Commissioner Knopper: This is going to be an edict from ...
2499

2500 Mr. de Geus: Yeah.

2501
2502 Commissioner Crommie: Who's leading the public education on this? Who's in charge
2503 of that?

2504
2505 Mr. de Geus: (crosstalk) Utilities Department. If you're interested in this topic, the May
2506 11th meeting will be an important one. The staff report itself will be an interesting read.

2507
2508 Commissioner Hetterly: I just have a quick question. The water feature at Mitchell Park,
2509 is that recirculating?

2510
2511 Mr. Anderson: It is not.

2512
2513 Mr. de Geus: That will be turned off.

2514
2515 Commissioner Hetterly: It will be turned off this summer.

2516
2517 Chair Reckdahl: What was the time span it took before grass and trees are damaged by
2518 100 percent recycled water?

2519
2520 Mr. Anderson: It depends on the site. At the golf course, I couldn't give you an accurate
2521 estimation. We ran it for probably a month on 100 percent recycled.

2522
2523 Chair Reckdahl: We can't make it to rainy season. You couldn't just go all summer and
2524 be all right with 100 percent recycled?

2525
2526 Mr. Anderson: No.

2527
2528 Mr. de Geus: It's interesting you ask. The new golf course, should we get underway one
2529 day, has a turf variety that can withstand 100 percent recycled water. We did a lot of
2530 research (crosstalk) on that topic.

2531
2532 Commissioner Crommie: I have an educational point to make. I think it was last
2533 weekend I went on a native gardens tour in Los Altos. It was very educational and
2534 inspirational to try to make those kinds of changes within our own property. Do you
2535 know if someone is running that in the City of Palo Alto?

2536
2537 Mr. Anderson: Do you mean conversion of lawn to ...

2538
2539 Commissioner Crommie: Where people put their gardens on display for educational
2540 purposes. Do we have an annual tour in the City of Palo Alto?

2541

2542 Mr. de Geus: I don't know if there's a tour. I know there's some of those gardens. We
2543 could bring it up.

2544
2545 Commissioner Crommie: I know they do one in Los Altos. That's the one I normally go
2546 to. I haven't seen it noticed in the City of Palo Alto.

2547
2548 Mr. Anderson: Gamble Gardens is our go-to. They're heavily involved in that.

2549
2550 Commissioner Crommie: I mean residents.

2551
2552 Mr. Anderson: I know. They are part of that tour of resident gardens.

2553
2554 Peter Jensen: I would like to preface that the renovation of a turf area to native landscape
2555 does not mean in the first two years that you save water. In fact, you would probably use
2556 more water to establish that plant material. The plant material is based on drought
2557 tolerance because of the size of the root system that grows. To develop that root system
2558 takes water. It's not like an area where you can just convert your grass to native
2559 landscape and you're reducing water. It's a transition idea. That part probably needs to
2560 be provided in the education to residents. What that conversion is and the amount of
2561 water you could expect to use. In that process where people do renovate their yards to
2562 drought tolerant, they are quite surprised in the first year that they're probably using a
2563 little bit more water than they were. They were watering established plant material, even
2564 if it was grass. Most old grass is not actually a lot of grass anymore, but it's a mixture of
2565 weeds that are usually a lot tougher than the grass we have. Just another point of view to
2566 think about.

2567
2568 Mr. de Geus: I'm glad you mentioned that. That's another criteria that we're looking
2569 through as we do this exercise, particularly for those high demand athletic fields. If we
2570 let them die, the cost of bringing them back, in terms of money and water ...

2571
2572 Commissioner Crommie: That's what I was getting at.

2573
2574 Mr. de Geus: ... to reseed a field. You could end up using more water to bring it back
2575 than to cut down to three days a week or whatever we can do to keep it alive.

2576
2577 Commissioner Crommie: That would be in your criteria, right? The cost to reestablish
2578 what you kill.

2579
2580 Mr. de Geus: Right.

2581
2582 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you, Daren.

2583

2584 **6. Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates.**
2585

2586 Chair Reckdahl: Are there any ad hoc committees that want to report in?
2587

2588 Commissioner Hetterly: I have an update that I received notice (crosstalk) putting
2589 together a resolution for Council about the fire management budgeting.
2590

2591 Commissioner Lauing: I was going to read that.
2592

2593 Commissioner Hetterly: (crosstalk) back on the radar.
2594

2595 Chair Reckdahl: They asked (inaudible).
2596

2597 Commissioner Lauing: I was going to raise that, as a matter of fact, for the agenda for
2598 next month.
2599

2600 Chair Reckdahl: The agenda's not (inaudible) for next month.
2601

2602 **V. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**
2603

2604 Chair Reckdahl: Rob, do you have any?
2605

2606 Rob de Geus: The May Fete Parade is this Saturday, the 93rd. The theme is no space to
2607 alienate. Last year's Mayor said the theme is to be about anti-bullying. I'm like, "How do
2608 we make that fun?" What we try and do is have a topic that is fun and interesting but also
2609 is something that teachers, in elementary schools in particular, as they build their floats
2610 can have a conversation about youth development. No space to alienate is also space
2611 focused but also not alienating your friends. Really fun. It's this Saturday, 10:00. The
2612 parade and fair starts at Heritage Park. It runs through the afternoon. Lots of music. It's
2613 going to be great. It's one of the best events we do. Kids can participate. Most children
2614 participate one way or another as part of their school. If a child wants to participate, if
2615 they want to walk in the parade, they can. We have kids with pets. Just come, bring your
2616 pet on a leash. Kids on wheels, come and we'll get you into the parade. It's really going
2617 to be a fun event. I think there's 78 groups in the parade. In fact this year, Mayor
2618 Holman's very interested in the parade and has been supporting some of the planning.
2619 She's been meeting with us. Her recommendation was to extend the parade route, so we
2620 did that. We can go by Lytton Gardens and Channing House. We shortened it partly
2621 because it was so long and there was no one on the sides to watch the parade.
2622

2623 Chair Reckdahl: Channing House always had a lot of people, right?
2624

2625 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, they did. We're having a block party, but we're organizing for them
2626 and with them right in front of Channing House and Lytton Gardens. Avenidas is
2627 participating with people at Stevenson House. That's a nice addition. It should be really
2628 fun.

2629
2630 Chair Reckdahl: What time does it start?

2631
2632 Mr. de Geus: 10:00 is when the parade gets started. The fair at Heritage Park starts at
2633 the same time, so you can go there as well and wait.

2634
2635 Chair Reckdahl: The Commission's marching in it?

2636
2637 Mr. de Geus: Yep. I'll be there at the corner of University and Emerson.

2638
2639 Vice Chair Markevitch: Do we ever invite the other commissions? I don't see too many
2640 of them.

2641
2642 Mr. de Geus: Usually we get some Community Relations Commissioners.

2643
2644 Chair Reckdahl: There's a better showing from Park and Rec.

2645
2646 Vice Chair Markevitch: Always.

2647
2648 Mr. de Geus: The other thing I want to say is we're going through budget season right
2649 now. Our budget goes through the hearing process which is through the Finance
2650 Committee. Eric, are you on the Finance Committee? I can't remember if you are.

2651
2652 Council Member Filseth: Yes.

2653
2654 Mr. de Geus: There's four Council Members on the Finance Committee. Vice Mayor
2655 Schmidt is the Chair, is that correct? The Community Services budget goes to the
2656 Finance Committee on May 5th. They meet several times this month and take two or
2657 three departments at a time and look through the budget for fiscal year '16 and the
2658 requests being asked and the rationale for those requests and a discussion. They have the
2659 opportunity to recommend changes and tweaks to that budget. After May, it goes to the
2660 full Council for adoption. Next Tuesday, May 5th, is when the Community Services
2661 budget goes forward. Council got their taste last night when Jim Keene, our City
2662 Manager, gave an initial preview of the capital budget plus the operating budget to the
2663 Council. It's a lot of information. They spoke for maybe half an hour or 40 minutes, and
2664 then the books were handed out.

2666 Council Member Filseth: Three of us are real green-eyeshade guys, so watch out
2667 (crosstalk).

2668
2669 Commissioner Lauing: Are you pretty much through the book already since last night?
2670

2671 Council Member Filseth: Sorry.
2672

2673 Commissioner Lauing: Did you get through the book yet?
2674

2675 Council Member Filseth: I got through it about 11:00 last night. It's like two or three of
2676 these things.
2677

2678 Peter Jensen: I'd also like to add that Rob was presented a key to the Magical Bridge two
2679 weekends ago that opened up the playground. If you haven't been by it to see the
2680 playground, it's a lot more powerful than I thought it was going to be.
2681

2682 Commissioner Lauing: You designed it.
2683

2684 Mr. Jensen: Yeah.
2685

2686 Mr. de Geus: Peter Jensen, our Landscape Architect, deserves a lot of credit as well as
2687 the members of the public who made that happen, Olenka and team. The City donated
2688 some land, of course, and some seed money, \$300,000. They raised \$4 million. They
2689 never came back to ask for more money which is amazing. I saw several of you at the
2690 opening. What a remarkable playground it is.
2691

2692 Commissioner Lauing: It was astonishing. I agree with Peter that the design was as good
2693 or better than anything we've been looking at. It's just phenomenal, completely
2694 heartwarming. Everywhere you look, the message is just absolutely great.
2695

2696 Mr. de Geus: One of the goals of the founders of the Magical Bridge Playground is to
2697 start a national conversation about inclusive play. They're really doing that. This is a
2698 national story, this playground.
2699

2700 Commissioner Lauing: It did get national publicity.
2701

2702 Commissioner Crommie: Can you plan to report back to the Parks and Rec Commission
2703 in a year or so about the durability of the components. That will come into play when
2704 people want to integrate those into other parks. It'll be really important to hear what
2705 lasted, what had trouble, that kind of thing. Is that already in your plans?
2706

2707 Mr. Jensen: Not right now to come back to give an update. We observe the playground
2708 every day to make sure that it's holding up. I'm happy to say that it's doing very, very
2709 well for the amount of traffic that it's getting.

2710
2711 Commissioner Crommie: It's a magnet, yeah.

2712
2713 Commissioner Lauing: I was going to ask anyway about any news on the golf course,
2714 with or without water impacts either way. Is it still in abeyance or moving to Plan B?

2715
2716 Mr. de Geus: There isn't a lot of information. At this point, we're not going to be able to
2717 start construction before the end of the calendar year. The earliest we could seek permits
2718 at this point would be after summer or at the very end of summer. It wouldn't be a good
2719 sensible time to start the construction. The earliest is January or February time period.
2720 The real question is how are we doing in the permitting application process. There's
2721 constantly movement in the right direction. It's just agonizingly slow. From the golf
2722 course perspective, we are waiting for the levee project to get through their issues with
2723 the Corps, and with the Marine Fisheries and the Water Board. We need a permit from
2724 all those, because they're telling us, "Wait. We want to first be sure that we're satisfied
2725 with the levee project and then we'll issue a permit for the golf course." You see the issue
2726 there. If there's concerns about the levee project, that they think in some way that
2727 project's going to change, that may impact the design for the golf course. That's why they
2728 don't want to do that. The Joint Powers Authority is making progress. They've made
2729 significant progress with the Water Board and have their permit from them. They're now
2730 working with the Corps and Marine Fisheries. I understand that's going well, that they've
2731 made progress. Not a permit in hand at this point.

2732
2733 Commissioner Knopper: On the schedule, the City Council/Commission joint meeting
2734 on the 27th of next month. It says 9:00 to 10:00 P.M. Then like 75 emails came in; 9:00
2735 to 10:00, no. What time is it?

2736
2737 Mr. de Geus: Agenda planning is next on the agenda, so we'll get into it there.

2738
2739 **VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR May 26, 2015 MEETING**

2740
2741 Chair Reckdahl: Agenda planning, we'll save that to the end. We had this resolution on
2742 the fire mitigation in Foothills Park. Byxbee Park, the PIO may come back. We were
2743 thinking about having it this month, but Daren's been swamped with other work as you
2744 can see. That one got bumped to next month. We have a couple of ad hocs that we've
2745 penciled in, the website and community gardens. They have a couple of weeks to figure
2746 out if there's anything they want to present, if you're on those ad hocs. Then the joint
2747 study session with Council. Do you want to talk about that?

2749 Rob de Geus: I'm not sure if everyone's responded to Catherine on availability for that
2750 evening. The Council has a lot on their agenda over the next few months. The idea here
2751 was to pool some of these study sessions on separate nights to get through them. That's
2752 why that's happening. The 27th was identified as a night for this Commission as well as
2753 the Public Art Commission and the Palo Alto Youth Council. Three of them, one after
2754 the other. The latest count, I thought, was that we may not have enough Commissioners.
2755 I think two or three said they couldn't attend. I was talking to Catherine about that. My
2756 view is if three can't attend a study session, we shouldn't do it. We should try and find
2757 another time when more Commissioners can be there. If it's later in the year, I think it's
2758 probably fine, unless the Commission needs to ...

2760 Commissioner Hetterly: I think it's much preferable to have it much later in the year. I
2761 don't think we have much to report to them frankly.

2763 Commissioner Lauing: On top of which we would have to plan it in the next 30 minutes.

2765 Mr. de Geus: Keith and I talked about that.

2767 Commissioner Lauing: It comes a few hours after our next meeting, so we would have to
2768 plan it right now.

2770 Chair Reckdahl: If you look at the last six months, the bulk of our time has been on the
2771 Master Plan. That still is a work in progress. We certainly could give them an update on
2772 where we stand, but I don't know.

2774 Vice Chair Markevitch: Can't we just send them a memo? Send them the matrix, this is
2775 what we're working on. Eric likes it.

2777 Commissioner Lauing: It's not a big problem from the Council's perspective. Just
2778 pushing it a few months later would be highly preferable for us.

2780 Commissioner Hetterly: After the summer break.

2782 Mr. de Geus: That's my sense. I don't know, Council Member Filseth, if you have any
2783 thoughts. You're pretty new to this.

2785 Council Member Filseth: Do it when it makes sense. Don't try to rush it because we've
2786 got a time slot here. We have lots of stuff to do. You guys have lots of stuff to do. Do it
2787 when there's useful material.

2789 Mr. de Geus: That makes a lot of sense. We'll report back to ...
2790

2791 Catherine Bourquin: Beth was okay with that.
2792

2793 Chair Reckdahl: This should have been back at the comments. This park, have we
2794 started construction on that?
2795

2796 Mr. de Geus: Oh, yeah. It's under construction. It's leveled. A bocce ball court's going
2797 in.
2798

2799 Chair: I really wanted bocce. How about ...
2800

2801 Commissioner Knopper: It doesn't take water bocce.
2802

2803 Mr. de Geus: El Camino Park is underway. It's still currently on schedule. It does
2804 represent another policy question. Did Daren leave?
2805

2806 Ms. Bourquin: Yes.
2807

2808 Mr. de Geus: The northern field is a synthetic turf field. The southern, large field is a
2809 turf field. It's going to require a lot of water to grow that in. I think we're planning to use
2810 sod. Still that's going to be a lot of water to make sure that that turf is ready for play. It's
2811 another question that'll come up as a policy matter for our community, the Council. Not
2812 just for community parks, but all of our parks and our renovation plans. Do we need to
2813 rethink some of the decision about how we're bringing them online? We don't have a
2814 recommendation about that.
2815

2816 Vice Chair Markevitch: That one field is literally sitting on top of 3 million gallons of
2817 water. Can't we tap some of that? It's a valid question.
2818

2819 Chair Reckdahl: Did we consider going with artificial turf or doing just a dirt outfield?
2820

2821 Mr. de Geus: What we need to do for every park site, as I've discussed with Daren, is
2822 think critically about every one and have a good sense of the criteria that we're using and
2823 some consistency about using that criteria. Some of them are unique, like bringing on a
2824 new field like that. That's really large; it's a couple of acres. That's a lot of water to grow
2825 that in. To at least pause and think through whether this makes sense given what we're
2826 facing with regard to the drought.
2827

2828 Vice Chair Markevitch: How about if we open half of it? The artificial turf gets opened
2829 and they're playing it.
2830

2831 Mr. de Geus: There's a number of different ways we could work it. That's what we are
2832 doing now.

2833
2834 Chair Reckdahl: In what timeframe do we have to make a decision on that baseball field?
2835

2836 Mr. de Geus: It will be ready to lay turf there at the end of summer.
2837

2838 Chair Reckdahl: We still have a couple of months.
2839

2840 Mr. de Geus: Yeah. Our hope is to open that field by the end of the calendar year, both
2841 of those fields. Of course, you know the community has been waiting for those fields to
2842 come online for a couple of years now, because we've fallen behind on that. That's
2843 another factor to consider. One might say, "You haven't had them for so long, maybe not
2844 bringing it online is the smart thing to do." That saves more. On the other hand, the
2845 community hasn't had that field, and it's going to be a great park. As you know, you've
2846 spent a lot of time on it. It's fantastic; a really, really nice park. The community wants to
2847 use it; they want to have access to it. Some of those tough policy decisions I expect the
2848 Commission will have to weigh in on and ultimately Council.
2849

2850 Chair Reckdahl: Okay. Is that it?
2851

2852 Vice Chair Markevitch: Mm-hmm.
2853

2854 Commissioner Lauing: On this resolution, I did want to check with Eric to see if we're
2855 still in okay shape on timing. This is the resolution around the fire that was a CIP, now
2856 going into the annual budget. We want to get Finance Committee support. If this is far
2857 along, then you might have missed the deadline.
2858

2859 Council Member Filseth: I don't have a good answer for that. The schedule is being set
2860 by the staff and (inaudible) check with those guys. (crosstalk) whatever their deadline is,
2861 is about the only answer I can give.
2862

2863 Mr. de Geus: It's in the fire management plan moved into CIP, the capital budget to the
2864 operating budget. The operating budget is being looked at by the Finance Committee
2865 next week on Tuesday. It includes the fire management plan which is in three different
2866 departments though. Community Services has a piece of it. We'll be discussed next
2867 week. Council Member Filseth is on the committee, so he can relay the strong interest of
2868 this Commission on that particular line item to the extent you understand. That's one
2869 way, or we could have a Commissioner come and speak. It's a public meeting, and
2870 there'll be time to speak. The Commission and management support staff can give a
2871 recommendation.
2872

2873 Commissioner Lauing: Even after it gets out of the Committee, we can also still do a
2874 resolution as opposed to Council.

2875
2876 Mr. de Geus: You can. Typically that is the way. The Commission is advisory to the
2877 City Council, not advisory to the Finance Committee.

2878
2879 Commissioner Lauing: That sounds like we can leave it on the agenda for next month,
2880 Keith. Then you can be our liaison.

2881
2882 Council Member Filseth: I encourage you to show up at the Finance Committee sessions.
2883 They're public sessions and there's time for public comment. The one thing I would say
2884 is I haven't been through this personally before. I'm going to find out how it works the
2885 same as you guys are. I expect that probably the Council isn't going to make too many
2886 changes to what comes from the Finance Committee. For what that's worth.

2887
2888 **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

2889
2890 Meeting adjourned on motion by Vice Chair Markevitch and second by Commissioner
2891 Hetterly at 9:58p.m. 7-0