



DRAFT

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

**MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
October 27, 2015
CITY HALL
250 Hamilton 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:** 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 anything? Then we'll move on.

23
24 **III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

25
26 Chair Reckdahl: At this time, anyone from the public can talk on any subject that's not
27 on the agenda. I have some speaker cards, but all of them are on the agenda. We will
28 skip over and move on to new business.

29
30 **IV. BUSINESS:**

31
32 **1. Approval of Draft Minutes from the Special Meeting of September 29, 2015.**

33
34 Approval of the draft September 29, 2015 Minutes was moved by Commissioner Hetterly
35 and seconded by Commissioner Ashlund. Passed 6-0, Markevitch abstaining



37 **2. Review of the Baylands Interpretive Center Improvements and Boardwalk**
38 **Feasibility Study.**
39

40 Chair Reckdahl: Daren is going to be talking. No, I'm sorry.

41
42 Daren Anderson: Hung Nguyen. I'll introduce him if you'd like.

43
44 Chair Reckdahl: Please do.

45
46 Mr. Anderson: This is Hung Nguyen from Public Works Engineering. He'll introduce
47 the consultant team and the other staff working on this topic.

48
49 Hung Nguyen: Good evening, Commissioner. My name is Hung Nguyen. I'm with the
50 Public Works Engineering Division. Tonight we have two wonderful project that we
51 bring in front of you. We have two wonderful design team. FOG Studio is going to
52 present the Lucy Evans Baylands Interpretive Center ...
53

54 Female: Could you speak up a little please?
55

56 Mr. Nguyen: ... and Biggs Cardosa will present the Baylands Boardwalk feasibility
57 study. We not asking for action from the Commission; however, we much appreciate if
58 you can provide any comment or input on the project that we present in front of you
59 tonight, so we can (inaudible) for our design. We will return to the Commission late this
60 year or maybe early next year for the PIO approval for the Baylands Interpretive Center.
61 We will return to you in the winter of 2015 for the final feasibility design study for the
62 Baylands Boardwalk. With that, I would like to introduce Tiffany Redding from FOG
63 Studio. They'll present to you about the Baylands Interpretive Center.
64

65 Tiffany Redding: My name is Tiffany Redding. This is my business partner, Brandon
66 Marshall. We have an architectural firm called FOG Studio. We were commissioned by
67 the City to shepherd the renovation of the Baylands Interpretive Center. Just as an
68 immediate comment, we are not looking to change the character of the building. We are
69 doing a renovation of the exterior, basically replacing all the deteriorated elements which
70 have been in the weather for 45 years and are suffering from it. Another part of the scope
71 is to renovate the bathrooms, reconfigure them to meet current ADA and building codes.
72 That is pretty much the extent of our scope of work. We're not doing an entire remodel to
73 the interior. That's not in this sort of fiscal allotment.
74

75 Brandon Marshall: Part of this effort is looking at the barn swallows that currently
76 occupy a portion of the building, what they're doing in the building and how that can be
77 addressed without ...
78

79 Ms. Redding: Without eliminating them.

80
81 Mr. Marshall: Eliminating them or a detriment to their environment. We're looking at
82 solutions, and we present some of those today.

83
84 Ms. Redding: Let's see. This little diagram kind of covers where the areas of concern
85 are, that we are going to address. The fascia which is the sort of trim that runs around the
86 edge of the roof is badly deteriorated, and we are going to address that. We're looking
87 again at the bird habitat protection, trying to isolate and control where those birds nest, so
88 that they don't continue to make a total mess on the building. We also have to upgrade
89 the electrical system, the panel and the lights. We are going to replace the sprinkler
90 heads; it's due time. As I said, upgrade the restrooms. Refinish the floors, but not do
91 anything else to the interior on the inside. Replace the railings; they don't currently meet
92 code almost everywhere. Replace the decking which is popping up all over the place
93 outside that connects to the Boardwalk which is not in our scope of work. Anthony is
94 going to talk about that at the end of this presentation, the Boardwalk that goes out into
95 the marsh. As part of our scope, our structural engineer came out and did a thorough
96 assessment of the underdeck and structural condition under the deck as well as the sort of
97 roof structure, and did a full report on that with a few recommendations. It's in good
98 shape and has a few sort of remedial things that we're going to attend to in the scope of
99 work, but should last quite a long time if we get the codings and repairs done now. We're
100 also recommending some repairs to the piping and hangers and stuff under the deck to
101 make sure they don't fall off.

102
103 Mr. Marshall: This presentation is actually what we presented to the community maybe
104 about a month ago. We're going to try and go through it a little quicker. Please interrupt
105 us if you have any questions. This is the floor plan as it currently exists. You see the
106 restrooms are in the lower right-hand corner. Most of the cost and the focus of this
107 project is upgrading that so that they're accessible to all visitors.

108
109 Ms. Redding: This is just a diagram showing the main areas of concern on the exterior,
110 what we need to focus on. Just a colored diagram to help people understand. Just some
111 shots of the restrooms as they currently—unfortunately the finishes are in good shapes,
112 but they conflict with code all over the place. We're trying to remove and retain for
113 reinstallation where we can. Especially, some of the existing interior wood finishes are
114 very nice.

115
116 Mr. Marshall: The challenges of the old floor plan. It's hexagonal which doesn't jive
117 with current building codes. There are wood columns everywhere, where you don't want
118 them. That's what we're looking at.

119
120 Ms. Redding: And obtuse angles and acute ones.



121
122 Chair Reckdahl: Does that mean you have to remove things?
123

124 Ms. Redding: The structure won't be removed but all the—this diagram shows you the
125 current accepted proposal. We went through quite a number of different configurations
126 and arrived at this. I believe that it has met with some approval. We're proposing a lot
127 more opportunities for hand washing, both for adults at ADA height and for kids, with
128 these two sort of trough sinks at Label D, in addition to two fully compliant single-
129 occupant restrooms up in the upper right. Then, a youth-height extra sort of toilet room
130 and a drinking fountain that meets code. There is one there, but it doesn't currently meet
131 code.
132

133 Mr. Marshall: The challenge we found was that a multi-occupant restroom was pretty
134 difficult to get to work at a code level, which is what they had with three fixtures in each.
135 The compromise was producing single-occupant rooms that included every code
136 allowance, including grab bars and baby-changing stations and that sort of thing. As
137 Tiffany described, a communal sink so that in particular when kids and classrooms are
138 there, there's a little bit more of an efficiency moving people along as opposed to getting
139 stuck in a room.
140

141 Ms. Redding: The single-occupant restrooms also have a lavatory inside next to the
142 toilet, you can see labeled B inside. There are also four extra places for groups of kids to
143 get in there and get cleaned up after they've been out in the Bay or doing whatever they're
144 doing out there. Some early concept ideas about what to do with the interior finishes, as I
145 mentioned. Up in the right corner, there's some interesting diagonal wood finish that we
146 hope to retain and showcase as kind of part of the history and character of this building.
147 A lot of it will require tile just for health and building codes. There's sort of like a basic
148 tile, and then we're proposing maybe behind the sink maybe take a cue from the
149 pickleweed and some of the beautiful vistas out there and turn it into an abstract mosaic
150 maybe, which is what you're looking at in that upper left-hand corner. The fixtures.
151 Another reason for doing this remodel is that there are now water-saving requirements, so
152 you have to have much more efficient water fixtures throughout. Everything we're doing
153 is quite modern.
154

155 Mr. Marshall: The lighting will be LED, high efficient water, low usage, complying with
156 CALGreen standards.
157

158 Ms. Redding: And Title 24, of course, energy requirements.
159

160 Mr. Marshall: Pretty much covered the lighting. The exterior lighting for the most part,
161 there's some that's been replaced, but a lot of the surface-mounted lighting just is in
162 disrepair and is, as we mentioned, low efficiency. What we're proposing is to replace it

163 with similar lights that are better performing and have a consistent look throughout the
164 building.

165
166 Ms. Redding: You can see in these photos the condition that sun, wind, rain and birds
167 have taken their toll on both the siding and the decking all around the building. Some
168 places a lot more than others. The west-facing siding is really, really kind of cracked and
169 peeling. We propose to replace it in-kind, detail it very carefully. These images show
170 some different kinds of wood finishes that we spoke about with the public at our last
171 meeting. The direction from the public at that time was they're not interested in
172 something like on the upper right that has a lot of kind of character and wood. They want
173 something a little more muted and monochromatic.

174
175 Mr. Marshall: The building right now fits in well with the wetlands. I think that was the
176 direction, to keep a building that has that character.

177
178 Ms. Redding: We'll do basically a stain that makes it look kind of like the way it does
179 but in a lot better shape. Some more shots of the disrepair.

180
181 Mr. Marshall: Tiffany mentioned the railing. There are some areas in the railings where
182 the supports are larger than the code allows for fall protection.

183
184 Ms. Redding: The gaps between the (crosstalk).

185
186 Mr. Marshall: There are also some issues with how high the rail is off of the deck. The
187 current proposal is to replace the railing with a wood railing. We'll get into a little bit of
188 the ideas for that in a moment.

189
190 Ms. Redding: We also want to make sure that we accommodate. There's an interpretive
191 graphics effort that is not part of our scope, but we want to make sure that the railing that
192 we design will accommodate that very neatly when it comes along. We're trying to
193 future-proof the railing design.

194
195 Mr. Marshall: One of the potential changes would be adding the ability for people of
196 lower stature, like a child, to be able to see through the railing. One of the ideas the team
197 came up with was either glazing or a plastic vision panel that could actually work in
198 conjunction with interpretive graphics that Tiffany is mentioning.

199
200 Ms. Redding: This would be here and there. This would not be the whole railing. We're
201 talking about maybe a section or a few sections that will allow people ...

202
203 Mr. Marshall: Purposefully placed.

204

205 Ms. Redding: ... to look into the marsh.

206
207 Mr. Marshall: That's something we're studying and looking at the pluses and minuses of
208 that.

209
210 Chair Reckdahl: Do you have to worry about bird strikes on that?

211
212 Mr. Marshall: Yes. And maintenance. We're looking at how easily they can be cleaned,
213 because everything gets dirty out there.

214
215 Chair Reckdahl: At the last meeting, someone mentioned putting a section of that on the
216 floor, and you said there was a possibility but we never addressed it later.

217
218 Ms. Redding: Not transparent, but we'll get to the idea of opening the deck.

219
220 Mr. Marshall: An opening in the deck.

221
222 Ms. Redding: It's coming up here. Having to do with the swallows actually.

223
224 Mr. Marshall: These are just quick ...

225
226 Chair Reckdahl: Oh, I see what you're talking about.

227
228 Mr. Marshall: ... quickly highlighting some of the subtle repairs to the structure just to
229 make sure this building lasts another 40 or 50-plus years. It's, as Tiffany mentioned, in
230 very good shape.

231
232 Ms. Redding: We get to the swallows which are the primary occupants, by the way, of
233 this building. Everyone loves them. They do a lot of damage and so how do we guide
234 their nesting habits. I think John is going to speak to the—hi.

235
236 John Aiken: John Aiken, Community Services Senior Project Manager. I oversee
237 interpretation in the open space preserves for kids. I'm here mostly because my
238 background is actually in ornithology and bird conservation. It's out of the architect's
239 scope of work to do the research to figure out what the best treatment for the swallows
240 were. I reached out to my colleagues and we came up with some options. Here are the
241 issues. The swallows are nesting on the building. It's a great site for their colonies.
242 There are two species of swallows, the barn swallows that were already mentioned and
243 then cliff swallows are the ones that are overhead. Let's go to the next slide. It's the acid
244 in their droppings that's causing the wood to deteriorate. If you look at the drawing on
245 the right-hand side, their droppings drop at a trajectory that, if they're nesting close to the
246 walls, they hit the walls. If they're further out from the walls, they hit benches or they hit

247 the walkways. They seem to prefer to nest in the areas where there is a structural
248 member in the soffit because they can fit their nests in those areas ideally. If we go to the
249 next slide; there we go. We mapped out where their preferred nesting areas are. The
250 orange areas are where the swallows seem to prefer to nest and where—correct me if I'm
251 wrong—but where we've marked in blue is all of the soffit areas that have those structural
252 members. The plan would be to actually seal off those structural members so that we can
253 control where the birds nest throughout the building.

254
255 Ms. Redding: Basically block them off with what we call a soffit board. In other words,
256 instead of having all those hundreds and hundreds of cavities, something smooth that
257 they're much less likely to nest upon or within. Does it show up? I'm not sure if the
258 soffit board is in there anymore. Basically the soffit board would match the siding of the
259 building and be colored the same.

260
261 Mr. Aiken: Let's go to the next slide. Besides sort of controlling where the nest colonies
262 occur, we've also looked at opening up areas of decking so that the droppings can
263 actually drop through. That has a double benefit of allowing kids to see down into the
264 marsh and look under the building and notice that you're on piers. That actually, I think,
265 might be an interesting aspect. It does restrict circulation on the deck a little bit, and so
266 it's problematic there. We wanted to bring this forward both to the community and to the
267 Commission for their input. Next. Our plan, we've got a couple of options here. Section
268 A and Section B show where we would attach—once we block the swallows from nesting
269 under the soffit areas, we're actually going to attach swallow boxes. They're not really
270 nest boxes in the traditional sense; they're actually shelves that have been designed and
271 used for swallow mitigation, where the swallows can nest. We can place those in
272 different parts of the building depending upon where the problem is and where the
273 swallows want to nest. They're looking for a particular sort of microclimate, and we're
274 going to put those in that microclimate for them to nest. We're going to try and position
275 them out of harm's way, so to speak, and where we can kind of manage the cleanliness
276 and the long-term deterioration of the building that they're causing. Is that my last slide?
277 Yes, it is.

278
279 Biggs Cardosa: Now I'll talk on the Boardwalk portion of the project. We're actually not
280 nearly as far along as the Interpretive Center. Our scope of work at this point has been
281 for a feasibility study, basically looking at the existing constraints, the existing structure
282 condition, and then three primary options for what we can do with the project. Again,
283 our three options that we're looking at on the Boardwalk as part of our scope of work for
284 the City is to look at what we call repair of the project. This would be a very short-term
285 repair. The existing structure is closed to the public currently. There's been a lot of
286 public interest in getting that open as soon as possible. The repair option would be do
287 some minimal repairs, open the structure or a portion of the structure up to the public
288 while more detailed design and either rehab or replacement options are considered. We



289 also looked at the feasibility of rehabilitating the existing structure. We looked at options
290 for replacement of the existing structure. Our structural was complete; we had a team of
291 structural engineers out on the site for two days. They looked at each and every one of
292 the supports underneath. They looked at all of the members on top and did a general
293 assessment of the total structure. In general, we assessed the structure to be in serious
294 condition for the superstructure—that's basically the walking surface and the hand rail
295 elements—and also for the substructure. That would be your supports and your girders
296 and beams. The overall assessment was serious, but it actually varies quite significantly
297 over the length of the structure. The portion closest to the Interpretive Center, roughly
298 200 feet or so, is in actually fairly satisfactory or good condition. The central portion of
299 the structure, roughly 200 to 600 feet out, is in actually quite poor condition. There's
300 several elements that have failed. Several of the posts have actually deteriorated and
301 broken off. That portion is in serious condition or has already failed, which is why the
302 structure is currently closed to the public. As you get out towards the Bay, the final
303 overlook area is actually in decent shape again. Also while we looked at the structure, we
304 also had our team of subconsultants out there. We had environmental subconsultants,
305 biologists, geotechs, hydrologists. We also had architects looking at the access and ADA
306 compliance issues. Environmentally we are dealing primarily with three species out
307 there. We have the Ridgeway rail; we have the marsh harvest mouse; and we also have
308 the swallows that we've already spoken on. Those three species are in plenty out in this
309 general area. They actually have quite significant constraints on work windows and on
310 our ability to work in and around the marsh. We'll have to significantly restrict any
311 operations by contractors. Subsurface-wise or geotechnically, we're out in what we call
312 Bay muds. They're a very soft material; they're still settling over time. The whole
313 structure will settle with the Bay muds, because they're fairly deep and the foundations
314 are shallow. They'll over the course of time settle. We will need a structure that's fairly
315 flexible and can work with that condition over time. The soils out there are also quite
316 corrosive. That salt environment has done a lot of damage to the existing timbers out
317 there, and existing metal components are also deteriorating. Any of our solutions will
318 have to address those conditions. Hydrologically we've got—the marsh is subject to the
319 normal tide flows. They go up roughly about 4 feet and down about 3 1/2 feet over a
320 normal cycle. We also have the occasional king tide where you have a very significant
321 tide that may coincide with some storm conditions. Those can go up as high as 6-8 feet.
322 During those kind tides, we actually have recorded flooding of portions of the structure
323 predominantly in those low-lying areas. In those areas where the structure has failed,
324 there's been some sagging, and they're a little bit lower. Those areas tend to flood first.
325 Lastly, the project wants to look at the condition of sea level rise. The experts in the field
326 have predicted that the sea level is going to rise over the next so many years. There's
327 kind of a graduated scale of what they've projected, so we want to design a structure or
328 rehabilitate the structure that can work with those projections and accommodate sea level
329 rise, so we can keep the facility open year-round as much as possible. The last issue we
330 looked at was access and ADA compliance. The existing structure has numerous



331 challenges associated with ADA issues. We have the same issues with our railing as the
332 nature center. There's things that need to be done there to tighten that up. Due to some
333 of the structural damage, there's been a lot of settlement and warping of the walkway. It's
334 become uneven. Each one of those has a corresponding compliance component to it, so
335 there will be a lot of work required to basically level out the walkway, smooth out the
336 walkway so you don't have tripping hazards. Maintaining slopes. The existing slopes—
337 the structure comes from the nature center. It's higher than the Boardwalk by about 3
338 feet. There's a ramp down; the slope of that ramp is higher or steeper than current ADA
339 compliance. The handrails along there aren't quite long enough for current code.
340 Likewise, when you get to the end, to that last observation deck you see in the photo, the
341 structure rises up again and, again those ramps and those handrails exceed current
342 criteria. For all of our options, we're basically looking at how we can best accommodate
343 those. Our first mandate from the City was to look at the repair option. I mentioned
344 earlier this was actually quite popular with the public at the community meeting. Based
345 on the structural assessment that we did, we are proposing to do minimal repairs to open
346 the nature center up to the first overlook platform. About 200 feet away from the nature
347 center, there's a little platform that sticks out. There's a little bench. We would be able to
348 open the structure up to that location with minimal repairs. In order to meet some of the
349 environmental criteria, all those repairs would basically be minimal in nature, can be
350 done from the existing Boardwalk. Any substructure work, we'd pull up planks and do
351 the work from the platform, staying out of the marsh area. That'll allow us to use existing
352 maintenance procedures that the City's allowed to maintain the structure; we can fall
353 under those criteria.

354
355 Mr. Anderson: If I can interject just quickly. Daren Anderson, Open Space, Parks and
356 Golf. Staff went ahead and made those repairs. As of this morning, that first 200 feet of
357 section of Boardwalk is now open to the public.

358
359 Biggs Cardosa: We can move right on. Don't need to belabor that one. We also looked
360 at rehabilitation options. Given the existing structure's condition, rehabilitation would
361 require significant level of effort, based on the existing damage and the existing number
362 of things that would need to be corrected to meet the various criteria. Looking at ADA
363 compliance—actually maybe back up. Option 1 is basically rehabilitate the structure in
364 its current place, in its current configuration. We'd use some temporary screw anchors.
365 Basically you screw these into the ground, and we'd use them as a platform or a jacking
366 platform to tweak the structure back into level and get it to the elevation that we want it
367 to be at. You basically lock off the structure in this location, remove those screws and
368 move on to the next segment, and kind of work your way down. ADA compliance
369 issues. It'll be difficult to meet current standards without significant overhaul. Getting
370 some of those slope issues resolved would be a challenge. We would be able to take care
371 of leveling the deck, removing tripping hazards. We'd also look to replace the railing, so



we could take care of those issues. We still have some challenges with the slopes and things. That'll be a little bit harder to meet.

Chair Reckdahl: What would be the advantage of this? The cost and the duration is about the same as full replacement.

Biggs Cardosa: Our early looks, the costs were not significantly lower. We're still refining those numbers for the City. In our mind, the only advantage would be really if the public or the City wants to maintain that look and feel of the structure. Both the rehab options have challenges. They actually have a lower design life; we're estimating 25-50 years. The newer elements you put in will last longer, but you are still dealing with elements that have been existing out there for some time, so it's going to have lower overall design life. Again, I think the rehab options have fallen behind the replacement options. I'll just kind of breeze through them briefly. The second option is slightly different. Here we would be putting in some new vertical supports outboard of the existing. One of the challenges from the existing structure is when the tides come in and out, a natural channel had formed underneath the Boardwalk. The Boardwalk blocks the sun from hitting everywhere underneath. The pickleweed doesn't grow underneath, so it made a natural channel for the water to come in and out. That would erode the soil in and out of there, and it exposed more and more of the substructure. Those are the areas that really deteriorated. By putting these new anchors outboard, we could get them out into the pickleweed, where the pickleweed's going to stay. We feel we get a little bit better overall long-term design life out of it. Again, we still have similar challenges to Option 1. It's going to have reduced design life, because we are reusing some of the existing elements, can't really accommodate sea level rise very well, and construction costs are going to be high and maintenance costs would continue to be high. The more preferred options are the replacement options. Replace Option 1, in general, sort of mimics the Rehab Option 2 I just described. We're going to have outboard vertical supports. We can either use a timber post option as you can see on the left side of the sketch, or you can use a screw anchor on the right. A screw anchor is basically like a big screw head on the bottom. They actually get screwed into place. They act like a pile, so they take the vertical support, and they'll anchor quite well into the soil out there. For both the timber and the steel screw anchors, when we get into the final design phase, we have advised the City that we want to bring onboard a corrosion specialist and kind of give some advice on which is going to give the best long-term performance for the City. For this option, the superstructure has a similar style as the existing with the walkways consisting of timber planks that run longitudinally in the direction of travel. This system could easily accommodate sea level rise. We estimate a design life of 50-75 years. Moderate construction costs. We expect maintenance costs to be less than the existing, because we've got newer elements in there. Construction ideally would take one year. Because of our constraints to work around the existing wildlife out there, we are restricted. Typically from February to August is their nesting seasons. Depending on how quickly we can



414 mobilize, weather conditions during the winter season, we're hopeful we can get that in in
415 one year, but want to plan for two at this early stage of the game. The second option is
416 fairly similar to the first, except we've changed the walkway portion. Instead of those
417 long timber deck planks, we're going to go with a transverse timber boards. This is more
418 traditional of what you see on a lot of the prefabricated steel bridges around the area,
419 these small timber boards. One of the advantages of that is you can look at using
420 engineered wood that may have a longer design life out there. They're smaller elements;
421 they're easier to discretely replace if issues happen in the future. You get roughly the
422 same aesthetic, and you have basically the same benefits as the other options. Those are
423 basically the concepts that we're working on. We're at the point of wrapping up the
424 feasibility study for the City, and then they'll be able to make their decisions as to how
425 they want to move forward with the design project.

426
427 Mr. Nguyen: At this point for the Interpretive Center, we plan to go the ARB for review
428 in December 2015 and return to PRC for the PIO approval next January, and then
429 complete the Interpretive Center 100 percent design by the spring of 2016. We hope to
430 obtain the permit with the project and have construction start in 2016. That's depending
431 on the permit approval. For the Boardwalk, we hope to complete the draft feasibility in
432 the fall/winter of 2015 and return to PRC for the final recommendation in the winter of
433 2015. We hope to go to Council early next year and seek their guidance on how to
434 proceed with design on the Boardwalk.

435
436 Chair Reckdahl: Very good. We'll move on to public comment here. First is Shani
437 Kleinhaus. You have two minutes.

438
439 Shani Kleinhaus: Thank you. I'm Shani Kleinhaus with the Santa Clara Valley Audubon
440 Society. I'm glad to see this project moving forward, both the Interpretive Center and the
441 Boardwalk. It's very nice that you're making an effort to keep the swallows' nesting
442 there. I have one comment about any kind of transparent glass or Plexiglas anywhere
443 should be proofed for birds. That means probably fritting which is they put these ceramic
444 lines in the glass. It's almost invisible; you can see through it. A lot of buildings are
445 doing it right now. If anybody wants to see an example, Intuit is building a new building,
446 and they have an example wall. Facebook put it on the entire campus. I don't think it's a
447 huge investment, but it's important to have that. I think that's all for this one. Thank you.

448
449 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. Our next speaker is Herb Borock. Herb, you have two
450 minutes.

451
452 Herb Borock: Chair Reckdahl and Commissioners. Attachment C indicates general
453 agreement that all exterior colors should match the more earthy color tones of the
454 Baylands. You may have noticed on the slide that was displayed (inaudible) that that's
455 not the case in that slide. I would feel that that first slide that was shown should show the

456 color rendering that is being recommended for the Interpretive Center. In terms of the
457 various processes and procedures and the order in which they're done, I would hope
458 that—as I understand it, it says an ARB review. Does that mean that they are making a
459 decision or actually recommending a decision to the Director of Planning and
460 Community Environment for the project? If so, I would have preferred that you would be
461 making a recommendation to them rather than to staff. All projects should have some
462 kind of environmental section in the staff report even if it's just to say that it's exempt
463 from the California Environmental Quality Act. In terms of the Park Improvement
464 Ordinance, if one is needed for one of these projects, then I believe it would be needed
465 for both. If it's not needed for one, then it's not needed for the other. Those are not
466 decisions of the Parks and Recreation Commission, but rather recommendations to the
467 Council since it's the Council that would make the action. The purpose of this
468 Commission is to make a recommendation to the Council. For that reason, I think it
469 would be a good idea for both of these projects to have clarity on what the roles of the
470 various Boards and Commissions are with the Council and with the project, so that the
471 various items are placed in their proper order so those recommendations and roles and
472 responsibilities are fulfilled. Thank you.

473
474 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. Daren, one question. The Boardwalk and the Interpretive
475 Center, they are two separate projects?

476
477 Mr. Anderson: Yes. They are separate, though we've linked them together for the
478 purposes of the public meeting and presentation to Commission. They are separate CIPs.
479 Obviously there's commonalities where we want to link them up to have our two
480 consultants working together so that they jived and were cooperative.

481
482 Chair Reckdahl: If there's a delay in the building, we still can go ahead and do the
483 Boardwalk?

484
485 Mr. Anderson: That's correct.

486
487 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. Commissioner comments? Commissioner Markevitch.

488
489 Vice Chair Markevitch: I have a question about the plumbing for the building. I know
490 there's an interest of late in the City to include gray water. I know that's not included in
491 this project. If it wasn't too expensive, I was wondering if you would consider plumbing
492 this building for gray water so you don't have to rip these walls up ten years down the
493 road when somebody says, "Let's run this pipe here and use gray water." If you did it
494 ahead of time, it would be minimal impact later on.

495
496 Ms. Redding: Would the City like to comment?

497

498 Male: Yeah, we can consider that.

499
500 Chair Reckdahl: Other comments? Commissioner Lauing.

501
502 Commissioner Lauing: Just a couple. One, could we get any more visuals or clarity on
503 what those creative deck holes are? I think it's great that the kids can look down and get
504 really a feel of where they are as opposed to being suspended there. You alluded to
505 potentially some constraints. I don't know if this time or next time we could get actual
506 visuals of what that's going to look like, looking down or traffic patterns around there.
507 We don't want to indirectly restrict access to that place, because you do want to get them
508 out there and look around. The second was just terrific effort on all this stuff relative to
509 the swallows. I mean there's just a lot of work that went into that, a lot of meticulous
510 work on everybody's part to allow the birds and the people to live happily ever after.
511 That was just really terrific. I think just generally, Daren, this project is in great hands. It
512 was a very good presentation, very thorough and, I think, right on target.

513
514 Chair Reckdahl: Commissioner Knopper.

515
516 Commissioner Knopper: Yes. I would concur. I mean everything was really great, and I
517 too was thinking about the holes in the deck. That would be really great to look at. My
518 one question is sea level rise came up during the discussion of—thank you—the
519 Boardwalk but not the building. How is that being addressed or is it not being addressed?

520
521 Mr. Anderson: Maybe I can allow the consultant to come. I believe the building is safe
522 from the predicted 50-100 year sea level rise.

523
524 Commissioner Knopper: Can I just ask, Daren, a question? The building is getting, like,
525 some basic fixer-upper kinds of things. Is there an anticipation that the building is going
526 to need more work in a relatively short period of time? Like, is this Phase 1 in just doing
527 the ADA compliant and the fascia and, like, some of the rotted wood kind of thing? Is
528 there planning for Phase 2? That kind of thing. Like, what other structural things might
529 need to be done to this building?

530
531 Mr. Anderson: I think you hit the nail on the head. This is the structural, make sure you
532 take care of the very basics of it, that structurally it's sound. The Phase 2, in
533 conversations with John Aiken who helps manage the facility, is really the functionality
534 of it, the interpretive elements. That's kind of separate from the structural part. I believe
535 that's the Phase 2. I'll ask John and Hung to elaborate on that.

536
537 Mr. Aiken: We have only funding for this portion of it. There is another CIP that starts
538 in two more years for some graphics, but it literally is just enough money to get a few
539 graphics onto some of the railings. We're planning now for the eventuality of really

540 rolling out a more robust graphics program. I've met with representatives from the State
541 of California; there are grant opportunities that the City is likely to seek that will fund
542 trail interpretive elements including interactives, sculptural elements and graphic
543 interpretations on the Boardwalk. These projects are significantly long and we want to
544 time the seeking of those funds and the expenditure of those funds to match, I guess,
545 when we finish the Boardwalk piece.

546
547 Commissioner Knopper: Thank you. With regard to the Boardwalk, there were a lot of
548 different options presented and the sort of repair, like, 3-5 year repair and then—I forget
549 the year thing—and then the 50-75. There's a lot of different options. Obviously cost is a
550 factor. Who is deciding what option we're putting forward? Like, is this literally going
551 to be like a laundry list that you want to present to the Council, like, for—I'm making
552 these numbers up—\$100,000 we'll get the basic repair. For \$200,000, we'll get ... and
553 then let the City Council decide how significant the Boardwalk repair is going to be or
554 are we trying to guide the conversation in a specific way with regard to the Boardwalk
555 repair?

556
557 Mr. Anderson: What staff intends to do—first of all the repair portion is done now. That
558 first 200 feet, so we're left ...

559
560 Commissioner Knopper: Sorry. The replacement or rehab.

561
562 Mr. Anderson: And rehab, yeah. We're left with just those two. Our hope is to have
563 Biggs Cardosa flesh it out a little more fully. Our preliminary assessments are they're
564 very comparable in costs. It begs the question whether we should really consider the
565 rehab when the cost is relatively the same, the permitting is relatively the same, but the
566 lifespan is almost doubled if you go with new. What I anticipate is we'll come to you
567 with a staff recommendation, flesh it out through the Parks and Rec Commission, and
568 then ultimately make that recommendation to Council.

569
570 Commissioner Knopper: Thank you.

571
572 Chair Reckdahl: Commissioner Crommie.

573
574 Commissioner Crommie: Thank you for your presentations. This is a really important
575 project, and I'm glad it's underway. I thought that the permitting process was going to be
576 more lengthy for replacement versus rehabilitation. Is that not true?

577
578 Biggs Cardosa: I failed to go into a lot of detail on that. Actually it's going to be fairly
579 similar, just because we're going to physically have to get in there, get approval to do the
580 work. In general, we're going to go through the same review processes with various
581 agencies. We're looking at the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Corps of

582 Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the
583 BCDC or San Francisco Bay—I always forget exactly what it stands for—Conservation
584 Development.

585
586 Commissioner Crommie: I guess I misunderstood. If the cost is the same, the permitting
587 process is the same, what is the advantage of rehabilitation? Is there not a single
588 advantage?

589
590 Biggs Cardosa: It's really if you want to ...

591
592 Commissioner Crommie: The look, you said.

593
594 Biggs Cardosa: The look, yeah. The costs are probably a little bit lower, but they're
595 going to be significantly high so that you're not saving that much. Again, at this point,
596 we were asked to look at all of these various alternatives. We've presented everything
597 we've looked at. Now, we'll start refining it down. But, yeah, that's been the general
598 consensus from the City side, it seems to make more sense to go with replacement which
599 ...

600
601 Commissioner Crommie: I did go to your meeting, the public meeting. I got to hear you
602 speak; I didn't get to hear both presentations. I did hear the presentation on the
603 Boardwalk. There was one difference that was discussed at that time which was the
604 height of the Boardwalk. People were used to it being a certain distance to the nature that
605 we're observing when we're on the Boardwalk. Can you discuss that a little bit? If the
606 replacement would make it be how many feet higher. How good are these predictions? I
607 mean, what's the uncertainty in the water level rise predictions?

608
609 Biggs Cardosa: I'll hit the last point first. There's a fair amount of uncertainty. If I look
610 at my numbers, the original predictions were you'd get 6 inches of sea level rise by the
611 year 2030. I think these were done back in about the year 2000. Currently measured rise
612 in sea level, they haven't really noticed any significant change yet, though they're still
613 predicting that rise. In my mind, there's a fair amount of uncertainty. I know all of the
614 various cities up and down the Bay are currently looking at their levee improvements and
615 things. There's a lot of discussion going on as to what's going to be our target level. I
616 know Foster City, for sure, is working on that currently. There's a lot of discussion about
617 what's the appropriate level. We can look at the design life of the structure and decide
618 what level is appropriate. The public in general at the public meeting was in favor of
619 keeping the structure as low as possible, so they can get that sense of belonging in with
620 the nature which is the great part of having that Boardwalk go right out into the middle.
621 One of our challenges when we get into final design will be to balance that and to really
622 take a hard look at what we think will be the true sea level rise over the life of the project.
623 I think the goal will be to keep the structure as low as possible and yet try and keep it

624 open for the majority of the year. There are disadvantages. If it does get flooded and you
625 have to close it, and there's a loss of use too. There's going to be kind of a balance I
626 think.

627
628 Commissioner Crommie: Great, thank you. Now as far as the visibility for the children
629 looking over the railing, in nature areas, natural areas, I've never seen that glass siding
630 work very well. It usually gets really dirty. I know it sounds good in theory, but I guess
631 my gut reaction is it's better to have slats that little people can look through rather than
632 dirty glass. Also mentioned I know there's the bird risks with that kind of material;
633 although, I'm sure you would take the recommendation from Audubon very seriously. I
634 don't know. I just don't see that. Personally, I've never understood the real benefit of that
635 unless you can show examples and best practices and things where it actually works. I
636 just hate to get something that looks good for a very short amount of time. It's the
637 longevity that I care about. Also, the color scheme. I know you heard strongly in the
638 community outreach that people really want this building to blend and be unobtrusive as
639 it was originally designed. Are you going to keep that color pallet in mind? Do you want
640 to just confirm that?

641
642 Ms. Redding: Yes. One of the ways that we anticipate addressing that is to ask in the
643 project specifications, which are directions to the contractors. Whoever ends up bidding
644 on this projects gets a set of directions in addition to the drawings. The specifications
645 should, I believe, call for mock ups of various stains that are put out on the building so
646 that we can get consensus on what's the best color and opacity of the treatment. We have
647 to treat the wood; we have to coat it with something, because it lasts much, much longer
648 if you do that. You probably all know that, but I had to say it. Rather than picking the
649 color now, I think the best way to do it would be to pick the right performance coating
650 and then let the color and opacity be selected in the field. Yes.

651
652 Commissioner Crommie: In the field, what does that mean?

653
654 Ms. Redding: That means not just on paper, but put up actual painted pieces of redwood
655 so that we can see what it looks like in the daylight, next to the pickleweed and out in the
656 sun.

657
658 Commissioner Crommie: Who makes that final decision out in the field?

659
660 Ms. Redding: It would typically be the client which is the City. Lots of people will be
661 able to see it and weigh in.

662
663 Commissioner Crommie: I would just say here to make sure our public gets to weigh in
664 when anything gets put out in the field.

666 Mr. Anderson: I might just add. This is typically something that the ARB loves to weigh
667 in on, paints and colors. They often provide us with details on that. However, we do
668 have the Baylands Design Guidelines which do dictate the very colors that you're talking
669 about. That's why the nature center is the color it is and all the other buildings and
670 structures within the Baylands are compliant with that. By that nature, it'll constrain the
671 options to things that are compliant with the Bay guidelines which the ARB is privy to.
672

673 Commissioner Crommie: My last question is, since we might be leaning toward
674 replacement as long as we can get the height, correct? I mean, it sounds like we need
675 more discussion on that. Aside from the timbers going vertical versus cross-wise, are
676 there other differences between the replacement options that I'm not picking up on?
677

678 Biggs Cardosa: No, that's really the primary difference between them, that walking
679 experience, whether you have those long boards that are more flexible or you've got the
680 shorter ones. In general, the substructure is going to be at about the same spacing on
681 center which will pretty much match what's out there currently. Yeah, primarily, I think
682 the substructure elements are pretty well defined based upon past history out there and
683 past experience.
684

685 Commissioner Crommie: Thank you.
686

687 Commissioner Hetterly: I think that goes to my question—oh.
688

689 Chair Reckdahl: Go ahead. Commissioner Hetterly.
690

691 Commissioner Hetterly: Has been addressed, but I have two additional ones. As far as
692 the decision whether to rehabilitate or replace, my only question there is about salvage if
693 that's the only difference in terms of cost and time. What we would do with the existing
694 materials if they would just go to waste, then that might argue for rehabilitating rather
695 than replacing. I'd like to know a little more about what would happen to the salvage of
696 the materials.
697

698 Biggs Cardosa: The same question came up at the public meeting. Now, there are
699 opportunities in the project specifications that we could require the material to be
700 salvaged. I think, from an architectural standpoint there is a market out there for the
701 salvaged material, all that nice weathered wood. Yeah, we could definitely work that into
702 the project if it's so desired by the City.
703

704 Commissioner Hetterly: I think we should encourage the City to do that. My next
705 question is again on the difference—I think you already explained the difference between
706 the two replacement options. It seemed there was some question about whether or not to
707 use the screw things or wood posts. Right, that's the difference?

708
709 Biggs Cardosa: Correct.
710

711 Commissioner Hetterly: I would like to know what the difference is functionally. The
712 screws, can you adjust them over time as it starts to settle? I think there's this kind of
713 aesthetic difference as well.
714

715 Biggs Cardosa: Key differences are, number one, aesthetics, whether you want the look
716 of the timber posts similar to what you currently have or if you want the look of the round
717 steel rods coming up out of the ground. From an installation standpoint, the equipment
718 for putting in the steel helical anchors is actually quite small and can be easily brought
719 out to the site. It's basically a motor that'll screw the thing in, and then they have a big
720 kicker bar that comes out off of that which will take the torque off of that engine that
721 drives it into the ground. We basically butt that up against one of the existing posts. You
722 need a larger piece of equipment to put in the steel posts. You typically have to push
723 those in, and so a small bobcat-type ...
724

725 Commissioner Hetterly: For the wood posts?
726

727 Biggs Cardosa: For the timber posts. The contractor would have to look at utilizing the
728 existing structure for that, so he may have to make some minor repairs, just enough to
729 accommodate his equipment through the areas that have already failed. There may be
730 some costs there. There is the possibility with the screw anchors of doing some
731 adjustments in the future should there be localized settlement of some of the spans. We
732 may be able to come back in and adjust them. It won't be quite as easy as just turning a
733 nut to get it to come up. You'll probably have to bring in some equipment, temporary
734 support and do an adjustment to it. There is more of an opportunity, I think, for a simpler
735 adjustment in the future with the steel. The corrosion specialist, though, would be key.
736 From my research, it appears that the steel holds up just fine, though we do know that the
737 environment out there is not friendly to steel, nor has it been friendly to the timbers in the
738 past. It'll be—have them give us some advice on that as we get into the final design
739 portions.
740

741 Commissioner Hetterly: Thank you.
742

743 Commissioner Ashlund: Thank you. I really like a lot of the accessibility improvements.
744 I want to ask a question about the unglamorous subject of the restroom design and the
745 challenges of working with the hexagonal building. You've done a really good job of
746 making them accessible here. I'm wondering—this is probably only a signage question
747 rather than a layout question. The single bathroom with the changing table is labeled
748 women, and the other one is labeled men. More and more what I'm seeing in newer
749 buildings these days is a gender-neutral bathroom. I'm wondering if they couldn't both be

750 just gender neutral with signage to indicate which one has a changing table so that
751 anyone could use that.

752
753 Ms. Redding: Actually both restrooms have changing tables. Maybe we mislabeled it,
754 but both of those single-occupant rooms are planned to have a changing table. In terms
755 of gender neutral, we're advocates of that. It's, like, kind of a universal access precept. In
756 the past, some plumbing (inaudible) don't recognize a unisex or a non-gender bathroom,
757 so it would be kind of a building review exercise to go through. Certainly it makes them
758 more versatile for user groups. I would love to pursue it if that's okay with the City.

759
760 Mr. Marshall: I would point out, I think there's a urinal in one of the rooms.

761
762 Ms. Redding: That's right. We did squeeze a urinal, barely, into the one labeled men. It
763 tends to be a little tidier. Something to weigh. We could remove the urinal or we could
764 just keep them both gender neutral and have one have a urinal in it.

765
766 Commissioner Ashlund: That was it. I didn't see the second changing and really don't
767 care much about the urinal personally. My other question. On the interpretive signing, it
768 said that they don't comply with ADA requirements. I assume they would be, when
769 they're repaired, brought into ADA requirements. I was wondering if that was including
770 Braille or audio. The Braille usage among blind and visually impaired users is actually
771 dropping significantly. It never has been very high among blind users. It is dropping
772 significantly because of the prevalence of audio availability. I was wondering if that was
773 something that could be considered in the repair of the interpretive signage.

774
775 Mr. Aiken: Good point. We're going to be looking at universal access to all of the
776 interpretive messages in as many ways as we can. The JMZ, where I also work, right
777 now is doing a series of focus groups with special needs kids and families around
778 interpretation. We're going to incorporate what we learn from those focus groups into
779 what we apply to this building as well.

780
781 Commissioner Ashlund: Thank you. I guess the last question I had was clarification
782 about the gap. When we were talking about those nesting swallows and the possibility of
783 the gap in the platform, you mentioned some restriction in walkway. Would it still meet
784 ADA clearance requirements?

785
786 Ms. Redding: Yeah. We wouldn't recommend it if it didn't. What we have currently
787 drawn in, just on a conceptual level, restricts the walkway in a few places to just over 5
788 feet wide which meets code.

789
790 Commissioner Ashlund: It does meet code.

791

792 Ms. Redding: It's not throughout; it's just in those locations. You can see on the drawing
793 that there are some faint dashed circles; those are showing just over 5 feet there.

794
795 Commissioner Ashlund: Thank you very much.

796
797 Chair Reckdahl: I have a couple of questions. What are the constraints on the bird
798 nesting periods where we can't do construction?

799
800 Biggs Cardosa: February 1st to August 31st is the nesting season, the breeding season.

801
802 Chair Reckdahl: February 1st to August 31st. That gives us what? About four months,
803 five months.

804
805 Ms. Redding: This applies to the building as well.

806
807 Chair Reckdahl: Five months.

808
809 Female: (inaudible) the swallows usually come (inaudible) so that changes (inaudible).

810
811 Chair Reckdahl: We have the swallows, and then we also have the—what are the birds?

812
813 Biggs Cardosa: Ridgeway rail.

814
815 Chair Reckdahl: The rails. Isn't there a mouse nesting also?

816
817 Biggs Cardosa: The mouse is more of just restricted—you need to restrict your
818 operations so you don't ...

819
820 Ms. Redding: Step on them.

821
822 Biggs Cardosa: Step on them, kill them. You don't take a mouse, I think is the official
823 term. Avoid takes.

824
825 Chair Reckdahl: There's no (inaudible) of stay out for the mouse. You just have to be
826 careful.

827
828 Biggs Cardosa: Right. You have to tailor your operations for them.

829
830 Chair Reckdahl: You talked about driving the piles into the mud. How far do we have to
831 put the piles into the mud?

832

833 Biggs Cardosa: That will be determined for sure during the final design phase.
834 Conceptually, around 20 feet.

835
836 Chair Reckdahl: The screws, how deep do you have to put the screws in?
837

838 Biggs Cardosa: They would go 15-20 feet likely.
839

840 Chair Reckdahl: Finally, the one thing that I've been sad about Lucy Evans right now is
841 just the time that's it's open is so small. It'd be really nice if we could incorporate some
842 type of—I don't know if you can make the interior exhibits turn around and face outside
843 so people who come there when it's closed can have more to look at than just the outdoor
844 signage.
845

846 Mr. Aiken: Our long-term goal is to take all of those interpretive messages and begin to
847 put them out where people can see the phenomena on the Boardwalk and on the trails, so
848 that the messages are always available.
849

850 Chair Reckdahl: Would we eventually still have exhibits still inside?
851

852 Mr. Aiken: We haven't gone through a design phase for that. The preferred use of the
853 building right now is as a meeting space for kids. We teach in there primarily. We're
854 open Tuesday through Friday for about 3,000 school children every school year that take
855 classes out there, and then evening events. I think it works really well for an event
856 center, less well for an interpretive center. It's likely that we'll have some interpretive
857 elements in there and always have a wet lab function so that people can actually get their
858 hands dirty looking at the life that's out there.
859

860 Chair Reckdahl: What are the current hours for the Interpretive Center for the public?
861

862 Female: Wednesdays from 1:00 to 4:00, Thursdays from 2:00 to 5:00. The times are
863 going to change soon because of the time change. Then Sunday afternoons from 1:00 to
864 4:00 or 5:00.
865

866 Mr. Aiken: Thanks. I knew I'd get it wrong.
867

868 Female: it's going to change though in the next couple of weeks because of daylight
869 savings and getting dark earlier.
870

871 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. That's it. We will be (inaudible) come back in—the PIO is
872 going to be in January, so you're coming back to the PRC later. What was the schedule
873 that he showed? In January.
874

875 Commissioner Hetterly: I have one last question. Sorry. On the Boardwalk, does the
876 ARB review the Boardwalk as well?
877

878 Mr. Nguyen: At this point we don't plan to go in front of the ARB until we have further
879 instructions from the Council, which option that we plan to proceed. Then we will
880 further the design and go back to ARB for (inaudible).
881

882 Commissioner Hetterly: They'll comment on the entire (inaudible). Thank you.
883

884 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you.
885

886 **3. Discussion on the Shared Use Dog Park Pilot Program.**
887

888 Daren Anderson: Just one second. Let me pull the materials.
889

890 Chair Reckdahl: Okay. We have some speaker cards. If anyone has not filled out a
891 speaker card for this, please do so now.
892

893 Mr. Anderson: Good evening. Daren Anderson with Open Space, Parks and Golf. I'm
894 here tonight to seek your guidance regarding the shared-use dog parks, basically your
895 feedback on how we're going to meet the community's dog park needs. At the last
896 Commission meeting, I had provided an update on this topic where we covered the vast
897 majority of the background in this staff report. I'll gloss over that and move on to the
898 discussion section. As I mentioned in my previous update, Staff had hosted a community
899 meeting July 30, 2015 to collect feedback specifically on the shared-use concept. The
900 vast majority of the participants were dog owners advocating for dog parks and generally
901 expressed dissatisfaction with the limited hours. Our proposal had Monday through
902 Friday 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. at these sites, Greer Park, Baylands Athletic Center and
903 Hoover Park. The feedback was that morning hours just aren't enough. That's not going
904 to be adequate. To be successful, (a), you've got to make them morning and evening at
905 least, and it's got to be more than one site. One site's inadequate to be successful. There
906 were a small number of participants who attended, who were park neighbors, who said
907 "We don't want a dog park near our house. There's parking issues. There's dog waste
908 issues. There's unwanted confrontations with children and dogs off-leash." There were
909 also some participants who voiced concerns about potential impacts to the fields
910 themselves. These are athletic users saying, "There's incompatibility between having
911 dogs off-leash and a contained athletic facility." One of the meeting participants
912 mentioned that City of Mountain View had recently made a number of their parks off-
913 leash areas. After this public meeting, the ad hoc committee did some additional
914 research. One was to verify what our current recreational use is brokered at those three
915 sites, Greer, Hoover and the Baylands Athletic Center, and determine if we'd have
916 conflict between evening use dog off-leash and athletic use. Unsurprisingly, there was

917 conflicts at all three sites with the exception or at least the least amount of impact for the
918 yellow area in Hoover Park. That outfield area was the least impacted if we had evening
919 and morning off-leash hours, if we did a pilot there. The other kind of follow-up research
920 that staff had done was to reach out to Mountain View, talk to their staff, and see what
921 lessons they learned from their entire experience with these off-leash areas that they
922 recently instituted. My interview of staff brought out some interesting facts. One was
923 that they started this pilot program in June 2014, made it permanent in May 2015. Only
924 one of their nine off-leash areas is a dedicated dog park; that's Shoreline Park. The other
925 eight are off-leash areas that is unfenced. Only one of those eight is on an athletic field.
926 The rest are kind of passive sections of a park. The majority of the complaints that they
927 received were about non-observance with their hours and days, that people were bringing
928 their dogs when they weren't really allowed to or outside of the areas that they were
929 allowed to. There were also concerns from parents who had off-leash dogs approach
930 their children. Mountain View's got a contract with a security firm that performs
931 enforcement on two of their sites. Their staff explained that the success of the program
932 really depended on that enforcement component. They also explained a little bit of the
933 process they went through, that their parks and recreation commission had not advocated
934 for doing a pilot program, but rather said, "You should research and look for dedicated
935 sites." Their Council directed staff to move ahead with the one-year pilot. After the pilot
936 which had some mixed results, some very positive, some against the program, the
937 commission said, "We should extend this pilot for a year with additional enforcement."
938 Their Council disagreed and said please proceed in making it permanent. Staff recently
939 learned some additional news about Menlo Park's experience with shared-use dog parks.
940 Since 2005, the softball field at Nealon Park has been a shared-use site. That is from
941 Monday through Friday 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. Recently the Menlo Park Recreation
942 Commission identified some concerns about the field conditions at the site. Their City
943 Council concurred and basically said that the joint use was not optimal for either user
944 group and approved a CIP to find a dedicated spot. This November, they're having a
945 public meeting to see if they can relocate what they had as that shared-use site for a
946 dedicated spot somewhere either in that park or another. Some of these challenges that
947 we've encountered, both in our public meeting and some of our outreach to other
948 agencies, led the ad hoc committee to explore opportunities for new or expanded dog
949 parks that could be implemented quickly without investing too much money nor waiting
950 necessarily for the Master Plan to be completed. Give me just one second to pull up the
951 ... This was in your staff report. This first site is across from Greer Park; it's called
952 Colorado Avenue Utility Substation. This is the landscaped area just outside it. It's about
953 an acre, .96 acres to be precise. It would require about 600 feet of fencing which would
954 cost about \$15,000. There's parking available on the street side, and it's close proximity
955 to neighborhoods. There are a few challenges with this site. The Utilities Department
956 has informed us that they may need this site for future expansion, that is, they're
957 constrained on the land they have and there's a possibility they might need to use this and
958 they're reluctant to give it up. They also had some concerns about security. This is an



959 area where the City gets a tremendous amount of its power. Having people very close to
960 the fence line was potentially an issue for them. Lastly, the Utilities Department pays a
961 significant amount of money to lease that land. There'd be an impact to the General
962 Fund; if we were to take it over for a dog park. They'd no longer be contributing that
963 money. However, we are going to remain diligent in looking to see if this is still an
964 option. CSD will continue to pursue it. This next site is Mitchell Park. The idea is can
965 we expand Mitchell Park. The red polygon is our existing dog park. It is about .56 acres.
966 We, with very minimal costs, could extend the fence line to that green polygon, which
967 takes you from .56 to 1.21 acres. This would only cost about \$9,500. The last site we're
968 looking at—these three sites are not exhaustive. These are three that the ad hoc
969 committee and staff could find that seemed to fit the paradigm of not very expensive,
970 could be implemented potentially quickly if we clear some hurdles. This last site is El
971 Camino Park. This is undeveloped area of parkland just outside. Of course, the photo
972 here is not that helpful. Just to the left of that red polygon that you see is the softball
973 field. There's a fence line that separates it. That's kind of the park proper to the left.
974 This undeveloped area is just largely mulch, and there's utilities on site. If we fenced off
975 this little area, you would gain about .77 acres of a dog park at about \$15,000 cost. We
976 did reach out to Utilities and found out they didn't have a conflict. We could work
977 around their access needs. However, Planning advised staff that there are plans for a
978 future transit improvement that may incorporate changes to this area. CSD staff is in
979 communication with Planning to see if we can work around that. That concludes my
980 presentation. I defer to the ad hoc committee to see if they have anything they'd like to
981 add.

982
983 Commissioner Hetterly: Sure. I would just add, what we're really looking for today is
984 feedback from you all on what should be our next step. Should we be continuing to think
985 about a shared-use option, in which case Hoover seems the only place that's really
986 workable in terms of the hours and for trying to set it up for success. As you can see
987 looking at the picture, that does take up a big chunk of the park for some hours of the
988 days. We'd like your thoughts on that. Also, these three sites, as Daren said, we're not
989 looking to preempt the Master Plan process in any way, but we're really trying to find
990 something that we can do in the near term to expand our off-leash dog opportunities.
991 These seem some places where, short of a CIP since they're a much smaller investment,
992 we may be able to open something at least for the interim until we're able to find
993 something more permanent or maybe one of these possibilities could become a
994 permanent option in the future. On this one at El Camino Park in particular, like I said,
995 all of them we're not proposing any improvements aside from fencing and a gate and a
996 poop bag station, maybe a bench. Who knows. They could be interim projects that could
997 be easily removed later for future use. This one, this Planning project, they're talking
998 about extending Quarry Road through to the transit center, which of course will have all
999 sorts of its own issues since that's parkland. It doesn't seem like something that they're

1000 going to break ground on in the next six months, so why wouldn't we go ahead and use
1001 that space? I'd like any reaction from you all (crosstalk).

1002
1003 Chair Reckdahl: Who owns the transit center itself?

1004
1005 Commissioner Crommie: Do we need community input?

1006
1007 Chair Reckdahl: Yeah, we will. I wanted to get one clarification. The transit center
1008 there, just to the right of the red line, who controls that?

1009
1010 Mr. Anderson: I'll have to look into that and get back to you.

1011
1012 Chair Reckdahl: Is that City land do you know?

1013
1014 Mr. Anderson: I don't.

1015
1016 Chair Reckdahl: We have some speakers here. First, we have Howard Hoffman.
1017 Howard, you have two minutes.

1018
1019 Howard Hoffman: Pardon me?

1020
1021 Chair Reckdahl: You have two minutes.

1022
1023 Mr. Hoffman: Thank you very much to the staff and to the Commission for at least
1024 recognizing that if we're not going to go ahead with a shared-use facility, that we really
1025 need at least some sort of interim dog park improvements until the Master Plan. We're
1026 optimistic that that's going to identify multiple locations. Palo Alto dog owners would be
1027 happy to see all of these. The people that have dogs running off-leash right now all over
1028 Palo Alto are not an asset to the community. It would be an asset to have one or more of
1029 these sites enclosed whether it's the shared-use facility at Hoover Park or any of these.
1030 We do appreciate that you're working on this and recognize that it's long overdue. We
1031 just hope that—we're not going to endorse any one particular option. The one other
1032 option that I would like to hold out there, which I didn't see in here, there's the part of
1033 Rinconada Park. Of course, the dog use facilities are especially in north Palo Alto.
1034 Rinconada Park back by the power substation there, there's an area I think in the Master
1035 Plan for that park that was identified for bocce ball perhaps. I think we've got bocce ball
1036 somewhere else. It's a small area, but it could be with artificial turf. We don't have any
1037 artificial turf parks being discussed here. That does give you another option over dirt or
1038 decomposed granite or over grass. Grass needs to be fairly large. I think that some of
1039 you are familiar with the Mountain View artificial turf park for dogs, and that's worked
1040 out really well. Thank you.

1042 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you, Howard. Next we have Amarad Acharia.
1043

1044 Amarad Acharia: Hi. I'm Amarad Acharia. I'd like to appreciate and thank the staff for
1045 taking the effort to put this together. The two things I would like to point. Centralized
1046 parks, wonderful to have them when there's nothing else available, but they take up the
1047 opportunity of intercommunity socialization. I mean, largely I meet my neighbors when I
1048 have kids and I take them to the park or if I have a dog and I go with the dog for walking.
1049 Those are largely the only times I get to meet my neighbors. Otherwise, I'm just living
1050 isolated and have relationships elsewhere. Having parks that are within communities
1051 provide that opportunities. It comes with all the other constraints; I understand that. We
1052 do have parks, Rinconada for example, for people living on the northern side of town.
1053 That does have some room that could be taken advantage of to provide such an
1054 opportunity. Thank you.
1055

1056 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. Shani Kleinhaus, you are next.
1057

1058 Shani Kleinhaus: Thank you. I'm going to speak as a resident who owns three dogs right
1059 now. One of them is probably not going to last much longer, and then I'll say something
1060 about environmental issues wearing my environmental hat. First, I find that dog parks
1061 provide a huge service to the community, especially when there is no fence around them.
1062 I have to say that it brings the community to the park. It brings people together, and it
1063 creates an opportunity for people whose children are already not at home. They don't
1064 socialize with their kids; they socialize with their dogs. That is very evident in our
1065 neighborhood. There is a need for more dog parks, for sure. I do want to say a few
1066 things about the one park at the Baylands that was proposed here. I have concerns about
1067 that. I've had other people from the environmental group have concerns about bringing
1068 dogs there. One reason is that you'd have to drive there, and it's not really a wonderful
1069 idea to drive anywhere these days if we don't have to. If you can provide the service in
1070 the City, it's better. The other thing is that unless there is somebody to actually monitor
1071 what happens and how people behave and whether they take the dogs then for a walk
1072 along the creek, then that could be a huge impact to that creek, especially as now the San
1073 Francisquito Creek is supposed to go through a flood control and habitat restoration
1074 project. Hopefully it will go through sooner or later. When it does, I don't want to have
1075 to look at an existing condition of dogs already there because this project moved forward
1076 before the creek was in place. When it goes to any kind of additional analysis, the dogs
1077 will already be there. I know it's already been through CEQA, but still I think that that's
1078 not a very good selection for a dog park unless there is huge monitoring of how people
1079 behave and that they don't go on the levee with dogs off-leash, which they already do
1080 anyway, but that just brings more people to do that. I think that the less risk of inviting
1081 unauthorized use to a remote location may not be a good analysis unless you have data to
1082 support that. That is of concern.
1083

1084 Chair Reckdahl: Your time's up.
1085

1086 Ms. Kleinhaus: Also artificial turf, I don't know. You may like that park over there. I
1087 find it kind of yech.
1088

1089 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. Mot Huri, you're up next.
1090

1091 Mot Huri: Hi, good evening. We've only moved to Palo Alto about 2 1/2 years ago with
1092 a dog. Since he can't come to the meeting, this leash is him representing himself and his
1093 friends here. One of the lovely things about Palo Alto is almost everybody has a dog. I
1094 would like to thank you all for these wonderful proposals. There's only one potential
1095 problem here. I live in Crescent Park. Most of these are concentrated south of Oregon,
1096 Hoover, Greer, Mitchell. The one exception is Baylands, and she very articulately
1097 mentioned why it wouldn't be the best option. These proposals leave seven communities
1098 which would be Crescent Park, Community Center, Saint Francis, Professorville,
1099 University South, Leland Manor and Old Palo Alto, with no options to walk to a dog
1100 park. The reason we would like to walk is many. One is you get to meet people. I know
1101 more people from all over Crescent Park just by running into them and their dogs and our
1102 dogs interacting than I would normally had I moved to any other community. The second
1103 things is—this also reference to her concern—when you're around people you know, you
1104 behave better. I don't know why, but we do that. When we are in a park and there are
1105 neighbors and we're all there with our dogs, we are going to pick up and they are going
1106 to pick up, because we are being watched. The third thing is the Baylands, besides
1107 everything else, all of these communities would have to negotiate Embarcadero during
1108 commute hours to get there. We all know Embarcadero is a traffic nightmare with
1109 unenforceable speed limits and many other problems, very congested. I would like for
1110 you all to think about the possibility, given how many dogs exist here and given the
1111 benefits of allowing for areas where dogs and people can meet, I would like you all to
1112 think about putting in off-leash, fenced dog areas in all the major parks in the north side.
1113 Certainly Rinconada has the space for it, as does Pardee. If you can go ahead and find
1114 some space for it in either Johnson and Heritage as well, that would be great. More are
1115 better for many reasons. I don't know how close I am to running out on time, but
1116 Mitchell is the one good off-leash in Palo Alto, which means it gets lots of people and
1117 lots of dogs. There have been dog confrontations. All of that can be eased up if there are
1118 multiple alternatives. Thank you.
1119

1120 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. Herb Borock is next. Irene Keene follows him.
1121

1122 Herb Borock: The first answer, Chair Reckdahl, is a question about El Camino Park.
1123 The land is owned by Stanford University and leased to Palo Alto. I believe the current
1124 lease runs to June 30, 2033. We have off-leash dog areas already, except they're not
1125 legal. Because they're not legal, they don't get the intensive use you would have with an

1126 official, sanctioned dog park. I've been familiar with the area in Hoover Park, the turf
1127 area outside of the ball field that's used off-leash illegally. That park also has an official
1128 dog park, and there people with dogs use both of those and some use one or use the other.
1129 When the most people congregate is the hours when animal control is not working. It
1130 limits the number of people, the number of dogs that come there. If you're going to be
1131 having more dog parks, they should be in the north area of town, north of Oregon
1132 Expressway. They should be on neighborhood parks. El Camino Park and Rinconada
1133 Park are district parks. When you tried to have a dog park or a bathroom even in Eleanor
1134 Pardee Park, you saw the resistance. The woman from Crescent Park who thinks
1135 everyone's got a dog and her neighbors want to go to a neighborhood park and do that,
1136 she'll find very quickly that in north Palo Alto there'll be a lot of resistance to having
1137 more dog parks. If you want to do something for the community as a whole, then you're
1138 going to have to make that kind of decision. You should expect that it'll be more than
1139 just people who are in walking distance. People will drive to any of these parks. If you
1140 did, for example, try Hoover Park with that area delineated in yellow, you should put a
1141 very firm time limit because you'll very quickly find not only the intensive use but also
1142 all the damage and concerns that people have mentioned will then happen that are not
1143 happening now. Thank you.

1144
1145 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. Our last speaker is Irene Keene.

1146
1147 Irene Keene: Hello. I also live in Crescent Park, but I'm on the edge of Community
1148 Center, so I'm in north Palo Alto. There are no dog parks anywhere near me. I have to
1149 get in my car and drive. We only have three dog parks in Palo Alto. It's crazy, only
1150 three. There's only one that's halfway decent which is the one at the big park, Mitchell.
1151 The one at Hoover is small; it's dirty; your dog gets filthy there in the summertime; in the
1152 wintertime the dog gets muddy because it turns into a mud puddle when there's rain. The
1153 other one is at Greer; that's a run. It's really narrow; it's kind of long, but it's also a mud
1154 pit. I love the dog park in Mountain View, the one that's got the fake grass. I mean, it's a
1155 little over the top, but I'll tell you what. It keeps your dog really clean. When it's wet
1156 out, grass gets wet. Your dog is going to be filthy because it gets a little wet on the feet,
1157 then he walks in dirt and it's a mess. I will get in my car and drive to Mountain View to
1158 keep my dog clean. Then I'm going to shop over there, because there's the nice Safeway
1159 there. Sometimes I go to Menlo Park, then I go to the Safeway in Menlo Park. You want
1160 people to stay in Palo Alto and spend their money in Palo Alto, get some dog parks in
1161 north Palo Alto please. Thank you.

1162
1163 Chair Reckdahl: Thank you. That was the last comment, so now we'll move on to
1164 Commissioners.

1165
1166 Commissioner Lauing: Chair Reckdahl?
1167

1168 Chair Reckdahl: Yes.

1169
1170 Commissioner Lauing: Just a process question. Would it make sense to just go quickly
1171 around for questions before we came to conclusions just to make sure everything was
1172 answered?

1173
1174 Chair Reckdahl: Okay. Do you have any questions?

1175
1176 Commissioner Lauing: I do.

1177
1178 Chair Reckdahl: Fire away.

1179
1180 Commissioner Lauing: I'd actually like to ask questions about the permanent ones first,
1181 the permanent options that have been identified. For example, Mitchell Park, there's no
1182 cons listed here. By the way, I thought this whole ad hoc report was terrific, very
1183 detailed, very thorough. Good job by the ad hoc and staff. It's just really, really helpful.
1184 Mitchell, there's no cons listed, and the cost is \$9,500. I always think of cost as a con.

1185
1186 Commissioner Crommie: Con is location.

1187
1188 Mr. Anderson: I should clarify. The pros and cons list were conducted for our shared-
1189 use ones. When we put together our list of potential dedicated parks, we hadn't done the
1190 pro and con analysis. It was just preliminary. We haven't quite resolved a lot of the other
1191 potential challenges like the substation (crosstalk) we didn't get to the pros and cons for
1192 this one.

1193
1194 Commissioner Lauing: This one seems to get to wow, we can get a real-size park here in
1195 a way that your analysis, the ad hoc's analysis, it'd be nice to have an acre and to be able
1196 to add that much—if there really are any cons and there's \$9,500 as the cost, that seems
1197 like a way to get some—like we created in the Baylands. What did Council say? We
1198 created land out there by doing that. You might be able to create a big dog park here.

1199
1200 Rob de Geus: Can I just comment on that?

1201
1202 Commissioner Lauing: Sure.

1203
1204 Mr. de Geus: There's always going to be tradeoffs and some pros and cons. I haven't
1205 been out there recently. That area, people do sit on that grassy area. It's sort of a hilly
1206 area. It's a nice place to just lie down on the grass and relax. I see people do that all the
1207 time, so that's one tradeoff that we have to consider.

1208

1209 Commissioner Lauing: Your point is an important point for all of this discussion. The
1210 public, some of whom spoke tonight, always need to know that there's a tradeoff. If
1211 you've got a dog there, you're not kicking a ball, you're not lying in the grass, and so on.
1212 That's part of our challenge with this whole issue Citywide. With respect to both
1213 Colorado Avenue and El Camino, the issue of there may be a future need, in and of itself
1214 doesn't seem too compelling to me as a con, because we can use it now. I guess my
1215 question back is how long do you think it would take to resolve that situation for either
1216 one of those? Yes, you might need it later, but as we know it takes time and it could be a
1217 couple of years before they need it, Let's be active with it, would be one approach.
1218

1219 Mr. Anderson: That's certainly the position that staff is taking. The conversations for
1220 both of those sites are ongoing right now.
1221

1222 Commissioner Lauing: I mean, I know this is a little bit unfair. Do you think this is
1223 going to be resolved in a month or 12 months or ...
1224

1225 Mr. de Geus: I don't think we have an answer. We're trying to get the answer to that.
1226 We have the same question, Commissioner Lauing. One of the things we've heard for
1227 this location here from Utilities staff is the concern that once you provide that service, say
1228 this is a dog park even if it's temporary, it's very hard to take it away once you've
1229 provided it. They've expressed that concern.
1230

1231 Commissioner Lauing: The other side of it is if we don't do it all for two years ...
1232

1233 Mr. de Geus: I know. That's what we ...
1234

1235 Commissioner Lauing: We have some blank space there that looks compelling. Just to
1236 be sure about the security concern issue there. Was it just getting too close to the
1237 electrical facilities? Is that what you mean?
1238

1239 Mr. Anderson: That's what they voiced, yes. That was the Utilities staff. Security in
1240 terms of protecting the asset of the City's power.
1241

1242 Mr. de Geus: That's a particularly important power plant, not that I know much about it.
1243 What I've heard from the Utilities staff is—I asked them about this. How serious are
1244 these constraints that they're suggesting? This site is where all the electricity for Palo
1245 Alto comes through, into that particular location. They're especially sensitive to ...
1246

1247 Commissioner Lauing: Is it a two-way security concern? They're concerned that
1248 somehow the public is going to get in there and disrupt that or is it a concern that we
1249 don't want the public to be hurt? I just didn't (crosstalk).
1250

1251 Mr. de Geus: I think it's both. I do think it's both. It wasn't a complete shutdown; it can't
1252 happen. The Utilities staff were willing to in fact even meet with the ad hoc committee if
1253 they'd be interested in doing so. I think we'll pursue that.

1254
1255 Commissioner Lauing: I didn't quite get the concern about the amount of money. Again,
1256 it's just sitting there vacant, and there wouldn't be any change for that if they needed it
1257 back in five years. I didn't understand why that was a potential constraint.

1258
1259 Mr. de Geus: I don't know if this is it. Daren, I don't want to jump in. Utilities is an
1260 Enterprise Fund, so they pay rent for the land that they use. They're paying rent to the
1261 City's General Fund for the use of that land including that. Once it's used for a different
1262 purpose, not a utility purpose, then they no longer pay rent back to the City. There's a
1263 financial (crosstalk).

1264
1265 Commissioner Lauing: Legally or conveniently?

1266
1267 Mr. de Geus: It's just there. They ...

1268
1269 Commissioner Lauing: I don't want to take too much time. Another question I had is
1270 that in the summary many, many dog owners at that last large meeting, which I attended,
1271 said that the hours just don't work. Again, it's a debate with if that's all you could get,
1272 would you take a shared-use dog park with a couple of hours. I share that concern,
1273 because what we're trying to do with any pilot is basically do a test market of will this
1274 work in a lot of different ways. If you only test two hours or three hours on five days a
1275 week, we're just not testing anything that's very comprehensive relative to, as you would
1276 say with a product, to be able to roll it out. I wasn't on the ad hoc, so I don't have the
1277 level of detail. I was surprised that at Baylands, for example, there weren't Sunday nights
1278 between 4:00 and 8:00 in the summers that might be open. I don't think, from my
1279 recollection of Babe Ruth which I was involved with, that they play at that time. My
1280 question is, if we really strive, could we find some other segments of time to test different
1281 time segments besides 10:00 to 12:00 in the morning. Has the ad hoc already exhausted
1282 that?

1283
1284 Mr. Anderson: I'll defer to the Commissioners on that one.

1285
1286 Commissioner Hetterly: I would just answer on when the Baylands Athletic Center is
1287 used, they're telling us from 3:00 until 10:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, it's booked.
1288 Weekends from 8:00 a.m. 'til 10:00 p.m. it's booked. That seemed to us to preclude joint
1289 use during those evening hours.

1290

1291 Commissioner Lauing: I'm surprised at the evening hours. I haven't worked on those
1292 schedules in a few years. Also in terms of the Babe Ruth, which is a big user of that, it's
1293 not 12 months out of the year.

1294
1295 Chair Reckdahl: They close down the field for how many months? Three months during
1296 the winter?

1297
1298 Mr. Anderson: Mm-hmm.

1299
1300 Chair Reckdahl: So no one can access the field just because of damage to the field. The
1301 field gets wet.

1302
1303 Commissioner Lauing: That makes sense.

1304
1305 Chair Reckdahl: During the non-closed, it's between Babe Ruth and other people that
1306 rent the field, it's brokered down there. It's pretty busy.

1307
1308 Commissioner Lauing: That was just one example. The question is do you feel like
1309 you've exhausted any options for evening walks. Basically, anybody who has a job, has
1310 an 8-5 job, is not going to be able to use this shared-use dog park.

1311
1312 Commissioner Hetterly: I think it's pretty clear to the ad hoc. Anyway, we concluded
1313 that Hoover was the only viable option of the three for a shared-use pilot that could
1314 handle those evening hours ...

1315
1316 Commissioner Knopper: The yellow.

1317
1318 Commissioner Hetterly: ... at the yellow part, outside that fence.

1319
1320 Commissioner Knopper: The stakeholders that use that said they would not use that part
1321 of the field. Now, part of the field they use sort of for practice, but if it was shared use
1322 with dogs, they wouldn't even put children on it at that point, because they'd be scared
1323 dogs would dig a hole and the kids ...

1324
1325 Commissioner Lauing: This is Hoover?

1326
1327 Commissioner Knopper: Yeah, outside the yellow portion. The baseball stakeholders
1328 said they just wouldn't use the yellow if we did ...

1329
1330 Commissioner Hetterly: They occasionally use it now, but it's not booked through our—I
1331 don't know (crosstalk).

1332

1333 Commissioner Knopper: For official practices.

1334
1335 Mr. Anderson: That's right.

1336
1337 Commissioner Hetterly: It's just informal use.

1338
1339 Commissioner Knopper: It's not official, but you use it to take kids out there to teach
1340 them technique or whatever. If we were to implement a pilot of shared-use, they
1341 wouldn't put kids out there.

1342
1343 Commissioner Lauing: Okay. Was the small field at Baylands the same way in terms of
1344 its usage?

1345
1346 Mr. Anderson: Yes.

1347
1348 Commissioner Knopper: Mm-hmm.

1349
1350 Commissioner Lauing: No further questions.

1351
1352 Chair Reckdahl: Deirdre.

1353
1354 Commissioner Crommie: How come Sterling Canal didn't end up on your list of extra
1355 opportunities?

1356
1357 Mr. Anderson: It just wasn't a comprehensive list. As I mentioned, these three jumped
1358 out at us. Both because there was partial fencing there on all three of those that limited
1359 the cost to something that we could afford without waiting for a CIP. As soon as you
1360 need a new CIP, you're looking at a much longer timeframe. Once you're within the
1361 20,000 and less category, it's something we could probably fund with our existing funds.

1362
1363 Commissioner Crommie: I have a problem with that actually, for generating a list that
1364 way. First of all, if you end up at Mitchell, there's already a dog park there. It seems like
1365 you're not even in line with the mandate to look for areas that are not served currently. If
1366 that's what you've come up with, it means you didn't look enough, as far as I'm
1367 concerned. I don't know if this is our comment section. I would just say that you're not
1368 being expansive enough right now.

1369
1370 Commissioner Hetterly: Should I respond? Would you like a response to that? As far as
1371 what we were limited—our mandate was really to look at shared-use sites. The whole
1372 purpose behind that was to find large sites. Shared-use was appealing because it offered
1373 the opportunity to have a big chunk of land that dogs could really run in. We had agreed
1374 as a Commission to defer the bigger question of how we can distribute dog parks

1375 Citywide within our parks better through the Master Plan, because we know there's a big
1376 public outreach process for every single park, as you know. Who wants a park, who
1377 doesn't want a park, dogs, bathroom, whatever. We thought that was more appropriate
1378 through the Master Plan process. We were really just looking at what can we do in the
1379 short term to test something out for shared use, which limited our options to begin with to
1380 the three we talked about because of the cost and the size, where we had athletic fields
1381 that were available. Then when we looked at non-shared-use options, again we were
1382 looking for big sites with few improvements that could happen quickly. That's how we
1383 ended up with those three that we ended up with. I think Sterling Canal has a number of
1384 issues, as you probably know because you were on the Sterling Canal ad hoc committee.
1385 There was limited options there. It's completely fenced off at this point, and there's no
1386 public access at all.

1387
1388 Commissioner Crommie: We never got to the bottom of that. Let me just ask this
1389 question then, based on what you just said. Is the current Mitchell Park dog park bigger
1390 than a baseball field diamond shared-use would achieve or smaller? The current size.

1391 Commissioner Hetterly: Small, small.

1392 Commissioner Knopper: Smaller.

1393
1394 Commissioner Crommie: Can you just give me the two square footages?

1395
1396 Commissioner Hetterly: They're on your handout.

1397
1398 Mr. Anderson: Mitchell's .56 acres. For example, Hoover which is up on the display,
1400 you can see the yellow area is 1.17 acres. Inside the red area is .96 acre. They're all a
1401 little different. As I toggle back to the Baylands, you can see it's much larger, for
1402 example. That large red area has 3.27.

1403
1404 Commissioner Crommie: Thank you.

1405
1406 Chair Reckdahl: Stacey, do you have any questions?

1407
1408 Commissioner Ashlund: Yeah. In the Hoover Park option, it's listed as a con that there's
1409 frequent use of the field by the Keys School. Why is that a con? Because the field is
1410 occupied?

1411
1412 Commissioner Knopper: There's a lot of children using it during the day, so that leads to
1413 the issue of use, because they use it for their PE activities during the course of the school
1414 day. A lot of the comment with regard to public comment is that you have dog waste that
1415

1416 isn't necessarily cleaned up and the occasional dog digging the hole and tearing up the
1417 grass. That is an opportunity for kids to ...

1418
1419 Commissioner Ashlund: That applies at any park, right?

1420
1421 Commissioner Knopper: For shared-use, yeah.

1422
1423 Commissioner Ashlund: For shared use. Do you only want questions at this point or
1424 we're making other comments as well? Is this the first pass through?

1425
1426 Chair Reckdahl: The first pass through. (inaudible) two.

1427
1428 Commissioner Ashlund: That's it for now.

1429
1430 Chair Reckdahl: That's it, okay. Any other questions? Okay. Now, comments,
1431 conversations. Ed, do you have anything?

1432
1433 Commissioner Lauing: Yeah. Why don't you start at that end? I'm happy to go if you
1434 want.

1435
1436 Chair Reckdahl: Stacey, do you want to start?

1437
1438 Commissioner Ashlund: Okay.

1439
1440 Chair Reckdahl: Go for it.

1441
1442 Commissioner Ashlund: I really like the recommendations. I mean, it's been so
1443 consistent all along from the community and Council and everybody that the need is in
1444 the north of Palo Alto. I really like the potential triangle we'd have if we kept Mitchell
1445 the size it is, use the Colorado substation area and the El Camino Park area. I think that
1446 would be really, really good coverage. The Colorado substation, today's the first day I've
1447 heard that brought up. I don't know if we've discussed that before on the Commission,
1448 but I may have missed that one in the past. If we are looking at shared-use, I don't see
1449 that use of a public park by a private school for PE is a con. It's public land, so I don't
1450 think that applies here as a con. It's public land. I mean, there's schools adjacent to all of
1451 our parks. It's public land; it's not private PE land.

1452
1453 Chair Reckdahl: Do they pay rent?

1454
1455 Mr. de Geus: I have to look into that. I'm not sure if they get a permit; I don't believe
1456 they do. I have to check.

1457

1458 Commissioner Ashlund: If they were renting the field, that would be one thing.
1459

1460 Commissioner Knopper: I think you have to look—just pardon me for interrupting.
1461 Point taken with regard to it's a private school. I think some of the other cons are there's
1462 a nearby playground and it's a heavily used park on any given day, all hours of the day.
1463

1464 Commissioner Ashlund: Yeah, I understand that. I don't think location-wise that Hoover
1465 is really jumping out. I mean, it's been so consistent that the need is in the north. The
1466 other possibility—I don't know if we have already approached the neighborhood
1467 associations. Since we do frequently hear from speakers in the north saying, "We want
1468 them in the neighborhood parks in the north," have you approached the neighborhood
1469 associations at all and said, "Talk to your neighbors and let's see what your consensus is.
1470 Do you guys want it or do you not want it in your neighborhood park?" Once it comes
1471 back to the Commission, then we have to go back and do the outreach. If the
1472 neighborhoods are asking for it and can start to say there really is more demand than
1473 there is resistance in a certain neighborhood park, that could help with community
1474 feedback.
1475

1476 Commissioner Hetterly: We have not done that primarily because the Commission had
1477 asked us not to do that and to leave that to the Master Plan process.
1478

1479 Commissioner Ashlund: Leave that to the Master Plan process, right.
1480

1481 Commissioner Hetterly: Just to reiterate, the idea of trying to get more dedicated dog
1482 parks in neighborhood parks across the City is, as we understood it, really part of the
1483 Master Plan process. This is an additional process that we're trying to move something
1484 forward quickly. That's a big (inaudible).
1485

1486 Commissioner Ashlund: I would avoid expanding at Mitchell. Mitchell is really, really
1487 crowded by a number of schools, a number of tennis players, bicyclists, pedestrians. I
1488 would really avoid it. The need just isn't there. Nobody is coming to our meetings
1489 saying, "We wish we had—if Mitchell were bigger on the south end of Palo Alto." We're
1490 hearing north, north, north. That's my feedback, is really, really keep the focus there.
1491

1492 Chair Reckdahl: Other questions? Deirdre.
1493

1494 Commissioner Crommie: Are we just doing comments now?
1495

1496 Chair Reckdahl: Comments, questions (crosstalk).
1497

1498 Commissioner Crommie: I knew the shared-use was dead on arrival when it was just
1499 morning hours. I mean, I wasn't surprised one bit because everyone I know that hangs

1500 out with their dogs in public places are doing it in the evenings. It just seems obvious.
1501 Just look around our City. Look around our neighborhoods. Look around our parks.
1502 Everyone comes out after they get home from work. They like to come during that
1503 twilight hour. All across the City, that's happening, and it's not happening in the
1504 morning. I'm not surprised that we got all that feedback. I brought it up at the time that
1505 the ad hoc was formulating their idea, but I was told, "We just have to do that as a pilot."
1506 These things are all connected. I mean, it's not independent. It's like you have to satisfy
1507 the need even when you do a pilot. I think we should take the Baylands park off the
1508 table. There's not a single person who's coming here saying they want to go over there
1509 and use that as a dog park. We need to look at what the constituency is saying. No one is
1510 saying that. Plus, it can harm the wildlife as people move from that park to the levee
1511 which they absolutely will do if they're over there. I just think that should be a non-
1512 starter. I know it was sort of put on the table because it was cheap, but I just don't see
1513 any reason to keep it there. Mitchell Park is in my neighborhood, relatively close. I
1514 guess it's a 20-minute walk or 5-minute car ride. None of my neighbors with dogs go
1515 over there. They just don't want to do it. They hang out at the tiny, little Monroe Park. I
1516 wish I could get them to go to Robles which is a 7-minute walk. People just don't seem
1517 to want to go very far from their homes with their dogs. Mitchell Park, I don't even like
1518 being there with my dog. It's all dirt. I haven't heard good things about the experience at
1519 Mitchell Park for a dog park. If we don't have a good experience with a half-acre dog
1520 park over there, I'm not sure it's going to improve to go into that nice sitting area nearby.
1521 We can't keep the grass nice at Mitchell Park. Now, if you double the size, maybe there's
1522 a lower impact, somehow you can keep it nice. I've just not seen that happen. I'm a big
1523 user of the artificial turf dog park; I go there multiple times a week with my dog. It's in
1524 the shopping center at San Antonio and Fayette. I was never into artificial turf; it seems
1525 gross to me. I will say it works, it really does work. It's hugely used, a massively dense
1526 dog park, and the dogs are all different sizes. It'd be really nice to know the acreage on
1527 that dog park. It seems tiny to me. I've talked to a lot of people there. Kind of the word
1528 at that park is, it's tiny but we all can see our dogs so the dogs are not misbehaving.
1529 That's why the small dogs work with the big dogs, because they're highly monitored.
1530 Some people in dog parks say where you really get into trouble is when it gets too big,
1531 the dogs run off. People want to stay and congregate with each other, and then the dogs
1532 start misbehaving or not getting picked up after and stuff like that. I guess of all these
1533 proposals, I would say put them where the people want them which is in the north. That's
1534 where we have the deficit. We should do whatever it takes to get something over there.
1535 Then we have to look at just neighborhood by neighborhood and make sure every
1536 neighborhood park is assessed for a dog area, because that's where people want to go.
1537 They want an easy walking distance. Some parks are a lot better suited for it. It's an
1538 absolute tragedy at Eleanor Pardee. The reason you don't have a dog park there is
1539 because people rebelled in that neighborhood. We need to have a stronger policy
1540 mandate to really counteract the NIMBY-ism. I've been on the Commission now for
1541 seven years. Ever since I sat here, we have looked at dog parks. I just hope the next

1542 wave we get more going with it. You really do need to look at where the users are, where
1543 people want it, independent of cost at this point. I think we're being misled to look for a
1544 cheap solution. Look where we ended up; we ended up in areas where we already have
1545 dog parks, looking at that. That's not what people are telling us they want. That's what I
1546 feel.

1547
1548 Female: Can I ask a question?

1549
1550 Commissioner Lauing: Not really.

1551
1552 Chair Reckdahl: No.

1553
1554 Female: Come back next month on this.

1555
1556 Chair Reckdahl: Ed.

1557
1558 Commissioner Lauing: Yes, thanks. As we address this whole issue, we need to go back
1559 over the last year and half when we got started and over the last six years. Why are we
1560 looking at shared-use dog parks? Because there aren't enough dog parks. Why aren't
1561 there enough dog parks? Because there's not enough parks and there's not enough park
1562 space. To have a comment that we should just survey the public and put them where they
1563 want them is not practical in any way, shape or form. We have to do what we can with
1564 the limitation of park space until we can get more park space, if we can, and do the best
1565 we can to identify existing spaces that can be turned into dog parks. We've been working
1566 on this for a long time. The need is there. We know that it's going to come out as a very,
1567 very high need in the Master Plan. The top three, maybe the top issue in all of parks,
1568 maybe in the top three of all City issues, but certainly as park specific. There are other
1569 options that are being uncovered, which I agree is above and beyond the scope of what
1570 the ad hoc was supposed to look at. I thank them for also looking at those. There are still
1571 a lot of cards to overturn there. We don't know if that's going to be the case. I would be
1572 very happy to see action at our next meeting in favor of going ahead with these pilots to
1573 get some data. That's what you do, as I said earlier, in a test market. You try to get some
1574 data on what works and what doesn't. For example, I think it would be a very valid test
1575 to have Hoover and Baylands because, amongst other things, it's comparing the usage
1576 that we get from someone who's walking to the park and the usage we would get with
1577 someone who is driving to the park. If I lived in north Palo Alto, which I do, and I had a
1578 dog, which I don't, I would love to go to Baylands a couple of hours and run my dog in
1579 that big space as opposed to never go there because it takes me five minutes to drive
1580 there. I think it could get extraordinary use. We don't know that if we just restrict it to
1581 one pilot or say, "Forget about it. Let's just wait another couple of years until we can get
1582 some permanent dog parks." To be able to test Hoover versus Baylands, number one,
1583 you really do need an A-B split test to have a valid study. You're testing north and south;

1584 you're testing drive to and walk to. I think you would get some pretty interesting
1585 feedback there. I'm very aware of the challenges involved, but I don't think the cons are
1586 so overwhelming that we say we shouldn't do it. In the meantime and in parallel if those,
1587 call them ready options, can be looked at, certainly the El Camino would be a tremendous
1588 alternative. We worked really, really hard on the El Camino Park to get a dog park in
1589 there. We were shot down on that a couple of years ago by the environmental; otherwise,
1590 there'd be one right there today because I see the park is almost ready to open. I'd like to
1591 see us move to action on the ad hoc at the next meeting. I'm sorry, on the shared-use at
1592 the next meeting that the ad hoc has studied. If we ended up saying contingent on if a
1593 permanent one opens up in 60 days, we can kind of reel it back in. The footnotes that I
1594 would have is that I still would like to see if there will be a way to extend the hours. In
1595 contrast to my colleague, I don't agree that nobody's going to come between 8:00 and
1596 10:00, because a lot of people walk their dogs in the morning. A lot of people. I've gone
1597 on morning walks, and I run into a lot of dogs and make a lot of dog friends. Let's see.
1598 The second thing is in the pilot I would like to see—this may be a detail—during the pilot
1599 I would like to see outreach and support from the dog owners in terms of the clean-up
1600 aspect of it just to make it a very successful pilot. We can sort out later what to do
1601 around that.

1602
1603 Chair Reckdahl: Anyone else? Pat.

1604
1605 Vice Chair Markevitch: It seems to me there's one park that has not been mentioned, and
1606 it's in north Palo Alto. That's Heritage Park where the old clinic used to be on Homer.
1607 They specifically planted trees there so soccer clubs couldn't play. I think it's a good
1608 shared-use option to look at.

1609
1610 Chair Reckdahl: We went over there after the May Fete Parade. I brought that up, that I
1611 thought there is room there to have a dog park whether it be a shared-use or a dedicated
1612 dog park. I understand the ad hoc was not addressing the whole dog park issue. They
1613 were very focused on the shared-use. Once the Master Plan comes in, I think we'll have a
1614 little more freedom. When I look at these options, I think the most promising one is El
1615 Camino. I think that is a very good location. If we can do that on the cheap, I think we
1616 should do it now and not wait for the Master Plan. I do think that, in my anecdotal
1617 experience talking to people who have dogs, most people want something that they can
1618 walk to. I hear that over and over again. We don't have big parks in Palo Alto. We can't
1619 have big dog parks in every park, but we can have small dog parks in a lot. Down the
1620 road, if I look in my crystal ball, I think that's the solution that's going to percolate up,
1621 having some small—it'll probably have to be artificial turf since you have high use on
1622 it—in neighborhood parks. That's a decision down the road, but now I think we should
1623 just move ahead and do something, either the shared-use at Hoover or the El Camino
1624 Park. Those are the two most feasible. Hoover Park, you could have evening hours.
1625 There is not the constraint that you would have if you had it inside the diamond where

1626 you would have competition from kids. You could do Hoover and have morning and
1627 evening hours, and that would be an option. You could have a dedicated park over at El
1628 Camino. I think those are the two best options. I don't see any reason to wait for the
1629 Master Plan for either of those. A couple of points I would bring up. A lot of people
1630 complain, "I'm a neighbor to a park. I don't want to have a dog park nearby." When I go
1631 over to San Antonio, I'll sit there and listen. One thing is if you look up there, people
1632 have their windows open looking out over that dog park. If it was really that noisy, they
1633 would have their windows shut. I don't think a dog park is any more noisy than any other
1634 park use. When I sit there and try and listen and pretend if I was in my living room,
1635 would I find this objectionable, I don't. I think that neighbors' objections are not based on
1636 fact. It's based on concerns that are not real. The second thing is off-leash without
1637 fences. I think that's a really bad idea. My son was knocked down in a park once by an
1638 off-leash dog, and it was very traumatic. He had a dog phobia for years after that. I think
1639 if we want to off-leash dogs, they really should be inside some type of fence. I think
1640 that's the best option. I think we do have options here. I agree with Ed that we should
1641 move on, and we should in the near future try something. If it doesn't work, we always
1642 can back it out. Failing any other comments, we'll move on to the Master Plan.

1644 **4. Update on the Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Facilities Master**
1645 **Plan.**

1647 Rob de Geus: Just to kick us off. Shall we get started, Chair Reckdahl? Missing a
1648 couple of Commissioners. A few things we wanted to share on the Master Plan this
1649 evening. One, staff have been working hard on putting together a much more
1650 comprehensive report for the City Council following our last Study Session. We hope to
1651 be ready for that follow-up Study Session on November 2nd or 3rd, 2nd. We got close to
1652 doing that, but then we felt like there was just a little more work that needed to be done.
1653 We went and reflected on the Council Study Session and reviewed the tape again and felt
1654 like there was still just a few things that some of the Council Members had asked about
1655 that weren't reflected sufficiently in the report, even though it is much more
1656 comprehensive and includes a lot more and tells the story, I think, a lot better. I felt like
1657 there was still a little more we needed to add. We're not going forward on the 2nd; we're
1658 looking for another date. That did give us an opportunity then to put it in the packet for
1659 the Commission, so that you have that and can provide feedback on what you think of the
1660 report. We're particularly interested if there are areas that you think need to be amplified
1661 or there are omissions from your reading of that report. That's one thing that we want to
1662 do today. I think we can start with that, just sort of feedback and response to the draft
1663 report for the Council Study Session.

1665 Chair Reckdahl: I'll start off. One of the things that came back last time was they didn't
1666 like when you talked about the principles. The principles are kind of nebulous. They
1667 were saying how is this going to help me plan the parks. They want concrete—one thing

1668 when I looked at the listing of this, I thought this was good stuff, but part of it was what
1669 am I getting out of MIG out of this? What are the deliverables? That should be made
1670 clear, what are we getting. On Attachment A, on that second paragraph there, it does talk
1671 about that, but I would itemize that and make that clear. We're getting this, we're getting
1672 this, we're getting this. Just to be clear this is what the Master Plan is producing. Each
1673 one of those, how will those help us plan parks. The other thing was when I looked back
1674 at my comments, there were some comments about—Council Member Schmid had
1675 comments about demographics. I didn't think that his questions were addressed properly.
1676 His concerns were that when he looked at the existing conditions report, he saw one
1677 growth and that did not agree with the CPA and the ABAG projections. I think we really
1678 need to look hard at the projections that the City and ABAG have and really incorporate
1679 them into the report. That's not done right now, and he's going to have that same
1680 comment. Every time we've talked about that, he's come back to demographics. He's
1681 very concerned—I am too—that the population is growing very fast and our parks are not
1682 growing fast. I think that's what he's poking at, saying you need to look at the
1683 demographics that we're projecting and how is the park system going to handle all those
1684 extra people. If you look on page 12 of the MIG report, way in the back, the
1685 demographic and recreation trend, it says what do we learn. They really didn't talk about
1686 this, this long-term growth. The City has grown steadily and they look in the rearview
1687 mirror. Then looking at current, the City has a lot of commuters who travel by bike.
1688 You're missing Schmid's whole point. The whole point is that we're getting more and
1689 more people in here and how is the park going to handle that. I think we need to address
1690 that.

1691
1692 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, that's a good point. I know he felt very strongly about that. MIG
1693 have gone back and revised the demographic report to sync up the predictions of growth
1694 with the Comprehensive Plan and the analysis that they're doing.

1695
1696 Chair Reckdahl: Can you incorporate some of that into the (crosstalk).

1697
1698 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, we can, definitely.

1699
1700 Chair Reckdahl: That would be very useful. I think, number one, it's a good point.
1701 Number two, he asked it and it'd be nice to address what he asked. There's two reasons to
1702 go after that. The other thing is that

1703
1704 Council Member Filseth: Can I throw in my comment on that?

1705
1706 Chair Reckdahl: Yeah, go ahead.

1707
1708 Council Member Filseth: As you were talking, I was sort of thinking about Ed's
1709 comment here, the fact that we're short of dog parks has to do with the fact we're short of

1710 parks in general. One of the members of the audience said there's only one really good
1711 dog park in town, and it's the one at Mitchell Park. You go there, and it's crowded all the
1712 time. Sometimes there's sort of dog-to-dog issues and so forth. If that's not a concrete
1713 manifestation of what you're talking about right now, I don't know what is. For what it's
1714 worth.

1715
1716 Mr. de Geus: I agree.

1717
1718 Chair Reckdahl: I think that is a good point. Yogi Berra, no one goes there anymore
1719 because it's too crowded. My final point was the principles I'm not real warm to, but the
1720 criteria, I think, is solid. Can we reference that earlier in the memo? We do talk about,
1721 way in the back, the criteria. These aren't numbered, but it's the second to last page.
1722 Currently there are five identified criteria. I would really like to see can we move that up
1723 somehow. I think that's the meat that Scharff wanted. It's how this is going to help me
1724 define the park. I think this is going to tell me. Not even change the content, but just
1725 shuffle things around so he sees that earlier. I'm afraid that people on the Council will
1726 read through this and lose patience before they get there. My question's not being
1727 answered, my question's not being answered, and they won't get all the way to the end. If
1728 you can get it up towards the front, saying this is criteria. One of the deliverables is a set
1729 of criteria, and we'll use that to judge projects and parks.

1730
1731 Mr. de Geus: One of the thoughts we had was, because the Council had a lot of
1732 questions, is to have actually an attachment that was specific to their questions that then
1733 refers back to areas in the report that gives the answer. If it's not in the report, then it
1734 provides it in that attachment. That's what we're currently working on.

1735
1736 Chair Reckdahl: That would be useful for them.

1737
1738 Mr. de Geus: That's what they want to see specifically (crosstalk).

1739
1740 Chair Reckdahl: They can go back and look and see questions.

1741
1742 Mr. de Geus: I see my question; I see the answer. Good, thank you.

1743
1744 Commissioner Lauing: To two of your points, since we're on that page. The first one
1745 you said is something about the principles were fuzzy. They're so fuzzy that they're not
1746 even on the page. I was actually thinking that at the top of that page before criteria, that
1747 we should just go ahead and re-list the principles. I think you referenced them in the
1748 back. If they were in the document here, you'd have the principles and then you'd have
1749 the criteria. If you want to swap them, that's all right but that's not how we created them
1750 in advance. That's why we have them in that batting order. What I'm saying is I don't
1751 think it's redundant to list them here for clarity of how the ...

1752
1753 Mr. de Geus: Are you on the staff report?
1754

1755 Commissioner Lauing: I'm on the staff report, exactly, where you guys were talking
1756 about it. Where Keith said can you get the criteria in sooner. Just above that, you
1757 reference the principles, but you didn't list the principles. I just thought it'd be clearer for
1758 them to have on their mind. Here are the principles and then here are the criteria that
1759 dropped out of that. The last paragraph above that criteria section.
1760

1761 Chair Reckdahl: Any other questions? Stacey, did you have any? Do you guys want to
1762 walk through ...
1763

1764 Commissioner Lauing: I had one.
1765

1766 Chair Reckdahl: ... this handout?
1767

1768 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, that's the next topic.
1769

1770 Chair Reckdahl: I'm sorry. Ed.
1771

1772 Commissioner Lauing: I had one. I didn't quite understand the number two here under
1773 criteria evaluation. They will be evaluated by an evaluation panel. I didn't quite
1774 understand.
1775

1776 Peter Jensen: We haven't talked about that yet.
1777

1778 Mr. de Geus: That's the next topic that we're going to discuss here.
1779

1780 Commissioner Lauing: You're going to present that to them before it's discussed? Okay.
1781 That's fine.
1782

1783 Commissioner Knopper: I had a quick question. On page 15, what we learned, the
1784 second bullet point says fewer neighborhoods are within—this totally could be me,
1785 because I'm not a spatial person. Fewer neighborhoods are within a half mile service area
1786 of every essential activity. I understood the bullet point above it. Maybe I'm missing it.
1787 You're saying that most have within a quarter to a half mile distance to a park. The next
1788 bullet point is fewer. Are you just saying more people are a quarter mile closer and then,
1789 like, there's just a lesser amount that are a half mile? I wasn't sure. It just didn't seem
1790 clear to me.
1791

1792 Commissioner Crommie: I think it's talking about two separate things, each bullet point.
1793

1794 Commissioner Hetterly: I think the first one's about geography, what's the distance
1795 between your house and a park. The other is about what's the distance between your
1796 house and a park that has an essential activity. Essential activities, throw, kick a ball.

1797
1798 Mr. Jensen: Play, sit.

1799
1800 Commissioner Knopper: Okay.

1801
1802 Mr. de Geus: Enjoy the outdoors. We can look at that to see if that can be a little clearer.
1803 If it was confusing as you read it, it might be to others. We'll take a look at it.

1804
1805 Commissioner Knopper: Maybe not. Maybe it's just me, which is entirely possible. The
1806 other question I had very quickly is on page 11, what we learned. The Master Plan has
1807 the potential to help advance recommendations and policies (inaudible) existing adopted
1808 plans, blah, blah, blah, Our Palo Alto, the Public Arts Master Plan and Urban Forest
1809 Master Plan. I guess my question is do you want to clarify what Our Palo Alto 2030,
1810 like, should you like indent more or is it just fine to do like those big broad, like I don't
1811 know how far in the weeds ...

1812
1813 Mr. de Geus: This report is intended for the City Council (crosstalk) familiar with these
1814 plans.

1815
1816 Commissioner Knopper: I just wasn't sure how, like, if you needed to do an indentation,
1817 like, Our Palo Alto 2035 includes buh, buh, buh, Urban Forest Plan, like highlight. I
1818 wasn't sure. That's just sort of like a question. I'm trying to, like, sort of anticipate if
1819 somebody says what exactly is that comprised of. Thank you.

1820
1821 Mr. de Geus: Other questions or are you ready to ...

1822
1823 Commissioner Crommie: I just had one. Where's the demographic study cited in here? I
1824 couldn't find it.

1825
1826 Mr. de Geus: It is ...

1827
1828 Mr. Jensen: Page 12.

1829
1830 Mr. de Geus: Twelve is it?

1831
1832 Commissioner Knopper: That's what Keith was talking about, what we learned.

1833
1834 Mr. de Geus: We can certainly add more there.

1835

1836 Commissioner Crommie: I agree with that comment.
1837

1838 Vice Chair Markevitch: Are you done?
1839

1840 Commissioner Crommie: Yep.
1841

1842 Vice Chair Markevitch: The final report, is it going to be closer to the size of the binder
1843 or to this? If it's going to be closer to the size of the binder, then it might be good to tell
1844 Council that this is just a snapshot of what the staff and the Commission have been
1845 working, so they don't think this is all we've been doing. There's a lot of information
1846 within that draft report that we're pulling together.
1847

1848 Mr. de Geus: Hopefully this illustrates that, that it points to the depth of the work and
1849 scope. We've been working on the website as well to make that a little more readable and
1850 accessible to all of the background documents and surveys and so on. Shall we move on
1851 to the next—actually, Peter, did you want to share the thinking around the model that we
1852 handed out? I'm going to pull it up on the screen here. How about that?
1853

1854 Mr. Jensen: This is going to start creating a structure that we're going to understand how
1855 this process flows through. If you saw the original flow diagram of this ...
1856

1857 Mr. de Geus: Did they see it? I don't know if they ever saw that.
1858

1859 Mr. Jensen: It looks something like this.
1860

1861 Mr. de Geus: Did you see that last time?
1862

1863 Chair Reckdahl: No.
1864

1865 Mr. Jensen: It's a much more complex process, and it's not very easy to follow through.
1866 We've been working on and generating this. What this is now telling us is what the
1867 process will be for us starting basically now as we develop the principles and the criteria,
1868 and then how we get through to the actual final recommendations. You can see then
1869 what's happening is that the potential list of projects, program ideas is a list that comes to
1870 us from the consultant. They put this list together from all the analysis that they've done.
1871 How they do that is they use the community input that we have received. They review it
1872 through the principles, and then they also look at it through the data opportunities
1873 summary which is basically the matrix. Taking all those line items and looking at all that
1874 data that's there to generate that list. All right? This is the list then that they're producing
1875 right now. We hope to have some version of it in the next month to share, because it's
1876 really kind of where the rubber meets the road in all of this. We started to look at the
1877 spreadsheet that the consultant has put together and allows you to look at it in a

1878 geographic sense and the program and how the parks, trails, open space, recreation
1879 facilities, recreational programs, so you can cross-reference all this data and look at how
1880 the system is balancing out when we start to prioritize. The list now—I'm not quite sure
1881 how long it's going to be. We've discussed it's in the hundreds to look at. When that list
1882 is generated, basically the criteria then is kind of the meat of the process of evaluating
1883 and prioritizing. That's going to be based on a point system. We're going to talk about
1884 that point system, what that point system is. Each one of the criteria is going to have a
1885 number associated with it, either a 1-5 or—I don't know what that is yet. Every project
1886 that's on that list will be run through that criteria process and a number will be generated.
1887 That number will then allow us to rank all the projects. That's the first pass of the
1888 prioritization. The second pass is going and looking at this segment of the process where
1889 we have our finalized list, and then we start to look at what we're recommending is
1890 balanced, how cost is associated with what we're recommending. That screen is too
1891 small for me to see it on here.

1892
1893 Commissioner Hetterly: Geographic distribution.
1894

1895 Mr. Jensen: Geographic, if it's distributed throughout the City. All those things will then
1896 come into play in whittling down the list. That is composed of a panel which we don't
1897 know how that's formulated yet. We will have to talk about that as we go along with the
1898 process in the next couple of months. Once that list is finalized and becomes the final
1899 list, it is then vetted again through the Commission, the City Council and gets us down to
1900 our final prioritization. These are the processes of how we're going to be doing this.
1901 How this has changed from before is that, I think, the flow diagram made the principles a
1902 more major thing at the beginning that seemed to be eliminating a lot of stuff. Really that
1903 isn't the case. Each project is looked at in how many principles it is fulfilling. Really the
1904 criteria is the key where the evaluation and the weight is put onto the list itself. Where, I
1905 think, the principles are really powerful is at the actual end of the process, when you have
1906 your list and then you go and look at—these projects don't have some of these principles,
1907 so how can we incorporate those principles into the project to make the project better. I
1908 was listening to your conversation before when you were talking about the Baylands.
1909 When you talk about the Baylands and that project doesn't incorporate playful in it, does
1910 it have balance in it, so you can start to look at those things and start to incorporate those
1911 things into the scope of the project to make it a more full-breadth project having a larger
1912 impact. That's what the principles really are, powerful. This is a more simplified
1913 diagram. I think it's a lot cleaner and easier to understand. I think the process now is
1914 starting to be structured where it's defensible, actionable, getting us to a recommended
1915 list that we can have backup and verification of. I'll open it up to discussion and
1916 questions about that.

1917
1918 Chair Reckdahl: Deirdre.
1919

1920 Commissioner Crommie: Just on the last point that you made, that very end process. It
1921 sounds kind of cool to reincorporate principles back into a project, but it seems a little
1922 backwards if you've let something win a race and then at the end you decide it doesn't
1923 really have what we want. Did it beat out a competitor that had more of those things? It
1924 just seems like a backhanded way—why are things sifting out that don't already have—
1925 why are you getting to the end of the process where you have a lot of items that don't
1926 have those principles?

1927
1928 Mr. de Geus: They're at the beginning as well. I think that's key. Maybe that was
1929 missed a little bit.

1930
1931 Commissioner Crommie: No, no. You are looking at that at the beginning. I guess, at
1932 the end ...

1933
1934 Chair Reckdahl: You're scoring them with criteria. You're not scoring them with the
1935 principles.

1936
1937 Commissioner Crommie: You never score with the principles is what you're saying.
1938 They have to have those, but then you look at what falls out at the end.

1939
1940 Chair Reckdahl: I mean, they don't have to. If you had a really good project that only
1941 had half the principles, you still might go for it.

1942
1943 Commissioner Crommie: Yeah, I guess that makes sense.

1944
1945 Mr. Jensen: There may be a project that maybe only one principle applies to it that is a
1946 legitimate project to use. We don't want to use the principles as the means to eliminate
1947 the projects. We want to make sure that they're aligning with the principles and we want
1948 to then try to bring the principles in to make the project better.

1949
1950 Mr. de Geus: I would say as we sort of reflect on the Study Session we had with Council,
1951 I think we emphasized the principles far too much. They're important, but they're really
1952 high level and talk about the whole system. We really need to be thinking about the
1953 community input that we've received, which is a lot, and the summary matrix,
1954 opportunities matrix which is a great deal of data, plus the principles that generates this
1955 pretty significant list is what we (inaudible). The criteria really allows us to prioritize
1956 which one should be higher and lower and what timeframe should they be invested in. I
1957 actually really think that's—the way Peter shared this and we've talked about it internally
1958 is sort of reapply the principles toward the end to say how can the project be even better.
1959 Have another sort of test against is it as accessible as it should be, is it as inclusive as it
1960 should be, does it incorporate nature, did we really get that or could we do more.

1962 Commissioner Crommie: That's why I get suspicious. Nature's tacked on at the end, and
1963 it really isn't substantial. That can be very superficial, just to add in some like natural
1964 play area instead of ...

1965
1966 Mr. de Geus: Hopefully it's there already, and it's just ...

1967
1968 Commissioner Crommie: Just be careful when you're dealing with nature that way, I
1969 would say.

1970
1971 Chair Reckdahl: I like the principles at the end. I think that's good. I can see that. Like
1972 you were talking about CIPs, you have some projects you present (inaudible) which is
1973 reviewed and is there any way that we can improve it, add a little wrinkle here or there.
1974 It's still the same fundamental project, but you're just adding the wrinkles at the end to try
1975 and align it more with the principles. I think that's more defensible than using it at the
1976 front end. Using the front end—you do want to keep them in mind as you're going
1977 through that list. I think this is a more logical way. When the Council was kind of
1978 confused how we're using them, I think this is a good explanation. Pat.

1979
1980 Vice Chair Markevitch: These principles and this criteria are all going to be held up
1981 when we do CIPs for the parks. Is this standard also going to be applied to other CIPs
1982 within the City? If it isn't, are our allocation of funds for parks going to fall by the
1983 wayside because it's not as strong as the metrics for the other CIPs? Does that make
1984 sense?

1985
1986 Mr. Jensen: It does. From my experience of how the CIPs now are formulated, it's based
1987 on maintenance and keep-up or it's based on what the flavor of the month of the project is
1988 at that time or whose special project can go forward. Building a framework that gives us
1989 the guidelines that can give us better projects, more in-depth projects, is the better way to
1990 go than just what we need right now and planning that out for the future.

1991
1992 Mr. de Geus: I think it'll strengthen it a lot actually. As we go through the CIP process
1993 and all the departments have different needs, if we have a Master Plan that has a process
1994 for defining priorities and needs that is very community-based in terms of input, we'll
1995 have a much stronger case when we come to the table with all the different CIPs that
1996 people want to do. We have this document that supports what we're putting forward as
1997 here's why this is a priority.

1998
1999 Mr. Jensen: Right. I think that is definitely the key. When it comes down to sitting
2000 around the table and deciding what CIPs are going to be awarded, this is going to
2001 generate background information that we can give as why we want to do this. That will
2002 make it more powerful and, I think, will allow parks projects to gain more revenue in the
2003 future, because it does have definitely a backing, a clear guide of what we're trying to do.



2004
2005 Commissioner Knopper: I just wanted to say that a company having a mission statement
2006 where they have a set of core values that go back to and they evaluate is always helpful.
2007 It doesn't mean that every project—to your point, Peter—hits every key measure every
2008 single time. It keeps you mindful of what the overall goal is, what the overall strategic
2009 position is and what we're trying to do and what we're trying to achieve. I really like the
2010 idea of having this core set of principles to go back to and say, "It meets these three
2011 measures. I think that if we think about accessibility a little bit differently with this
2012 project, we can integrate it this way." Again, it's that overall umbrella of value
2013 statements that you can come back to. It reminds you of what you need to be thinking
2014 about on a consistent basis.

2015
2016 Chair Reckdahl: What is the schedule for going back to Council?
2017

2018 Mr. de Geus: We're looking for a date, so it's with the Clerk's Office right now. We very
2019 much would like to be back before Council before the end of the calendar year. There's a
2020 lot on the Council agenda as Council Member Filseth can attest to. It's a bit of jockeying
2021 to find an hour where we can present this to them. We don't want it to be too long,
2022 because we want to continue to work on the plan and make progress. We do feel like this
2023 check-in with Council is a very important next step that we really need to be doing now.
2024 Hopefully soon.
2025

2026 Chair Reckdahl: If you went to Council, will that change what you're doing? I guess
2027 they could give you different direction.
2028

2029 Mr. de Geus: They can always give us new direction.
2030

2031 Chair Reckdahl: You're not waiting on anything, you're still going full blast?
2032

2033 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, we're still moving ahead. I mean, the next big piece is the work of
2034 MIG to draft potential new project program ideas, which they're working on
2035 concurrently.
2036

2037 Chair Reckdahl: Do we have an update to the matrix? We had some updates, but then
2038 we never got the final.
2039

2040 Mr. Jensen: I do have a final now that I'll post and send out to the group.
2041

2042 Chair Reckdahl: We were converging, but I don't think we had converged yet.
2043 Commissioner Hetterly.
2044

2045 Commissioner Hetterly: On this new handout, I have some suggestions and some
2046 questions. I think one of the pieces that's missing is the site survey and analysis, which
2047 was a big chunk of MIG's work. I wonder if it doesn't make sense to put community
2048 input and the site survey and analysis at the top, because those are kind of the big inflows
2049 of information and those feed through the principles and the data and opportunities
2050 summary to get to the project ideas and programs. I would stick both of those up top
2051 rather than on a parallel line. I think we want community input as the most important
2052 thing on the flow chart. In terms of potential project and program ideas, I'm still not
2053 entirely clear what differentiates a project from a program idea. Bunching them together,
2054 that could include we should put a dog park at this place and this place and this place or it
2055 could be we need more dog parks. The former is a really useful recommendation. The
2056 latter not so much a useful recommendation.

2057
2058 Mr. Jensen: It'll be the former.

2059
2060 Mr. de Geus: It has to be. Otherwise, we can't apply the criteria. It has to be ...

2061
2062 Commissioner Hetterly: That was going to be my next question. I wasn't sure what
2063 program ideas meant.

2064
2065 Mr. Jensen: It'll be site specific for those that are physical elements in parks.

2066
2067 Commissioner Hetterly: That might be useful for Council to know as well, if they're
2068 wondering what these ideas are, how are we going to act on an idea. Maybe a little
2069 clarity around program ideas.

2070
2071 Mr. de Geus: I would just add that the program could relate to the recreation piece of it, a
2072 changing of a trail or a (inaudible). It's more of this type of activity for this age group.

2073
2074 Commissioner Hetterly: It would be more specific than expand services for seniors?

2075
2076 Mr. de Geus: Yes.

2077
2078 Commissioner Crommie: Can you call it programming rather than ideas?

2079
2080 Commissioner Hetterly: That's the level of specificity that I think is useful.

2081
2082 Vice Chair Markevitch: What was that?

2083
2084 Commissioner Crommie: I was just saying can you call it programming instead of
2085 program ideas. You're talking about programming. If you're talking about programming,
2086 it does imply a site. It's more concrete.

2087
2088 Chair Reckdahl: The distinction here is that project means some type of facility or park,
2089 something physical. Programming is like recreation programming.

2090
2091 Commissioner Crommie: I was just trying to get rid of the word "idea."
2092

2093 Commissioner Ashlund: Staffing as opposed to facility, right?
2094

2095 Mr. de Geus: Hmm?
2096

2097 Commissioner Ashlund: Staff-run activities as opposed to facility.
2098

2099 Mr. de Geus: Yeah.
2100

2101 Mr. Jensen: Feedback on the potential project and program ideas, we'd like to have that.
2102 We discussed this at length with staff a few times of what that should be, and it's changed
2103 just as we talked to the consultant a few times. If there's more ideas about how we should
2104 frame that, we started calling it draft recommendation list and then it developed into
2105 potential actions. There has been a process of ...
2106

2107 Mr. de Geus: It took us a long time to get to this.
2108

2109 Commissioner Hetterly: (crosstalk) be able to talk about it so that you can convey the
2110 level of specificity. My other comment was the scoring and the review panel are
2111 certainly the things I'm most interested in. I suspect they will also be the things Council's
2112 most interested in. I understand those are still being fleshed out. Is that right?
2113

2114 Mr. de Geus: They are. The current thinking is a panel of some type. We'll have to
2115 discuss how best to do that. My feeling is it's probably easier if staff takes a—we sort of
2116 present the process and get comfortable with it as staff and Commission. Then we take a
2117 shot at doing that and bring that to the full Commission for review to see if it makes sense
2118 as opposed to a couple of Commissioners. We still have to think about this and what
2119 involvement does the stakeholder group have in something like that. I think they could
2120 play a role here as well. We still have some thinking to do about how we do. If you have
2121 thoughts, ideas, that's going to be a topic (crosstalk).
2122

2123 Chair Reckdahl: The stakeholders, won't that be community input? Are you saying
2124 community input would be both top and in the iteration?
2125

2126 Mr. de Geus: We see community input going through the whole process really. How do
2127 you do that in a meaningful way? We have this stakeholder group that's very engaged, as
2128 you know, sort of 25 or 30 members. How do we effectively use them through this

2129 process? It seems to me they have some role to play below the line here, after we come
2130 up with the list of potential projects and ideas. How do we filter those through the
2131 criteria? It would be good to engage the stakeholder committee in that some way.
2132

2133 Chair Reckdahl: We do have outreach meetings to the community before we remodel
2134 parks. Even if we convince ourselves that we want to remodel Rinconada park, we go to
2135 the community and say this is what we're planning to do.
2136

2137 Mr. de Geus: Absolutely.
2138

2139 Commissioner Ashlund: There's sort of individual community responses from individual
2140 residents versus the stakeholder group is more representative. It's like the dog owners
2141 want more dog parks. The soccer clubs need more field space. That kind of thing. It's
2142 more collective feedback. Can I ask a quick question about the stakeholder list? When
2143 there was a discussion about getting rid of the Girl Scout house at the Rinconada Park,
2144 the Girl Scouts weighed in really, really heavily on that. I see Boy Scouts are on the list.
2145 In terms of gender equality, is there a reason that the Girls Scouts are not on the ... Palo
2146 Alto Unified is actually on there twice. If you ...
2147

2148 Mr. de Geus: I'll have to look at that.
2149

2150 Commissioner Ashlund: You might want to check Palo Alto ...
2151

2152 Mr. Jensen: Maybe the Unified was (crosstalk).
2153

2154 Commissioner Ashlund: Get them on there once and maybe add the Girl Scouts.
2155

2156 Mr. de Geus: Yeah. Maybe we'll have to add that. We're trying to create a model as
2157 well that helps us complete the Master Plan, of course, but then as a model we can use to
2158 evaluate future ideas and programs and projects consistent with how we came up with the
2159 Master Plan.
2160

2161 Commissioner Ashlund: The last question about the stakeholders. The very first
2162 stakeholder meeting that we attended, I know Olenka was there and spoke about Magical
2163 Bridge and accessibility. There's no organization like Abilities United mentioned, or
2164 Vista Center for the Blind and Visually Impaired. There's several organizations in Palo
2165 Alto, even Children's Health Council which is affiliated with Stanford but represents
2166 children with special needs, could be represented as well.
2167

2168 Mr. de Geus: Okay.
2169

2170 Chair Reckdahl: If you want to talk about how community input goes in, I think that's
2171 the last circle at the very bottom where we're applying principles. We really are applying
2172 principles and also community input. When we get a draft plan, we'll present that to the
2173 community and say, "What do you think about this?" Then we'll get their feedback.
2174 Sometimes we do tweak things. That would be one place if you were looking at places
2175 where community input would fit. Pat, anything else?

2176
2177 Vice Chair Markevitch: No.

2178
2179 Chair Reckdahl: Abbie?

2180
2181 Commissioner Knopper: I'm good. Thank you.

2182
2183 Chair Reckdahl: Deirdre?

2184
2185 Commissioner Crommie: I was just looking at the stakeholder list. Did we drop any
2186 people, other stakeholders or is this the same list that we've carried through?

2187
2188 Mr. de Geus: It should be the same list. If something's dropped off, it might be
2189 intentional.

2190
2191 Mr. Jensen: There are some individuals though that I did not name specifically that didn't
2192 really represent an organization.

2193
2194 Commissioner Crommie: That makes sense.

2195
2196 Mr. de Geus: The other thing, just to Council Member Filseth, we don't have to talk
2197 about it here, but I do want to get your feedback on this as well, particularly because
2198 you're the liaison to this Commission. As we go back to Council, having your support
2199 and have had a review of it would be helpful.

2200
2201 Council Member Filseth: I think it's all good stuff. I think as you said before in the
2202 previous meetings, it's pretty high level and process oriented and so forth. I think for the
2203 next one, the closer this group can get to sort of more concrete is—top priorities are this,
2204 this, this and this, and the next set are this, this and this, a list—the better. I think that's
2205 sort of what everybody's looking to see.

2206
2207 Mr. de Geus: I think (inaudible) good.

2208
2209 Mr. Jensen: We'll send the group the source index that we've made online. I might have
2210 sent it to the ad hoc committee. It's basically a PDF that's like the binder. It's just like the
2211 source index at the front. You can click on that specific section and it takes you to that

2212 data source. It's like having an electronic binder basically. I think it's a lot easier to look
2213 through that way than trying to flip the pages. I think that turned out really good. I'm
2214 hoping that the Council can use that if they have questions about it. We did clean up the
2215 web page quite a bit and made it more streamlined and easier to use. It's now arranged
2216 per the binder so we're all on the same page talking about the same sections and
2217 everything.

2218
2219 Chair Reckdahl: The prioritization exercise, when does that stop?
2220

2221 Mr. Jensen: We haven't set a date on that. It was going to stop when we had the
2222 community meeting that did that.
2223

2224 Mr. de Geus: How many people have responded to that? Do we know?
2225

2226 Mr. Jensen: The last time it was up over 300 people. That was a couple of weeks ago.
2227 I've sent out more emails about it. (crosstalk) should have a timeline or (crosstalk).
2228

2229 Chair Reckdahl: I think I saw more emails from the previous park survey. I'm not sure
2230 why I haven't seen that much traffic on the list that I'm on for this one. When the parks
2231 plan came out, that first survey, I was forwarded a lot of emails.
2232

2233 Commissioner Hetterly: I was glad to see it on Nextdoor this week. I think that'll get a
2234 lot more people. When is the meeting, the prioritization meeting? Is that scheduled yet?
2235

2236 Mr. de Geus: I don't think it's been set.
2237

2238 Mr. Jensen: No, we have not set that yet.
2239

2240 Mr. de Geus: We don't want to get too far ahead either. I really feel like we need to get
2241 back to the City Council before we get too far along in terms certainly prioritization.
2242 That's sort of the next critical part, get back in front of Council with a Study Session.
2243

2244 Chair Reckdahl: You want to do the Council before you do the meeting or do you want
2245 to do the ...
2246

2247 Mr. de Geus: We haven't decided.
2248

2249 Council Member Filseth: Let me ask this. What do you want from the Council at the
2250 next Study Session?
2251

2252 Mr. de Geus: It's really a check-in to be sure that the Council's comfortable with the path
2253 that we're on and the kind of community outreach that we've taken in and a green light to

2254 move on. Once we get into prioritization and start really defining, that really gets down
2255 to starting to build out the plan. If there is some red flags or something from the Council
2256 saying you're really missing a certain principle or other thing, then we need to know that
2257 now. Otherwise, we'll have to redo work. I think the first Study Session was helpful in
2258 that regard. We made a number of adjustments because of the feedback that we received
2259 in that first Study Session. I feel it's important to do another check-in before we get too
2260 far along.

2261
2262 Council Member Filseth: Obviously, you can't just do this, but everybody's eager to hear
2263 here's what we're going to do. I think that's sort of where we are.

2264
2265 Mr. de Geus: Right.

2266
2267 Female: We are too.

2268
2269 Mr. de Geus: Like last night with the Healthy Cities.

2270
2271 Council Member Filseth: The Healthy Cities thing is ...

2272
2273 Commissioner Knopper: You can pass an ordinance that they don't (crosstalk).

2274
2275 Council Member Filseth: That one's more aspirational. This one's got to be more
2276 prescriptive.

2277
2278 Mr. de Geus: This one will lead to the—right.

2279
2280 **5. Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates.**

2281
2282 Chair Reckdahl: Does anyone have ad hoc? We talked about maybe having website ad
2283 hoc. Are we doing that next month or is that—do we have anything to add?

2284
2285 Commissioner Ashlund: We haven't had time to meet.

2286
2287 Commissioner Hetterly: I am on that. We haven't had time to meet since last month's
2288 meeting. (crosstalk) next month (crosstalk) depend on whether we can get together. I
2289 don't know if (crosstalk) with us (crosstalk). We know it's on our to-do list.

2290
2291 Chair Reckdahl: You're the only two on the website right now?

2292
2293 Commissioner Ashlund: We were the two, yeah.

2294
2295 Commissioner Lauing: We need to crank up the CIP too.

2296
2297 Chair Reckdahl: Yes, that's a good point.
2298

2299 Rob de Geus: (inaudible) that meeting and it's on the (crosstalk). I'm going to talk to
2300 Daren.
2301

2302 Chair Reckdahl: It would be good to get that going. I think last year we were started by
2303 now.
2304

2305 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, we actually were, that's right. It hasn't started at the City yet. There
2306 hasn't been a kick-off meeting or anything from the Office of Management and Budget.
2307 It's right around the corner, so it's right now.
2308

2309 Chair Reckdahl: Do you have a wag on how much money?
2310

2311 Mr. de Geus: No, I don't.
2312

2313 Chair Reckdahl: We can still prioritize.
2314

2315 Mr. de Geus: We definitely should and probably not think too much about what money
2316 is available, rather what are the needs and trying to (inaudible).
2317

2318 Chair Reckdahl: Although when you have your matrix, and then you say, "How many
2319 can we do each year," you know you have less money and that column becomes more
2320 bare. If you have more money, you can populate that. We only have one Peter, so that ...
2321

2322 Mr. de Geus: That's right. I'll set that up.
2323

2324 **V. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**
2325

2326 Rob de Geus: I just had two that I wanted to share with you. We're working on an event
2327 here for Veterans Day. It's actually on the 9th, that week. It'll be here on the plaza. It's
2328 going to be a really nice event recognizing our service men and women. The Gunn High
2329 School band will be there. There'll be some food. We'll be doing some service projects
2330 for kids to make thank you cards and other things. There's a proclamation that the Mayor
2331 and Council will read that evening. It should be a nice day. It's on the 9th, 4:30 on the
2332 plaza, 4:30 to 6:00. Lots of activity. The other thing I wanted to mention was Cubberley
2333 Community Center. Discussions with the School District have begun about the master
2334 planning of the campus. Maybe you've seen some articles in the paper about that. Just
2335 starting out, but some exciting developments, I think, starting to emerge particularly out
2336 of the School District. They seem much more engaged than I've ever seen before. I'm
2337 much more hopeful about possibilities at Cubberley and what could happen there about

2338 experimenting in some ways with education and modern education and choice type of
2339 school. It might be really something innovative that Dr. Max McGee, the new
2340 superintendent, is spearheading with the community. When we met with him, he was
2341 interested in what the community wants and what the community might want to build on
2342 our 8 acres and how that might support and complement what a new school might look
2343 like. That's just starting out; we'll have more to follow-up on that. As you recall, we
2344 have a five-year lease agreement with the School District. Part of that lease agreement
2345 includes a master plan for the Cubberley campus. We want to get started on that.

2346
2347 Chair Reckdahl: When we say master plan, this means if they put a school there, what
2348 they would want the campus to look like?

2349
2350 Mr. de Geus: Right. It's a 35-acre site. The buildings are very old. Most of them are
2351 very old and really are not worthy of repairing or spending a lot of money on them. What
2352 might we do there that would meet the future needs of the School District and the future
2353 needs of the community.

2354
2355 Chair Reckdahl: Do we have a soonest construction date? We're talking ...

2356
2357 Mr. de Geus: Oh, wow, I don't know about construction.

2358
2359 Chair Reckdahl: The reason I ask is that we have a lot of stuff in Cubberley that really
2360 needs updating and how much do you throw into Cubberley.

2361
2362 Mr. de Geus: This is a great question. The new lease agreement with Cubberley does set
2363 aside about \$1.8 million that used to go to the School District, now sets it aside for
2364 investment in Cubberley and the buildings there, but more importantly probably what the
2365 future of Cubberley might be and investing in its future as opposed to repairing very old
2366 buildings. You're right, there are some things that we have to do there, roofing and other
2367 things. There's some parking issues that we are investing in. I think the focus is let's see
2368 what we can do in terms of a master plan and a long-range plan for what we do on the
2369 campus, so we're not spending money on things that are not going to be there long term.

2370
2371 Chair Reckdahl: What's the status of the old library that was going to be remodeled?

2372
2373 Mr. de Geus: The auditorium at Cubberley was a temporary library. Now they've moved
2374 out, of course; they're back at Mitchell. Renovating the auditorium back so that it can be
2375 a rentable space is one of the higher priorities. It's a big space. People really enjoyed
2376 using it. It generated about \$80,000 in revenues every year, just from rental revenues.

2377
2378 Commissioner Crommie: It has that kitchen, right? That little kitchen, does it still have
2379 that?

2380
2381 Mr. de Geus: It doesn't have the kitchen anymore, because that was renovated to be
2382 office space for the technical staff of the library. Putting back a catering kitchen of some
2383 type so that it could be used for a rental space.
2384

2385 Chair Reckdahl: It's just sitting empty right now? It's not being remodeled?
2386

2387 Mr. de Geus: The plans are underway to remodel it. It's mostly empty. It's used for
2388 some small programs, but not as much as it could be.
2389

2390 Chair Reckdahl: Do we have an estimate of when they would start remodeling that or is
2391 that a CIP that has to get funded?
2392

2393 Mr. de Geus: It's a CIP; it's with Public Works. It's on there, but it's soon. I think it's
2394 within the next year they're going to get started on that.
2395

2396 Commissioner Crommie: Can you just mention how that plan impacts the fields that are
2397 there now? Do you want to bring that as an agenda item to the Commission?
2398

2399 Mr. de Geus: You recall the Cubberley Community Advisory Committee spent a year—
2400 Commissioner Hetterly was chair of the one of the four committees. Which one was
2401 that?
2402

2403 Commissioner Hetterly: Facilities.
2404

2405 Mr. de Geus: Facilities, right. It was a big report that came from that. One of the key—I
2406 thought it was like 14 recommendations, one of which was to retain those athletic fields
2407 for community use as much as possible as long as possible.
2408

2409 Commissioner Crommie: Are those on the school property? As I recall, that was a
2410 problem with them.
2411

2412 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, that's right.
2413

2414 Commissioner Crommie: Just as you said, there's a master plan process. It's probably
2415 impacting those fields.
2416

2417 Mr. de Geus: Yeah. I think there's interest from both the School District and the City
2418 that we retain those athletic fields. Any questions on Cubberley? A lot happening there.
2419 Are you going to ask about the golf course? I just bring it up with the announcements.
2420 There isn't a lot of news on the golf course. We did make a decision. We met with our
2421 City Manager, yesterday actually it was, and the Public Works staff got an update on the

2422 permitting process, which was new to me as well. The earliest time we could get the
2423 permit and actually be able to go out to bid and start construction is summer of next year,
2424 2016. That's the very earliest that we could begin. We're going back to the City Council
2425 to give them a report on that update. We have funding in the budget to keep operating
2426 the golf course until the end of the calendar year.
2427

2428 Chair Reckdahl: This calendar year?
2429

2430 Mr. de Geus: This calendar year. We thought we'd be under construction after that.
2431 That's not going to happen. We've done some analysis on the cost benefit of closing
2432 versus staying open, and it does pencil out that it's better to be open, even though we
2433 don't fully recover. Annually, it's better to stay open and generate some revenue. We're
2434 recommending that to Council, that we increase revenues by some \$600,000. That's
2435 approximately what we would make in revenues to keep it open. An approximate similar
2436 cost to keep operating. It's sort of net neutral. That's the status.
2437

2438 Chair Reckdahl: I don't understand how this can drag on.
2439

2440 Mr. de Geus: Neither do I.
2441

2442 Chair Reckdahl: It just seems dysfunctional.
2443

2444 Mr. de Geus: It is dysfunctional.
2445

2446 Chair Reckdahl: Do they have a specific rationale or are they just twiddling their thumbs
2447 and saying, "We're thinking about it"?
2448

2449 Mr. de Geus: I think opinions vary about the motivation, why things are taking longer. It
2450 is very frustrating for our side, the Community Services side. We're sort of not even at
2451 the table really. It's really about the creek and the flood control project and the necessity
2452 to get those permits in place and have all of the regulatory agencies be comfortable with
2453 that project before they will permit our project. Our project, every indication is that
2454 they're quite satisfied with that, but they're holding off on the permitting because they
2455 want to be sure that the flood control project is in its final state in terms of where the
2456 levees are actually going to be placed and so on. You've heard that story a few times.
2457

2458 Commissioner Lauing: Move the dirt and open the other holes again.
2459

2460 Mr. de Geus: You've got 300,000 cubic yards of dirt out there and a possible El Nino
2461 winter.
2462

2463 Peter Jensen: We could move the dirt into a perfect dike.

2464
2465 Mr. de Geus: It looks like a new levee out there.

2466
2467 Commissioner Knopper: You could make money. You know the motocross, the guys
2468 that go vroom, fly.

2469
2470 Vice Chair Markevitch: (crosstalk) they actually open up the creek under 101 before the
2471 rain really starts. Every time I drive by there, it's just blocked on the east side. I think
2472 they're going to forget to do that, and it's just going to be a huge problem.

2473
2474 Commissioner Hetterly: I think they're clearing it out now.

2475
2476 Mr. de Geus: They are. They're doing a lot of work in the creek in preparation for
2477 potential storms and a lot of rain in January-March timeframe.

2478
2479 Commissioner Hetterly: I think the project shuts down for the winter, so I think they're
2480 moving all their stuff out of there.

2481
2482 Commissioner Lauing: I have other questions for Rob. Can I go ahead?

2483
2484 Chair Reckdahl: Ed, go for it.

2485
2486 Commissioner Lauing: Give us an update on your staffing.

2487
2488 Mr. de Geus: Right. We've got a lot of vacancies right now that we're working through
2489 recruitment. The key one right now is the Assistant Director position that I vacated.
2490 We're down to one candidate and doing reference checks and background checks.
2491 Hopefully we'll have an offer out by the end of the week. We have a Superintendent of
2492 Parks that we've been recruiting for for quite some time now, and still don't have a really
2493 great pool of candidates unfortunately. That's Joe Vallaire's old position. You may
2494 remember he retired. We have to decide whether we need to reopen that. The other
2495 position is the Superintendent of Recreation Services. We've got a lot of great candidates
2496 we're interviewing this Friday, eight very qualified candidates. We'll make a decision
2497 there quickly. Senior Ranger Lester Hedrie, remember he's retired; he's moved up to
2498 Oregon, very happy up there. We've got a couple of good candidates. One internal
2499 candidate I think might be a really good fit. That's keeping us busy.

2500
2501 Commissioner Lauing: El Camino Park looks like it's ready to go. Do you have an open
2502 date for that?

2503
2504 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, it's November—do we have a date?
2505

2506 Peter Jensen: I have not heard the date yet.

2507
2508 Mr. de Geus: I think there's a date out there, isn't there?

2509
2510 Commissioner Lauing: I thought the run in the outfield grass was just beautiful.

2511
2512 Mr. de Geus: I'll have to send you some pictures. We did a little fun thing. We're trying
2513 to do some things to get the staff together to do things together; it's good for the team.
2514 There's 80 full-time staff within the department, and we're all over the town in different
2515 buildings. We had a workday at El Camino Park just to help Daren and the crew do the
2516 final sort of cleanup and cutting back of the brush.

2517
2518 Commissioner Hetterly: I got some oak (crosstalk).

2519
2520 Mr. de Geus: Catherine was out there really working hard. It was a great morning that
2521 we spent together and then had lunch. The park is just fantastic; it's beautiful. If you
2522 want to go and have a little tour or something we can coordinate with you.

2523
2524 Commissioner Lauing: Yeah, that'd be great.

2525
2526 Vice Chair Markevitch: I have a question about it. In the outfield of the baseball field,
2527 when you're driving past El Camino, it looks like there's this landscaped part that kind of
2528 juts out into right field. Now, is that just an anomaly?

2529
2530 Mr. de Geus: That's the redwood (inaudible).

2531
2532 Mr. Jensen: No, that's there to buffer and protect the bike path. It's further out in the
2533 outfield than it was before. It's pretty deep. You'd have to hit it a long way to get out to
2534 that landscaped area. Yes, every once in a while a ball's going to roll into that space, and
2535 it's going to be like Wrigley Field when it goes into the ivy, ground rule double. It is put
2536 there to buffer the pathway that's there. It's stopping balls from hitting the bikers as they
2537 drive past out there.

2538
2539 Vice Chair Markevitch: That's just another hit.

2540
2541 Chair Reckdahl: One of the news stations did a series about rubber crumb tires in turf. I
2542 have three questions people ask me about the new park, whether it has rubber crumb.

2543
2544 Mr. de Geus: No.

2545
2546 Chair Reckdahl: I said no.

2547

2548 Mr. Jensen: It's got a material called TPE.
2549

2550 Mr. de Geus: We'll set up a time. I'm sure you can't all be able to make it, but just to get
2551 a little tour, to walk around. You spent a lot of time on the design of that park, many
2552 meetings. I think you counted up ...
2553

2554 Vice Chair Markevitch: Eighteen now.
2555

2556 Mr. de Geus: It was something like that. Because of all the Julia Morgan building,
2557 remember all that?
2558

2559 Commissioner Lauing: Oh, yeah.
2560

2561 Mr. de Geus: It's something to be on that park and see how it's come together. You want
2562 to take a good look at it before it opens. We'll set that up.
2563

2564 Mr. Jensen: This past weekend we had a good tree planting event at Bol Park. That was
2565 brought about by the Barron Park Homeowners Association in response to the tree
2566 removal that occurred from the Veterans Hospital project. We planted 105 native plants,
2567 55 oak trees of three different varieties. It was a pretty good turnout; I would say
2568 between 50 to 70 people were there, all different ages. Keith came and helped and
2569 worked hard.
2570

2571 Chair Reckdahl: I was sore the next day. Boy, I was sore. It was a lot of fun. I was
2572 really glad.
2573

2574 Mr. de Geus: (inaudible)
2575

2576 Mr. Jensen: Definitely. It was a great event. Like I said, we planted a lot of plants out
2577 there. It should help rejuvenate that native corridor that's there. It was a great day. It
2578 was funny. I was tired; it was a long day. It's about a half mile, the little walk there.
2579 Your iPhone now tracks you if you don't know this, your steps. I woke up and went there
2580 and worked there until about 2:00 in the afternoon. I went home and just fell asleep the
2581 rest of the day, so I didn't walk at all. I looked the next day and in that whatever, 4 1/2
2582 hours, I walked 7.2 miles. I walked up and down that thing constantly talking to people
2583 the whole time. It was a good event. Yeah, it was fun.
2584

2585 Chair Reckdahl: Peter was the ringleader, so everyone was say, "Ask Peter about that.
2586 Ask Peter about that." There was a queue of people needing Peter's help. It was a good
2587 turnout. We had people from—there was a few Gunn students, but we had Canopy and
2588 Acterra there. We had some CCC volunteers or workers. There was some good kids
2589 there; they were working hard. They weren't sloughing off.

2590
2591 Mr. de Geus: Good. Last little announcement is just because I'm involved in some other
2592 things now that we're doing in the department. Public Art is a new area which is really
2593 fascinating, interesting to work with Elise DeMarzo. We have a new piece out here on
2594 the plaza called *Rondo I*, a Bruce Beasley piece, big rings. *Aurora* the tree is gone, so I'm
2595 sad about that. Some are happy to see it gone. That's the thing about public art, a lot of
2596 opinions. Thursday there's a little get-together at 5:30. The artist will be here, and the
2597 Mayor will say a few words. I think it looks really, really cool. If you're around, come
2598 on by.

2599
2600 Commissioner Crommie: I wanted to mention an announcement too.

2601
2602 Chair Reckdahl: Go ahead.

2603
2604 Commissioner Crommie: They've finally started work at Monroe Park. They put some
2605 fencing up last week.

2606
2607 Chair Reckdahl: I peeked over the fence, and they had already dug up all the old asphalt.

2608
2609 Commissioner Crommie: Yeah, I could hear them digging. I didn't look. We had some
2610 traffic problems, so they had to take some of the fencing away because of visibility at the
2611 intersection. They just had to take down some of the green covering on the fence.

2612
2613 Mr. Jensen: It did have green covering?

2614
2615 Commissioner Crommie: Yeah, they put green covering all the way around, and then
2616 people couldn't see getting through the intersection.

2617
2618 Mr. Jensen: They shouldn't have put that green covering up.

2619
2620 Chair Reckdahl: Do you have something?

2621
2622 Commissioner Hetterly: Yeah. I just wanted to say I'm on the Comprehensive Plan
2623 Advisory Committee. I just wanted to let you all know where we are. Before I joined,
2624 they did a first run through of the Community Services Element. That'll probably be
2625 coming back to the full committee for action before the end of the year. I'll let you all
2626 know when that's going to be on the agenda. We're through our initial discussions of the
2627 Transportation Element. Starting next month, we're going to be looking at Land Use.
2628 Land Use is another one that I think the Commission might have a lot of interest in. You
2629 might want to plug into the process, come speak or listen or send your comments in on—
2630 what's it called? It's not Open City Hall. I will send an email out with the link to
2631 (crosstalk) public commenter.

2632 Commissioner Lauing: Open what?

2633
2634 Council Member Filseth: I think it's Open Gov.

2635
2636 Commissioner Lauing: Open Gov.

2637
2638 Council Member Filseth: It's Open Gov.

2639
2640 Commissioner Hetterly: No, it's not Open Gov. It's specific to the Comp Plan process,
2641 and it's like open community. I'll send it around. It's an opportunity for you to comment
2642 on any program or policy or a general vision for any elements in the plan.
2643
2644

2645 Chair Reckdahl: One other thing is the City Council will be interviewing candidates on
2646 Monday, this coming Monday.
2647

2648 Mr. de Geus: Are they interviewing or they're selecting?
2649

2650 Chair Reckdahl: They're interviewing five candidates for Parks and Rec on Monday.
2651

2652 Mr. de Geus: I think they're selecting—selection of applicants to interview for the Parks
2653 and Rec Commission, I think is what they're going to do.
2654

2655 Chair Reckdahl: Is that what it said?
2656

2657 Mr. de Geus: Yeah.
2658

2659 Chair Reckdahl: It's not actually to interview them.
2660

2661 Mr. de Geus: Right. That's how it reads on the agenda.
2662

2663 Female: They usually do a special meeting for the interviews (crosstalk).
2664

2665 Mr. de Geus: It's (crosstalk) will interview all of them, to see what they're saying.
2666

2667 Council Member Filseth: That'd be my guess.
2668

2669 Commissioner Crommie: How many are there now?
2670

2671 Mr. de Geus: I haven't heard.
2672

2673 Chair Reckdahl: In the online agenda, there's five of them. There's five candidates.

2674
2675 Mr. de Geus: There must be another date selected already. (inaudible)

2676
2677 Chair Reckdahl: They do a selection and then they do the interview and then they do the
2678 voting.

2679
2680 Mr. de Geus: They take a motion, say who should we interview. That's a specific item
2681 on the agenda. Then usually it's a separate meeting they come in for to do the interviews.
2682 I did bump into Anne Cribbs; I know that she's in there. Staff (crosstalk).

2683
2684 Chair Reckdahl: I (crosstalk) names; I didn't know any of the people.

2685
2686 Vice Chair Markevitch: She was on the Commission when I started.

2687
2688 Mr. de Geus: She's a longtime Palo Altan. She's an Olympian too.

2689
2690 Commissioner Crommie: That's how I know her name. She is very active in the senior
2691 games.

2692
2693 **VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR DECEMBER 8, 2015 MEETING**

2694
2695 Catherine Bourquin: The meeting is October 8th. I mean December 8th. Excuse me,
2696 December 8th.

2697
2698 Commissioner Crommie: Our next meeting?

2699
2700 Ms. Bourquin: Yeah.

2701
2702 Rob de Geus: We have the Master Plan, obviously, coming back. There should be a lot
2703 to share there. I heard the dog park item might come back, at least there was interest in
2704 making a decision to try. I have to get with Daren and maybe the ad hoc committee to
2705 see what we'll recommend there. It sounded like there was some interest in getting a pilot
2706 started.

2707
2708 Ms. Bourquin: The Boardwalk. (crosstalk)

2709
2710 Mr. de Geus: Boardwalk comes back.

2711
2712 Chair Reckdahl: The Boardwalk is coming back in December?

2713
2714 Ms. Bourquin: Yeah.
2715

2716 Mr. de Geus: That's all I have for now.
2717

2718 Chair Reckdahl: Is that an action item?
2719

2720 Ms. Bourquin: Isn't that what he said on this, on the schedule? They asked to be on it.
2721 It's probably going to be an ordinance.
2722

2723 Chair Reckdahl: I thought the PIO was in January.
2724

2725 Ms. Bourquin: No, the other one.
2726

2727 Mr. de Geus: What other one?
2728

2729 Commissioner Hetterly: The draft feasibility study was to be done in the fall/winter.
2730

2731 Ms. Bourquin: Yeah. The PRC recommendation for adoption, that's what's coming to
2732 you.
2733

2734 Mr. de Geus: That could be January.
2735

2736 Commissioner Hetterly: Winter of 2015, we don't know what month that's going to be.
2737

2738 Mr. de Geus: We'll see if it's ready. I thought it might be nice to acknowledge the
2739 Commissioners that are leaving the Commission. In their honor, we have some orchids
2740 here for their service, and a card for the three Commissioners. Just a thank you for all the
2741 time and the passion and commitment you all bring to this work. It's much appreciated,
2742 and it helps us do our work in all sorts of ways. Thank you from all the staff.
2743

2744 Commissioner Crommie: Is this our last meeting then?
2745

2746 Mr. de Geus: We don't know. We'll have to see in December.
2747

2748 Commissioner Crommie: Maybe not if they get ...
2749

2750 Mr. de Geus: I expect you'll be back, frankly, because of the way Council's got so many
2751 things going on. The new Commissioners will probably be seated in January, if I had to
2752 guess.
2753

2754 Chair Reckdahl: These will be big shoes to fill. They've a lot of experience on this
2755 (inaudible).
2756

2757 Commissioner Ashlund: Deirdre's seven. How many, Pat?

2758 Vice Chair Markevitch: It's either ten or eleven.

2759
2760 Commissioner Lauing: That's at least 19 to 20 years amongst the three of you.

2761
2762 Chair Reckdahl: You guys will have so much time on your hands; you won't know what
2763 to do with it. They'll be doing public comments, saying what they really think.

2764
2765 Vice Chair Markevitch: I'd like to give a shout out to Herb Borock.

2766
2767 Commissioner Lauing: Is he still here?

2768
2769 Vice Chair Markevitch: He's long gone. He kept us in line for so many different aspects.
2770 I really appreciated his insight on (crosstalk).

2771
2772 **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

2773
2774 Meeting adjourned on motion by Vice Chair Markevitch and second by Commissioner
2775 Ashlund at 10:00p.m. Passed 7-0
2776