



DRAFT

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

**MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
January 26, 2016
CITY HALL
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California**

13 **Commissioners Present:** Jim Cowie, Anne Cribbs, Jennifer Hetterly, Abbie Knopper, Ed
14 Lauing, David Moss, Keith Reckdahl

15 **Commissioners Absent:**

16 **Others Present:** Eric Filseth

17 **Staff Present:** Daren Anderson, Catherine Bourquin, Rob de Geus, Peter Jensen, Kristen
18 O'Kane

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

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

22
23 Chair Reckdahl: Next we have agenda changes. Does anyone have any changes or
24 deletions? Rob.

25
26 Rob de Geus: It's not really agenda changes, but I do have a couple of introductions to
27 make

28
29 Chair Reckdahl: Yes.

30
31 Mr. de Geus. If I could do that rather than at the end. The first is Kristen O'Kane. The
32 person sitting next to me is the new assistant director of Community Services. Thrilled
33 that she's on board. How many of you have met Kristen already? Most of you already,
34 all of you.

35
36 Chair Reckdahl: All.
37



1 Mr. de Geus: Kristen has been a Parks and Rec Commissioner in San Jose actually and
2 has been a ranger in her background and has a background in environmentalism and
3 stewardship. She comes to us from the Santa Clara Valley Water District where she was
4 a senior manager there. We're thrilled to have her on board. She's going to be the CSD
5 liaison to this Commission. She'll take over starting today actually.

6
7 Chair Reckdahl: Really?

8
9 Mr. de Geus; Yeah.

10
11 Chair Reckdahl: She'll be the new Rob.

12
13 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, she's the new Rob. I have another introduction. The individual
14 sitting out there in the audience, that's Stephanie Douglas. She's our new recreation
15 superintendent. This is the position that we got put back in the budget this last cycle. We
16 went through quite a process for recruiting. We're thrilled to have such an outstanding
17 individual rise to the top and be selected. She comes to us from Milpitas, and she's been
18 a supervisor in the parks and recreation field in a number of different cities and brings a
19 lot of skills and expertise and is going to strengthen the team significantly. She wanted to
20 come and just say hello. She's going to sit and listen. That's her. She said that was her
21 Miss America wave.

22
23 Chair Reckdahl: Welcome. It's good to have you. Any other changes? Then we'll move
24 on.

25
26 **III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

27
28 Chair Reckdahl: This is for the general public. If you want to talk about something that's
29 not on the agenda, now's the time to get your speaker card in.

30
31 **IV. BUSINESS:**

32
33 **1. Approval of Draft Minutes from the Meeting of December 8, 2015.**

34
35 Approval of the draft December 8, 2015 Minutes was moved by Commissioner Hetterly
36 and seconded by Commissioner Knopper. Passed 7-0

37
38 **2. Election of Chair and Vice Chair.**

39
40 Chair Reckdahl: I'll start off. I was elected Chair last year and found it quite enjoyable.
41 I would prefer not to do it again next year, just to spread the wealth around. I would be
42 open to Vice Chair to provide continuity if that's desirable. I would like to nominate Ed

1 Lauing. Ed has been on the Commission for many years now. I think his experience
2 would be very good, very useful for getting the Master Plan done. Ed, are you interested
3 in being Chair?
4

5 Commissioner Lauing: Yes, I would be.
6

7 Chair Reckdahl: Do we need a second? No second. Any other nominations? Then we
8 will vote. Take one of the ballots here. I should note for the newbies especially, but for
9 anyone, I nominated Ed, but anyone can nominate themselves. You don't need someone
10 else to nominate you. If you're interested, speak up and say you want to do it. If you
11 have questions about what the Chair and Vice Chair do, let us know. We'll wait for
12 Catherine to pass.
13

14 Catherine Bourquin: Seven for Lauing.
15

16 Chair Reckdahl: Ed Lauing is now the Chair. Do you want to just move the gavel or do
17 you want to move chairs?
18

19 Chair Lauing: I don't care.
20

21 Commissioner Hetterly: Move chairs.
22

23 Commissioner Reckdahl: Move chairs.
24

25 Chair Lauing: No write-ins at all in that vote. Thank you. We do have a lot of work to
26 do this year. Thanks to Keith for rising to the challenge when he was sort of forcefully
27 nominated last year.
28

29 Commissioner Reckdahl: A little arm-twisting last year.
30

31 Chair Lauing: Stepped right up and did the work. Capable hands and still standing by
32 ready to help at any moment. Which is the next item of business. We need to elect a
33 Vice Chair. The Vice Chair obviously assists the Chair in any absences, but also at the
34 direction of the Chair participates in a lot of the meetings which could be meeting with
35 City staff, the Mayor on occasion, occasionally individually with a City Council Member.
36 That's the overall job description. Again, I agree if any of the new folks have any other
37 questions about that, I'd be happy to field them. Seeing none, then we would look for
38 nominations for Vice Chair.
39

40 Commissioner Hetterly: I'll nominate Keith to continue, since he expressed an interest in
41 that.
42

1 Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm willing to do it, but if other people have interest, I don't
2 want to cut in front. I am willing.

3
4 Commissioner Knopper: I'll do it. I'm happy to be the Vice Chair and work with Ed this
5 year.

6
7 Chair Lauing: Any others? Would either of you like to comment any more extensively?
8 On your own interests or whatever.

9
10 Commissioner Knopper: I feel like Keith did a fantastic job this year and certainly would
11 be very capable of working with you, Ed. I also know that kind of, as Keith said,
12 spreading the wealth with regard to workload, etc., I've been on the Commission for two
13 years, just starting my third year and certainly would be willing to step up and get my
14 hands in more pots, so to speak, besides the ad hocs that I've been working on. If you're
15 interested in letting me participate in that, I would be interested in taking on that position.

16
17 Commissioner Reckdahl: I don't have anything to add. Like I said, I'm happy to do it,
18 but if other people are interested, then I'm happy to let them do it too.

19
20 Chair Lauing: Good. Let's mark our ballots.

21
22 Ms. Bourquin: We have seven for Knopper.

23
24 Chair Lauing: We know who's going to do all the work this year. Congrats. I have three
25 speaker cards. Are there any other speakers cards? If so, please give them to Catherine,
26 and she can submit them here.

27
28 **3. Discussion and Feedback on Off Leash Dog Parks in Palo Alto.**

29
30 Chair Lauing: The ad hoc committee and staff, Daren Anderson, if you can make a
31 presentation on that.

32
33 Daren Anderson: Good evening. Daren Anderson with Open Space, Parks and Golf. I'm
34 here tonight to give you that ad hoc update on dog parks and to collect your feedback on
35 how best to proceed. As you know, the ad hoc committee's been working on dog parks
36 and investigating dog off-leash opportunities for some time, especially ones that could be
37 provided in advance of completion of the Parks Master Plan. This would help us serve
38 interim needs, hopefully test usage and behavior and evaluate impacts on neighbors and
39 park users. We started looking at a six-month shared-use pilot that would utilize large,
40 mostly fenced athletic fields during weekday mornings. We had looked at Baylands,
41 Greer and Hoover as options. We learned from our outreach that there were a number of
42 challenges with this, ranging from the hours being too limited to meet the dog users'

1 needs or the need to hire a contractor to enforce rules and pick up dog waste and other
2 impacts to field users. Because of these challenges with this shared-use concept, the ad
3 hoc committee decided to explore opportunities to find new or expanded dog parks that
4 could be implemented quickly, simply and with existing funds while waiting for the
5 Parks Master Plan to be completed. This was discussed at our October 2015 Commission
6 meeting. The three areas we had looked at sites—this wasn't an exhaustive search. It
7 was ones that were readily apparent, that could fit this model that I just described, simple,
8 existing funds and implemented quickly. We picked out three. The first was expanding
9 Mitchell Park. This is our largest existing dog park of our three. It's .56 acres right now.
10 The red outline delineates the existing; the green shaded area is the expanded portion.
11 That would take us from that .56 to 1.21 acres if we were to expand it. It would cost
12 about \$10,000. As far as what it would displace or what it would utilize, it's largely
13 passive turf. There's a small seating area—sorry, this cursor won't be overly visible. Up
14 in here there's a few benches and a small pathway. Nearest to it, there's a picnic area over
15 here that would not be part of the fenced off area. The other areas we looked at for this
16 near-term dedicated site was El Camino Park. This is the north field with synthetic turf
17 up here, our south field with natural grass. Just outside the park is this undedicated parcel
18 here. It's very difficult to utilize because it's got an enormous number of utilities
19 underneath it. You can't build on top of it and all sorts of infrastructure challenges with
20 that area. It seemed to lend itself very well, being that half of it is already fenced, it's
21 already got mulch and there's no use at all on it right now. Could we fence that off and
22 use it as a dog park? It made sense to the ad hoc and to Staff, but as we investigated a
23 little further, there are tentative plans that there could be this transit hub expansion.
24 Perhaps one part of that is there could be either a road or a tunnel that goes right through
25 this area, that would make it not viable for a dog park. Staff's still looking in to that one.
26 We have a little more research to do. I hope to bring that back as a viable option but
27 more to come. There was a third site, a utilities site on Colorado Ave. After further
28 investigation and meeting with Utilities staff, there are some serious safety concerns and
29 safety laws that prohibit us from using that as a dog run as we'd hoped. This is not to say
30 that this is an exhaustive search. As I mentioned, these were the ones that jumped out at
31 staff and the ad hoc right away. I'm certain we could find more, but that's really under
32 the purview of the Parks Master Plan which is coming and will have hopefully a wealth
33 of different opportunities to meet our dog park needs. The ad hoc committee is
34 recommending that we pursue expanding this Mitchell Park dog run and continue
35 investigating the possibility of using El Camino as a dog run. There is another model that
36 we learned about during our outreach. This is the unfenced, shared-use model that
37 Mountain View is using. The City of Mountain View has eight sites now dedicated, as
38 you read in the staff report. Only one of the eight, I believe, is part of an athletic field.
39 The rest are kind of passive turf areas within their park system and again unfenced. This
40 is a model that MIG has proposed as a possible consideration in the Parks Master Plan for
41 Palo Alto to implement. This was outside the scope of what the ad hoc committee had
42 originally formed to look at. However, the ad hoc has a recommendation that the



1 Commission further investigate and discuss the policy around this option. We also
2 thought the February Commission meeting might be an opportunity for the Commission
3 to figure out what the appropriate process would be for looking at this particular option
4 and whether the ad hoc should have a role, if any, in that discussion. With that, that
5 concludes my presentation. I'll defer to my other ad hoc Commissioners if they'd like to
6 comment and share additional things I missed.

7
8 Commissioner Hetterly: I think that pretty well covers it. I think another issue that the
9 ad hoc was a little concerned about was as we looked at the project and programs list and
10 the draft list in the Master Plan, it didn't seem quite connected with what we thought we
11 were hearing about dogs. We wonder if it doesn't make sense for the Commission to give
12 a little more consideration not only about whether doing off-leash in unfenced areas
13 would be a pretty radical proposal for Palo Alto. It seems like we ought to weigh in, in
14 some way, on that question, but also to get some feedback from Commissioners about
15 other recommendations that were on the list or particular locations just to kind of touch
16 back in with the Commission before the Master Plan moves much further. We feel like
17 maybe there hasn't been a holistic look at dog parks through that process. We want to
18 make sure that they stay on track as we move forward. We weren't really sure what is the
19 best way to cover that, and we were hoping we could have a discussion about what you
20 all think about how much more effort we should put into that particular topic and what's
21 the best way to move forward in terms of public outreach, further research, etc.

22
23 Vice Chair Knopper: Also, just one slight clarification. Daren, you mentioned
24 discussing it at the next February meeting. I think you meant the Commission work
25 session.

26
27 Commissioner Hetterly: Right.

28
29 Vice Chair Knopper: With regard to this, I think one of the things that we should do at
30 this work session is figure out with regard to all of the discussion points on the off-leash
31 and dog park is do we want to continue the ad hoc as it, do we want to change the scope,
32 do we want to reconfigure it and really kind of hone in as to moving forward on this
33 particular subject, whether it's off-leash or a dedicated dog park, how we want to proceed.

34
35 Chair Lauing: I think on the latter point, changing up ad hocs, that's something we've
36 traditionally done when we can do it sort of a little bit more casually, off camera and just
37 in a more casual setting at the retreat. That part I think we should do at the retreat. You
38 would like conversation now on the other aspects of it. You want some input tonight on
39 this as well, right?

40
41 Mr. Anderson: I'm sorry. I didn't hear the question.

1 Chair Lauing: You want input tonight on this ...

2
3 Mr. Anderson: Yes.

4
5 Chair Lauing: ... as well, correct?

6
7 Commissioner Hetterly: Yeah.

8
9 Mr. Anderson: That's correct.

10
11 Commissioner Hetterly: I'm sorry. I didn't (inaudible).

12
13 Commissioner Reckdahl: Can I ask a clarification?

14
15 Chair Lauing: Go ahead.

16
17 Commissioner Reckdahl: You mentioned the Colorado substation. I thought that was a
18 really good location. You said there was some laws. What laws?

19
20 Mr. Anderson: We met with the Utilities staff that supervises that, the assistant director.
21 He had expressed serious safety concerns amongst their own staff. That's where the City
22 gets all its electricity, through that site. He said there were recent new laws regarding
23 access, proximity to recreation or just people in general around facilities like that that
24 would prohibit that kind of thing.

25
26 Commissioner Reckdahl: Right now, it's an open area and anyone ...

27
28 Mr. Anderson: We brought that up to.

29
30 Commissioner Reckdahl: ... can walk up there. What's the difference whether a dog
31 walks up there or people walk up there?

32
33 Mr. Anderson: Their perception was we would actively be encouraging them into an area
34 that's really just passive turf right now, where not very many people are hanging out.
35 Whereas, we would now create a very large draw.

36
37 Commissioner Reckdahl: What kind of spacing do we need from that for safety?

38
39 Mr. Anderson: He did not think any spacing would be appropriate. That entire site from
40 the passive turf up to the sidewalk is really no part of it, in his estimation, would be
41 appropriate for us to use.

1 Vice Chair Knopper: May I elaborate?
2

3 Mr. Anderson: Of course.
4

5 Vice Chair Knopper: Being that is the main point of electrical power infrastructure for
6 the City of Palo Alto, he expressed quite adamantly that it's a security risk just in the
7 greater general risk. Cities are looking at how, and the State of California, to beef up
8 security around power grids and points of interest. To Daren's point, creating a situation
9 where you're actively telling people this is an area you should go and hang out and play
10 with your dog, etc., is not. The State of California is actually looking at specific rules, so
11 they may end up fencing it all off at some point, etc. At this particular juncture, they do
12 not want to encourage people to actively go there.
13

14 Commissioner Reckdahl: I appreciate security at utilities like that, but I don't see any
15 way a dog park would sacrifice security. If a dog park could sacrifice security, we've got
16 big problems. I think that it's a perfect place for a dog park. There's a fence there. If that
17 fence isn't sufficient to keep dogs out, it's not going to do anything for someone who
18 wants to play with the power plant. I think that's just a really big mistake to shrug this off
19 so casually. Rob, do you want to ...
20

21 Rob de Geus: Yeah. I was part of that meeting as well. That's sort of where I started as
22 well. I thought this really could be a great location for it. It's near residential, and people
23 could walk there. The safety concerns seem pretty significant from the Utilities staff, not
24 only the safety of their plant but safety of people that are nearby. If kids or whatever get
25 in there or start climbing and if we encourage more people to be there, there's potentially
26 more likelihood that that could happen and how really that is necessary. Another thing
27 that the Utilities staff told us was they are looking at potentially reconfiguring the site and
28 that particular utility that could actually require or need that space in the future. There
29 was a concern about if we develop the site for a particular recreation activity, then it's
30 hard to take it back once you do that. That's probably sometime out before they're ready
31 to do that, but that is something that's in consideration from the Utilities Department.
32 That was just another element.
33

34 Commissioner Reckdahl: Can I respond?
35

36 Chair Lauing: For a minute or two.
37

38 Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm sorry. I'll get off my soapbox eventually. Kick me off if I
39 stay up too long. Part of this was that we didn't want to necessarily have a final park.
40 This was let's get some more dog parks into the system. Let people use them with the
41 understanding that it may go away in two years. I think both the transit hub issue and this
42 issue, if they reconfigured it and people lost the dog park, they'd say at least we had a dog

1 park for two years. We as the City would learn more about running a dog park and what
2 worked and what didn't work. I think it's only upside if we did it. We're not talking
3 about putting anything fancy in, just having basic fencing around it. We'd have to take
4 that fencing down and put it somewhere else. I see the cost impacts being minimal, and I
5 see the risks being minimal. My two cents.

6
7 Chair Lauing: Yes, David.

8
9 Commissioner Moss: I'd even go so far as to say if they want to have a second temporary
10 fence that gives them a 5-foot buffer and a double-high fence with barbed wire at the top,
11 that you'd still have room for a dog park. It would extend the security somewhat. They
12 could have cameras and things like that if they want to do that. I've seen that over at that
13 one Coyote Valley. They've got a million cameras on that site. If we could go back one
14 more time, that would be great.

15
16 Mr. Anderson: I proposed the double fence concept as well. We threw every option that
17 we could think of. I found that site and proposed it as the ad hoc was looking at sites. It
18 seemed perfect to me too. I share your frustration. They were adamant that it's not an
19 appropriate site to have any form of recreation. Be happy to sit down with them again,
20 but I do not foresee that being a viable option at least from the Utilities standpoint.

21
22 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Hetterly.

23
24 Commissioner Hetterly: Just to add to Daren's response. Abbie and I were at that
25 meeting as well. We pushed pretty hard, as you might imagine. They were absolutely
26 adamant. I think really what it came down to was yes, it may well not be likely that you
27 would have a security breach that would endanger the utilities station, but if you did in
28 that 1 in a million chance have one because you had more people milling around,
29 blocking views from the streets, blocking view from their security cameras, it would be
30 catastrophic. They were really looking at it's a lottery. The odds aren't good that it'll
31 happen, but if it does, it's a huge impact.

32
33 Chair Lauing: Other comments on—briefly.

34
35 Commissioner Moss: A comment about the El Camino Park and a comment about
36 Mitchell Park. The El Camino Park, you said they might someday put a road or
37 something through there, but that won't preclude us from putting a park there temporarily
38 and see how it falls.

39
40 Mr. Anderson: That's my contention.

1 Commissioner Moss: That would be great. That would be great. About Mitchell Park, I
2 heard quite a bit in the previous meeting that concentrating all of our dog park in one
3 place is not what people had in mind. They had several in strategic places. Expanding
4 Mitchell Park, I noticed—I live right behind Cubberley fields, and there's at least four or
5 five dogs that are let run wild on that Cubberley field. They won't even go two blocks to
6 Mitchell Park. Expanding Mitchell Park doesn't seem like it's in the spirit of what the
7 public is asking for. They would rather really find some additional places around. The
8 El Camino Park should be first, in my mind, versus Mitchell Park. It sure would be nice
9 if we could find one more place somewhere in the north corner.

10
11 Mr. Anderson: I agree. I agree with everything you said. The only thing I would add to
12 the Mitchell one, because we heard that from a former Commissioner as well. I would
13 just add this is not meant to be end-all-be-all. It's more one piece in this puzzle that we'll
14 ultimately put together that kind of helps meet this need. The Master Plan is really the
15 area to get it. I think it would be a big missed opportunity to double the size of your
16 largest dog park when another piece of the feedback we've gotten is we need bigger
17 spaces, .5 acres is not big enough. This is the answer to that component. You're
18 absolutely right it doesn't give us the other pieces of what about north Palo Alto, what
19 about one in every neighborhood park. Those are something we need to strive towards.
20 I'm really hopeful that we'll continue to push the Master Plan to get us those answers. I
21 wouldn't blow off Mitchell as insignificant or ineffective. I do concur with you, let's get
22 a new one before we expand the other one. Push hard on El Camino first is my personal
23 preference too and recommendation.

24
25 Commissioner Moss: They're both low-hanging fruit. I would do them both, but not take
26 our eye off the ball on the other.

27
28 Mr. Anderson: Yeah.

29
30 Chair Lauing: Council Member Filseth.

31
32 Council Member Filseth: If I can just make an observation on the location next to the
33 utility station. If I understand what happens correctly, if there's disagreement between
34 Parks and Recreation and the Utilities on the disposition of that piece of land, eventually
35 it comes to Council I assume. Is that right? I assume that's the process. The other
36 observation I would make is that it seems to me that the risk that everybody would have
37 to consider is not exactly the absolute risk that there be some kind of bad incident. That
38 could happen anyway. The risk to consider is does having a dog park there increase that
39 risk materially. It seems to me that there's sort of two ways that risk could happen. One
40 is there is some person that for whatever reason wants to vandalize the utility. It seems to
41 me that that's going to happen with or without a dog park there. The other risk to
42 consider is somebody who's there suddenly gets the idea that they're going to climb over

1 the fence and do something or something like that. It seems to me as everybody weighs
2 it, it's going to be like that. That's going to be somebody's judgment as to how big a risk
3 that is. I mean, you're right. If there was a catastrophic failure, there would be a
4 catastrophe, but the risk is obviously very low. Now you're arguing about what that is.
5 My guess is that if you and the Utilities can't agree, eventually it winds up in front of
6 Council.

7
8 Chair Lauing: Any other comments from Commissioners on any of the—these are all
9 interim locations to support what Daren is saying. Yes, Commissioner Cribbs.

10
11 Commissioner Cribbs: What is the timeline if we were going to do an expanded park at
12 Mitchell?

13
14 Mr. Anderson: It would start with public outreach. We'd do a public meeting, so we'd
15 make sure the neighbors understand and get a chance to voice their concerns. Bring that
16 back to the Commission with a Park Improvement Ordinance if the feedback was
17 generally positive. If it was negative, I could find mitigations. Bring back a Park
18 Improvement Ordinance, and then from there that Park Improvement Ordinance would
19 go to Council. At \$10,000 we could use our existing funding to get that going. Rough
20 estimate, five months.

21
22 Commissioner Cribbs: Five months?

23
24 Mr. Anderson: That's a crude, rough estimate but something like that.

25
26 Commissioner Cribbs: Thank you. I would just say that I love the El Camino solution if
27 that could be a solution as soon as possible. I think that would be really nice for northern
28 Palo Alto and actually for all of us.

29
30 Chair Lauing: Since that's on the table, can I do a follow-on comment? What's actually
31 the blocking issue there? We thought we were going to have it back this time actually for
32 action, but now we don't.

33
34 Mr. Anderson: We're at the stage where we need more feedback both from Planning and
35 from the City Manager's Office on that issue. Rob and I have been discussing this. It's
36 something we're anxious to push forward. We just need a little more time and feedback.

37
38 Chair Lauing: Might it come to our next meeting as an action item?

39
40 Mr. Anderson: I couldn't commit to that. I'm not sure. I'll definitely have an update for
41 you either at the ad hoc updates or be bringing you something perhaps.

1 Mr. de Geus: I would just ...

2
3 Chair Lauing: Do you have a comment?

4
5 Commissioner Reckdahl: (inaudible) comment.

6
7 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Reckdahl.

8
9 Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm not real wild about the Mitchell Park just because that
10 hillside is used. There's a picnic area right there, and people quite often have picnics.
11 People go up on the hillside and eat. People sit on the other side of the hill and watch the
12 soccer games. Maybe some of it could be expanded, but I don't think I'd want to see that
13 whole hill. Also, I'm not sure how well that would work, having a hill in a dog park. It
14 might work well; I'm not sure. There's four places that I think are better locations than
15 Mitchell. Both Peers Park and Ramos Park have back corners that are relatively unused.
16 Because it's in a corner, you wouldn't need fence around four sides. You'd just need
17 fence around a couple. Especially on Peers Park, you're between the tennis court and the
18 train tracks, so you only would need fence on two sides. I think both of those would be
19 very good options. Also, Heritage Park, I parked right next to that spot tonight, and I
20 looked at it. It to me still looks like a really good spot, the part of Heritage Park that's
21 right on Bryant. There's a little leg there that's not used very much. I think that would be
22 a perfect place for a park. It would be north Palo Alto. It'd be easy to walk. I think there
23 would be support for that. Howard Hoffman brought up last time Rinconada Park. That
24 little back area kind of behind the fire station isn't used for much right now. I think
25 there's a horseshoe pit there or something. I think that would be another spot we could
26 put up a small dog park. It would be relatively small. I mean, that's one thing we want to
27 learn, what works and what doesn't. All those, if you put fences around it and didn't
28 spend a lot money, just made a basic park, we would learn something from the process.

29
30 Mr. Anderson: Something I personally wrestled with was as we start expanding, as
31 you're proposing, looking at these other sites, how far do we get before we're stepping on
32 the toes of the Master Plan that may have some other demand or need or use for those
33 areas that we're prescribing at Peers or Ramos. It's a slippery slope. It could become one
34 of those things of why stop there. We would look at every single spot we've got in the
35 City just with the ad hoc. Are we again stepping on the toes of the Master Plan? It's just
36 a rough one that I could certainly use some guidance and some deliberation from the
37 Commission on.

38
39 Chair Lauing: I think that's totally true. The scope of the ad hoc was to look at not even
40 interim parks, but shared-use dog parks. We're already kind of going beyond the scope of
41 the ad hoc precisely for that reason which is that we wanted the infusion of the

1 knowledge on the Master Plan to really guide this thing for decades, if we could. Were
2 there others? Commissioner Hetterly.

3
4 Commissioner Hetterly: That's right; we did have a limited scope in what we were
5 looking at. The reason that these three options came up for us is because part of our task
6 was to find a large space because all of our dog parks are very small. We were looking at
7 shared used because that seems the only option for a large space. Mitchell was attractive
8 because we can get a large space by only adding half an acre as opposed to having to take
9 away a full acre from another park to dedicate for dog use. The other benefit at Mitchell
10 is that the current park, due to its size, faces significant maintenance challenges. Every
11 single year we hear from Staff it's a disaster, the grass won't grow. We hear from users,
12 it's a mud pit, the grass won't grow, we need a better facility. For several years, we have
13 not found a solution to that problem. We had hoped that making that park a little larger
14 with a larger turf area would be beneficial in terms of the maintenance, sustainability
15 going forward. That's why that made our list. As for the other parks, I think that's sort of
16 one of the things we were getting at, that we hoped we could talk about the process at the
17 retreat, to figure out where's the line between what we do in the interim and what we plan
18 to do the Master Plan.

19
20 Commissioner Reckdahl: I have a quick reply. The thing about the Master Plan is we're
21 part of it. We don't see anything where we're going to say we don't need any dog parks. I
22 think the Master Plan is going to come back and say, "You don't have enough dog parks."
23 The analysis they're doing is the same analysis we're doing here. As long as we're not
24 going fancy with these dog parks and we're just doing bare bones, if the Master Plan
25 comes and changes our mind, we change our mind and we move it. As long as you're
26 buying fencing, you can put that fencing anywhere. I don't think we're painting ourselves
27 in a corner at all.

28
29 Vice Chair Knopper: There's also—pardon me. There's one other thing to consider with
30 regard to the idea of dog parks. For instance, Mountain View took a completely different
31 approach. Again, at our work session, we can discuss like is this the right approach.
32 Obviously we're guiding and giving input to the Master Plan with regard to how the City
33 handles off-leash dogs. There's a different way to look at it too. For instance, Mountain
34 View does not have fenced off-leash they allow in eight of their parks. It's this is your
35 area, go and watch your dog. There are other ways to approach it. Again, this was out of
36 our scope as part of the ad hoc. As a Commission, we have to figure out how we want to
37 move forward on this particular subject utilizing some of the preliminary input that we
38 have thus far from the Master Plan and then sort of guide how we want to work moving
39 forward.

40
41 Chair Lauing: I suggest we listen to the speakers on this issue. I thought it would be
42 helpful to hear the kind of recap from the ad hoc before we had the speakers on this issue.

1 We'll do that, and then we can decide if we want to put this on the agenda for the retreat.
2 The first speaker is Irene Kane.

3
4 Irene Kane: Hello. Thank you. I live in north Palo Alto. I have a dog who's 2 1/2 years
5 old. I'm here on behalf of Howard Hoffman who couldn't make it tonight. I think all of
6 you know Howard. He has an organization, paloaltodogs.org. There's quite a few people
7 in that group now. We're advocating for all of our dogs, especially in north Palo Alto. I
8 think that in my mind this has dragged out way too long. This was supposed to be
9 something that was supposed to be quick and, in my mind, should have been done by
10 now. We're still just talking about it. Months and months ago, there was a community
11 meeting about this at Lucie Stern when that was just for the dogs. At that meeting, you
12 guys introduced this shared space, field. That's an okay idea until the Master Plan is
13 done. I think we should stick to the three spaces that were originally proposed, and get
14 this done, please. It's just dragging on and on. This was supposed to be a shared use,
15 take a big field. I love the idea of Greer Park. Just fence one of those fields in, and let
16 the dogs go even if it's just for two hours in the morning. If it has to be two hours in the
17 morning, then that's better than nothing which is what we've been having for months and
18 months and months now. Thank you.

19
20 Chair Lauing: Thank you. The next speaker is Herb Borock.

21
22 Herb Borock: Chair Lauing and Commissioners. I believe that the Commission at its
23 next meeting should recommend that the Council approve a dog park at El Camino Park.
24 If there are some concerns from the City Manager or other staff about things that have to
25 be delayed, they can discuss that with the Council rather than using that as an excuse for
26 why you keep getting this on your agenda, but it's not an action item. I believe the
27 Commission should take action. If staff prepares an agenda that prevents you from doing
28 that, you can't act. In regard to unfenced off-leash parks, we already have that except
29 they're not legal. One difference between Palo Alto and Mountain View is about 60
30 years ago the voters adopted by an initiative measure that dogs should be on leash. I
31 don't think it makes sense to try and stretch that. We're already stretching it by having
32 the dog parks that we have. In regards to the rules, there were suggested rules in the staff
33 report from October in Attachment C, but it didn't show what the current rules are. One
34 of them is that you have to be at least 8 years old to be in a dog park. You need to be
35 able to understand what it means to be around these animals and to respect them. The
36 rules seem to be written as if there were unfenced parks, but that gets into the idea of how
37 can you enforce people who are not there with dogs to behave. I don't think that's a good
38 idea. In terms of expanding the one at Mitchell Park, the sense I get from dog owners,
39 from the dog owners' groups is they would like to have a big area with their dogs but not
40 many other dogs. I had an example of that recently when I was taking care of a friend's
41 small dog at Hoover Park. The dog was somewhat reserved due to the fencing and the
42 small area. When her owner arrived, she was willing to take the chance of releasing her

1 off-leash in the fields behind the ball field. I don't think it was because there was grass or
2 that was there or that it was a bigger area. It was also the density. It was roughly the
3 same number of dogs over an acre compared to the small fraction of an acre at the
4 Hoover Park dog park. That was the difference. You have to understand it's not just that
5 people want more off-leash areas, it's that they're expecting that somehow magically it's
6 going to be the way it is now when people are using the off-leash, unfenced areas that are
7 illegal. I had one question. On the first page of the staff report ...
8

9 Chair Lauing: That's three minutes. If you could wrap up please.
10

11 Mr. Borock: Yeah, that'll be the final thing. I left this to last. It shows the size of current
12 Hoover Park as just a little bit more than Greer Park. I don't think that's correct. I believe
13 Hoover Park dog run was larger than Greer Park before it was expanded. Thank you.
14

15 Chair Lauing: Thank you. The next speaker is Mada Houry [phonetic].
16

17 Mada Houry: Good evening. I'm Mada Houry, and I have a six-year old, extremely
18 playful Samoyed golden mix. I'm here to advocate on behalf of him, since he hasn't quite
19 picked up how to speak like us yet. He's very vocal about the fact that he wants a place
20 to run around without being on a leash, with all his other dog buddies and human
21 buddies. I know you guys have been trying to do this. We moved to the City about three
22 years ago, and I hear that this has been in the attempt phase for over 20 years. I do not
23 understand how it's possible for a City with so many civic participation minded people to
24 not be able to do this in so long. The level of frustration is very, very high. I'm from
25 north Palo Alto, and we have really no options. I should put it, we only have illegal
26 options. We do exercise them, because we have no other options. One of the things we
27 do is go to schools, Addison, after hours and let our dogs run. We just don't have any
28 options. The consequence of that is the policemen show up and throw us out. That's
29 what they should be doing, because we are in violation of the City leash laws. To be
30 personally warned by the policemen at least two times, to be in the park on days when the
31 policemen came and warned people at least six to eight times would perhaps, that's just
32 me, give you an idea of how desperate we are. One of the other points I want to mention
33 is with regards to having these areas, having more in many locations solves a lot of this
34 problems, problems related to overuse, problems related to bad waste cleanup behavior.
35 When we walk to a park in our neighborhood and we are seeing the same people in our
36 neighborhood day after day, we are going to behave ourselves. Guess what? If we don't,
37 our neighbor will come over and say, "Your dog pooped. You need to pick that up." I
38 think that should be something that you should consider. Most people will behave nicely
39 if given the opportunity with a little bit of shame thrown in. If you have more of these
40 areas in multiple parks, Rinconada, Eleanor Pardee, it would be great. As far as Eleanor
41 Pardee is concerned, in the last meeting one of the Commissioners mentioned that—I
42 think Commissioner Crommie—that the neighbors got together and nuked that idea. I

1 have been speaking informally to folks who live around. I do not think their (inaudible)
2 is quite as high. It is not noisy. Noise was a big issue. It's not noisy because I'll tell you
3 something. When we are at Addison, all of the teachers have been told to call the cops on
4 sight. They usually can't because they don't know we're there. The dogs don't bark. We
5 don't scream.

6
7 Chair Lauing: That's three minutes. Thank you.

8
9 Ms. Houry: Please consider that. Thank you.

10
11 Chair Lauing: Take it back up here. If everyone's amenable, we can put this on our
12 retreat agenda to kind of decide if we should re-org or go for the flow or expand it or wait
13 for the Master Plan or whatever, rather than get too deep into it tonight. Commissioner
14 Moss.

15
16 Commissioner Moss: How does this work? If we did want to make recommendations
17 for additional places to the staff, do we do it here or do we do it in the retreat and then
18 come back? Or just call?

19
20 Chair Lauing: It can be through any channel. It can even be through the ad hoc, if we
21 continue to go through that channel or the existing one. Any other questions? Rob.

22
23 Mr. de Geus: I was just going to amplify that a little further. We heard some
24 recommendations this evening about other parks that possibly could work as dog exercise
25 areas. That's captured in the minutes, and it should be part of the Parks and Rec Master
26 Plan as we consider what to do with respect to that area of focus. It's one of the areas of
27 focus. It's good feedback. Let us know if you have ideas about other park locations.
28 We'll evaluate it as part of the Parks Master Plan.

29
30 Chair Lauing: Thank you, and we'll move on to the next agenda item.

31
32 **4. Review and Update on the CIP Budget.**

33
34 Chair Lauing: Daren, you're going to lead that one?

35
36 Daren Anderson: At the December Commission meeting, I provided an update on capital
37 improvement project budget preparations for the fiscal year '17 through '21. On
38 December 18th or shortly thereafter, the Community Services Department submitted our
39 capital budget requests which included ten new requests. This is in your staff report, but
40 I'm going to into a little detail on each of the new requests. Mitchell Park/Adobe Creek
41 bridge replacement. This is the Magical Bridge. The bridge itself is very simple in
42 design and old. The primary reason it needs to be replaced right away and the reason

1 why we're proposing FY '17 is the side rails are very low. As we added the playground,
2 the number of children using this as a corridor, back and forth between the larger side of
3 the park over to the playground, kids are climbing over there and coming perilously close
4 to falling off. The number of parents who bring their children to the playground have
5 said, "We'd really like you to do something." We tried to take an interim measure to find
6 a contractor who could just add onto the fencing and bring it up. We're struggling to find
7 someone who will come on and take the liability of adding elements to that bridge. Not
8 that we're going to stop, but we believe replacement is a high priority. The Cubberley
9 tennis courts, also FY '17. This won't come out of the general fund. This is a separate
10 Cubberley fund of dollars. It's a high ticket price item at \$950,000. They're probably the
11 worse condition tennis courts we've got in the City, so the need is very high. The theatre
12 soft goods. This is stage curtains, things like that, for our Children's Theatre. It's a Fire
13 Code that those have to be updated. It's \$55,000 in FY '17. Our park restroom CIP was
14 an existing one that was defunded as we started the Parks Master Plan, basically saying,
15 "Let's wait until we know where the priority areas are to put these restrooms before we
16 keep funding it." It's been on hold, and now we're recommending refunding it in FY '18,
17 once the Master Plan is done and can provide insight on where these restrooms go. Of
18 course, this is in light of the fact that one of the important parts already identified from
19 the Master Plan process thus far that we need more restrooms. The replacement of the
20 theatre seats. This is again a Fire Code, scheduled for FY '18. The Foothills Park,
21 Pearson-Arastradero, Esther Clark Comprehensive Conservation Plan. This plan is a
22 companion to the one we've got starting in FY '17 for the Baylands. This will be the
23 same kind of things, just looking at these other open space preserves. The intent is to
24 give a best management practice guide to staff on how to manage wildlife, vegetation and
25 habitat and appropriate recreation in those sensitive areas. The Baylands Boardwalk
26 Project. This is—of course, we recently finished the feasibility study which will be
27 coming back to you in February for an in-depth look at that study. This CIP that we're
28 proposing is design in FY '17 and construction in FY '19 based on the feedback from the
29 feasibility study. The Foothills Park Interpretive Center exhibits in FY '20. The existing
30 exhibits at this part in the IC, Interpretive Center, at Foothills are antiquated and probably
31 in 1950s style where it's just stuffed animals, no interaction, just the name of the animal.
32 It's definitely due for a replacement. We're looking forward to that in FY '20. The
33 aforementioned Comprehensive Plan in FY '19 will help inform that a little bit,
34 prescribing some of the interpretive messaging that's important for that preserve. The
35 Foothills Park renovation project. This includes irrigation to the upper and lower turf
36 areas and the Sunfish Island bridge. Sunfish Island is a little, tiny island in the middle of
37 Boronda Lake. The bridge is original to the park and ready for replacement. The
38 Pearson-Arastradero improvement project. This is for bridges, fences and trails in FY
39 '21. There's also two changes to some existing CIPs. These are ones that are already on
40 the books, that needed to be augmented. The first is the Baylands Comprehensive
41 Conservation Plan that I mentioned in FY '17 is already funded, hopefully starting in
42 early July. We're proposing adding \$59,000 to this CIP which would help address



1 planning for interpretive messaging not originally a part of the scope. We think it's
2 important and its timely while we're looking at the Baylands comprehensively to say
3 what should the messages be and where should they be specifically. The same for public
4 art. As projects happen in and around the Baylands, they have to contribute a certain
5 amount to public art, and they're usually placed in and around that building. This is the
6 opportune time to look at the Baylands holistically and say where is the right place for art
7 generally throughout the Baylands. Are we going to do it ad hoc or do we do it
8 comprehensively and plan it out? That's the intent of that change to the existing CIP.
9 Lastly, the open space trails and amenities CIP. This is a continuing one, ongoing, that
10 funds things like trail service. We have a contractor that comes in and does trail work in
11 our open space preserves. We recommended a change for FY '17, bumping it up by
12 \$75,000. This is primarily to address a serious erosion problem that we have on Los
13 Trancos Trail. This is the backside, so unless you're hiking in 5 or 6 miles, you might not
14 see this. There's some serious erosion. It's very difficult to address by just routine
15 maintenance; this is insufficient. It needs a substantive fix. This is going to be a
16 challenging year, this budget cycle. There just isn't enough money to address all the
17 projects that have been submitted Citywide. We're going to need to prioritize how we
18 spend the approximately \$126 million in available funding. The first priority is going to
19 go towards the infrastructure plan that Council's identified. This includes things like the
20 new Public Safety Building. That's the top priority; it's a high ticket item as I'm sure
21 you're aware. There's also the replacement of fire stations number 3 and 4 and the
22 completion of Byxbee Park. I just saw this priority settings today, so it's kind of new to
23 me. The second priority is the recurring projects. These are projects that were identified
24 during the Infrastructure Blue Ribbon Committee. They looked Citywide at all our
25 infrastructure and rated where we're either—it's got a catch-up or keep-up category,
26 essentially deferred maintenance that needs to be addressed. Projects there will be the
27 second priority. Third is health and safety. An example of the health and safety among
28 our list would be that Mitchell Park, Adobe Creek bridge would kind of fit into that
29 category. Then Council priorities and then, lastly, projects offset by other revenue
30 sources. This, for us, would be that new park restroom CIP. The new park restrooms
31 could use the Park Development Impact Fee money. This wouldn't be existing restroom
32 replacement, but rather brand new ones that would increase the capacity to the park. The
33 schedule that you saw in your staff report is in May 11th this will go to the Planning and
34 Transportation Commission, and then in mid-May to the Finance Committee for review,
35 and then June to Council for adoption of the capital budget. That concludes my
36 presentation.

37
38 Chair Lauing: Just by way of review, do any of the newer Commissioners have questions
39 about this process? We kind of touched on it last month. It's an annual cycle and
40 planning out for five years. Capital projects are anything over \$50,000. I think we would
41 take comments on the new capital projects. In specific, probably more like questions



1 because they're already submitted. Any comments from Commissioners? Commissioner
2 Moss.

3
4 Commissioner Moss: The bridge to the Magical Bridge, not being able to find a
5 contractor because of liability. Is there some way that the City can share that liability, so
6 you could get a contractor sooner? It seemed like it should be sort of business as usual
7 maintenance for health and safety.

8
9 Mr. Anderson: I agree with you that we shouldn't stop. We found three contractors,
10 came out; none of them gave us a bid. We reached out and found a fourth. He originally
11 looked at it and gave us a partial design, and then backed out. He said the owner of his
12 company wasn't willing to take liability. We definitely aren't going to stop; we're going
13 to continue to pursue this and, I think, additional pressure on our facilities staff to see if
14 they might be able to do it. It's nothing I have in-house in the parks or open space
15 division that could do those fixes to a bridge. We'll continue to look at it. It is a high
16 priority.

17
18 Chair Lauing: This is fast. When it says '17, that's about four months away. This would
19 be a high priority from staff's recommendation. Do you have other comments on any of
20 these? Okay. Other folks? Commissioner Hetterly, go ahead. I'll hold mine.

21
22 Commissioner Hetterly: I just have a couple of questions. I wondered if any of these that
23 are on the list in the staff report were also on the IBRC list.

24
25 Mr. Anderson: Yes.

26
27 Commissioner Hetterly: And which ones those were.

28
29 Mr. Anderson: Sure. Let me see. I don't have the comprehensive list. Just off the top of
30 my head, I know that the Foothills Park renovation project, that's the irrigation and bridge
31 replacement, and the Pearson-Arastradero improvement project, that's bridges, fences and
32 trails, are on the IBRC for sure. They're cyclical. The irrigation, for example, has a 25-
33 year lifespan. After that ends, it comes up next in the IBRC. It just shows it recurring.
34 That's kind of the keep-up.

35
36 Commissioner Hetterly: I had another question about the Arastradero item. It is
37 \$275,000 out in FY '21. The intent seems to be to make trail improvements to reduce
38 winter trail closures as well as signs and fencing and gates. I guess that feels to me like
39 an ongoing cost. I'm wondering why it's a one-shot deal far in the future as opposed to an
40 ongoing investment in keeping those trails open.

1 Mr. Anderson: It's bridges, fences and trails. We've got some bridges, those are again
2 cyclical with a very long lifespan. The trail portion, we have routine trail maintenance
3 that I mentioned in one of our other—the ongoing CIP, for example, the open space trails
4 and amenities. That's routine maintenance. This one would be more of a substantive
5 change to rock portions. It turns muddy in the winter. It's unpassable, and we have to
6 close quite a few. With this one, if it gets approved, we would look to rock some of those
7 seasonal trails, so it would not turn to mud, and you could keep it open through the
8 winter.

9
10 Commissioner Hetterly: I see.

11
12 Mr. Anderson: Or larger portions.

13
14 Commissioner Hetterly: It is sort of a one-shot, major change?

15
16 Mr. Anderson: Yeah.

17
18 Commissioner Hetterly: Thank you. My other question is on the Comprehensive
19 Conservation Plans. For the Baylands, we have \$330,000 dedicated to 2017, I think,
20 coming out right away. For the other three preserves, the total budget is \$300,000. Why
21 is it that one costs \$330,000, but three others is so much less? Is that because of the
22 ecology of the locations?

23
24 Mr. Anderson: No. I think the acreage is comparable. Baylands relative to those other
25 three preserves are equal acreage, that is, about 2,000 for the Baylands and about 2,000
26 for Pearson, Foothills and Esther. They're all comparable ecologies for the most part in
27 the Foothills region. Likewise, in the Baylands, you've got a different marshland,
28 wetland, riparian areas. It's inflated by that \$59,000 to look at those two additional
29 pieces, the interpretive messaging and the public art portion, for the Baylands.

30
31 Commissioner Hetterly: That's helpful. Also, I noticed that the Foothills, Arastradero,
32 Esther Clark ones are scheduled out in FY '19. Do you think you'll be able to do all three
33 of those at the same time? I know there are staff support timing issues involved. Would
34 it be better to spread those out or do you think those can all go in a single year?

35
36 Mr. Anderson: I believe they can all be done in a single year. I think it'll also save staff
37 time. A lot of the outreach and stakeholders (inaudible) for each preserve. Again, the
38 ecology types are similar. It makes sense to me to lump them. Plus, we need these plans
39 now. The idea of waiting a year and a half between each one, because they take a while,
40 it's putting out too far.

41
42 Commissioner Hetterly: 2019 is soon enough?

1
2 Mr. Anderson: Yes. We'll have the Baylands one to carry us from FY '17 through—I
3 don't know exactly how long it'll take. Hopefully, it'll be quicker than our Parks Master
4 Plan process by a good margin, but we don't want to overlap in any way.

5
6 Commissioner Hetterly: My last question. Sorry I have so many questions.

7
8 Chair Lauing: That's fine.

9
10 Commissioner Hetterly: On the Boardwalk extension at the Baylands, feasibility and
11 improvements, are those dollar figures the cost only for that first stage?

12
13 Mr. Anderson: No.

14
15 Commissioner Hetterly: That's for the entire thing?

16
17 Mr. Anderson: The \$250,000 for design and then the \$1 million, you're going to get this
18 in more depth come February. The Public Works staff will bring that whole project to
19 you, including the feasibility study, and explain the next steps. The \$1 million would
20 cover replacement, as far as I understand, completely.

21
22 Commissioner Hetterly: That first stage is happening sooner?

23
24 Mr. Anderson: The first stage, the first 200 and some odd feet is already repaired and
25 open. From the Boardwalk out to the first pull-out, which is about 200 feet, is open now.

26
27 Commissioner Hetterly: I didn't realize that. Great. Thank you. That's all I have.

28
29 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Reckdahl.

30
31 Commissioner Reckdahl: I want to double check on the Foothills fire plan. That's going
32 forward every year now?

33
34 Mr. Anderson: Yes.

35
36 Commissioner Reckdahl: That's going to be status quo? We don't have to do any action
37 to keep that?

38
39 Mr. Anderson: That's correct. It's not tied to the capital. We've got ongoing funding in
40 our operating budget for that. The work is progressing nicely.

41
42 Commissioner Reckdahl: How is that split again?



1
2 Mr. Anderson: It's a portion for CSD. We handle the in-park portion. External to the
3 park roadways are handled by Public Works who do roadside clearing. The controlled
4 burn and risk assessment by the Fire department.
5

6 Commissioner Reckdahl: Also, the Foothills Park renovation project for the irrigation,
7 would we ever consider not irrigating that?
8

9 Mr. Anderson: I think there's definitely a need to reexamine how it's done. It's 15 acres
10 of irrigated turf. I think it's almost certain that we're going to have to reconfigure it and
11 reduce some of that turf. How much I don't know. We may need some public outreach
12 process. Of course, it's out a ways and we'll see how the drought plays out. Is it worse
13 by then? Do we have to really drastically rethink how we handle non-athletic field turf
14 like that?
15

16 Commissioner Reckdahl: That's in '21, so we have some time.
17

18 Mr. Anderson: I think it's actually design in '21, construction in '22.
19

20 Commissioner Reckdahl: By that time, the Buckeye Creek will all be done, and the 7.7
21 acres will be open to the public. We can now take our time and do it right then. That's it.
22 Thank you.
23

24 Chair Lauing: I had a couple of questions. Just to clarify what I think you said is these
25 park restrooms are now in here, but they're kind of a placeholder. You're not assigning
26 any particular park. We just know that it's going to be necessary.
27

28 Mr. Anderson: The only exception is we internally have looked at some existing ones.
29 This would not be ...
30

31 Chair Lauing: It's both. You noted it was both.
32

33 Mr. Anderson: That's right. Foothills Park, for example, has restrooms that are in
34 desperate need of replacement. We internally have earmarked the first year of that
35 funding we'd like to go to that, but will of course be informed further by the Master Plan.
36

37 Chair Lauing: I'd just like to salute this process. We talked about that in the CIP ad hoc,
38 that if we could get some placeholders, we would know that we'd have the money after
39 the Master Plan is done so we don't have to wait two more years for this to be
40 approached. I wanted to clarify that for you and also for the Commissioners, that these
41 are placeholders so that when we start looking at individual parks with Peter and all, then
42 we can figure out if this goes here, we've got money to get that done. A couple of

1 questions on the fire retardant materials that you're putting in. I understand that, but it
2 seems to me like this becomes an urgent item as well. We talk about 18 in one case and
3 19 in another case. Nineteen is it?

4
5 Mr. Anderson: Seventeen and 18.

6
7 Chair Lauing: Seventeen, 18, okay. The question is if it's a hazard, is that soon enough.
8 That's really the obvious question.

9
10 Mr. Anderson: I don't believe it was a hazard. I believe that the Fire Code mandated you
11 change it at the end of its life cycle. They're both at the end of their life cycle. There is
12 the fire hazard at least for the soft goods. Again, that's happening in FY '17.

13
14 Chair Lauing: I think my last question here. The interpretive exhibits, do we have a feel
15 of what the scope is for that yet or is that a placeholder number? I thought we'd just kind
16 of stuff a few more foxes and get rid of the old ones. \$350,000 is kind of a big number.

17
18 Mr. Anderson: We are thinking a lot bigger than just more stuffed animals.

19
20 Chair Lauing: Maybe something that's interactive ...

21
22 Mr. Anderson: That's right.

23
24 Chair Lauing: ... for kids particularly to play with would be terrific.

25
26 Mr. Anderson: That's the goal definitely, to have an interactive, top of the line
27 Interpretive Center (crosstalk) come and learn about nature.

28
29 Chair Lauing: Closer to a museum. Commissioner Knopper, did you have a question,
30 comment?

31
32 Commissioner Cribbs: I just wanted to ask about the Interpretive Center. I was
33 interested in if there are plans for any kind of support from the community in terms of the
34 interactive displays. There's a lot of people out there doing really cool things. I
35 wondered if that was in the planning process.

36
37 Mr. Anderson: That's a great question. We specifically timed this to take place after that
38 comprehensive plan. During the comprehensive plan, there's enormous amounts of
39 outreach to the public. They'll be able to weigh in on it. We're hoping that
40 comprehensive plan informs what kind of interpretive messaging would be most
41 appropriate for the Interpretive Center. That would be the place to learn best
42 management practices at that time. Who's got the best stuff? Is it East Bay Regional?

1 Let's go borrow their greatest ideas around how to send interpretive messaging and reach
2 out to our community to figure out what kind they would specifically want and long for
3 and tie them altogether.
4

5 Commissioner Cribbs: That would be great, because there's so many people who, I think,
6 would love to be involved in creating something like that. It'd be great. I'm sure you're
7 collecting names already.
8

9 Mr. Anderson: Will do.
10

11 Chair Lauing: Go ahead, Abbie.
12

13 Commissioner Cribbs: Thank you.
14

15 Vice Chair Knopper: I just had one quick clarification. With regard to the Foothills Park
16 improvement project, Keith had mentioned that turf will be reduced in certain areas to
17 help conserve water. Is that sort of across the board in passive turf, non-sport areas?
18 Right now, it's like what we're doing just consistently as far as water conservation as well
19 as maintenance.
20

21 Mr. Anderson: It is what we're doing. One of the policy recommendations you'll see
22 proposed in the Master Plan will allude to that as well. I wouldn't say it's categoric. I
23 wouldn't say it's absolute, that every piece of passive turf goes away. I don't believe that's
24 the case. We're not currently doing that in every way. For example, at El Camino we
25 have a piece of passive turf. We did select a turf type that can make it on two days a
26 week, where the typical turf we use for sports cannot. It has to be irrigated more. We're
27 making changes and adapting to meet that goal. Whether we go to something that
28 extreme is really something for the Master Plan, for the Commission and for the
29 community to weigh in on, on how far we go. Yes, with every CIP where we have any
30 turf, whether it's athletic field or passive, it's examined. Can we reduce this? Do we need
31 it? Are there other alternatives? Either mulch or California native landscaping, that kind
32 of thing to save us water.
33

34 Chair Lauing: Any other comments on that? Thank you very much.
35

36 **5. Update on the Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Facilities Master**
37 **Plan.**
38

39 Chair Lauing: Peter Jensen lead a discussion on that, and then we'll have a ...
40

41 Rob de Geus: I'll kick things off, Chair Lauing.
42

1 Chair Lauing: Sorry. Go ahead.
2

3 Mr. de Geus: Just an update. We had a study session with the City Council last night
4 and gave them a much more comprehensive, detailed report. They really appreciated
5 that. It was a late night. It was at the end of the agenda, so we were there until 11:30 or
6 something. It was good. It got some really good feedback, and the Council was very
7 appreciative of the work and of the Commission and all the work that you're doing. A
8 few just highlights. We got a lot of feedback from a lot of Council Members. It was kind
9 of interesting. Certainly a lot of support for additional dog exercise areas. They want to
10 see us do something there. We've heard that from a lot of Council Members. There was
11 a discussion about natural turf and synthetic turf, and what is our policy going forward on
12 that topic. They'd like the Commission and the Master Plan to weigh in on that topic.
13 Highlighting the benefits of nature and trees and the canopy in particular, they want to
14 see that highlighted. Expanding the system, I know this is near and dear to the
15 Commission's heart. That was consistent across the Council as well. It may be hard, and
16 we may not know exactly how to do it. If it's something that we think is important, it
17 ought to be in the Master Plan with some hard thinking around how we might do that.
18 That was good to hear. There was an interesting discussion and comments around
19 Foothills Park, and whether it's time to think about opening it up again for nonresidents.
20 I say again because we have discussed it a number of times with the Council. It hasn't
21 been approved in the past with different scenarios. It was a study session, so there was
22 no voting, but it seemed like on balance there was interest in considering options there.
23 There was a representative from the Lee family actually that was there and spoke
24 encouraging that we figure out a way to open it up in some way. Sustainability was
25 another big theme not surprisingly, because the Council and the community had a
26 Sustainability Summit on Sunday afternoon for five hours, and then two study sessions
27 on sustainability before the Parks Plan study session. That was close on the mind. That's
28 obviously a principle within the Parks Master Plan, so they were happy to see that and
29 very happy to see nature added as a principle as well. Over all pretty supportive of the
30 principles and the areas of focus and generally where we're headed. They recognized
31 we've got some work to do. They're looking forward to us coming back with a set of
32 recommendations on policies, programs and projects, which of course we're working on
33 now. The last two things I'll just mention. There was lots of others, but these are the
34 ones that I found particularly interesting. It was investing in wayfinding to parks and
35 thinking creatively about how we do that with signage and other things, like it's ten
36 minutes walk to Greer Park from different locations. Pocket parks, at least a couple of
37 Council Members said there's value in small spaces, small parks. They'd like to see the
38 Parks Master Plan weigh in on that topic as well. Overall pretty good. Happy with that
39 study session. Looking forward to the next phase and step which Peter is going to talk
40 about now.
41



1 Peter Jensen: Good evening, Commissioners. Peter Jensen, Landscape Architect for the
2 City of Palo Alto. As Rob was alluding to, a lot of time over the last month was spent on
3 the study session that was last night and preparing the presentation and the staff report. I
4 would recommend taking a look at the report and reading the report. It does have a lot of
5 good information in it about the process that we've had so far and what information we've
6 gathered there. I would encourage the Commission to look at that. Tonight, though, we
7 do want to look at a couple of things. One, talking about the additions of the list, most
8 importantly the order of magnitude costs that are added and how that's going to take place
9 within the list, so we can get a good understanding and grasp of the cost impact of new
10 projects. Not just of the project, but actually then of the maintenance and keep-up of
11 those, another thing to think about recommending a new project or new program. That is
12 something that MIG has provided a summary update of what they're proposing to add to
13 the list. The list beside your comments which again I do thank you very much for. They
14 supplied a lot of insight for the list that you returned back to us and that we have given to
15 MIG to start incorporating and revising the list. They've done a good job of getting the
16 initial aspect of that going, but it's still ongoing as we speak. We don't have an updated
17 list tonight, but I do want to get through and talk a little bit and have a discussion about
18 the magnitude cost, talk some more about the criteria and the weighting of the scoring.
19 I'd like to get some type of direction tonight so we can solidify that so over the next
20 month staff can go forward and do some of the prioritization ranking that we can bring
21 back to you next meeting and have a further discussion more about the list and that
22 prioritization list ranked itself. MIG also responded to a couple of the questions that were
23 repeat questions from a lot of the Commissioners. We can discuss some of those, the
24 answers as well. That's basically the three main items that we want to talk about tonight
25 and have discussion on. I'd like to open it up first to discuss the order of magnitude and
26 get feedback and questions from the Commission on that.

27
28 Chair Lauing: Are you putting up a slide in that regard or are we working off paper?

29
30 Mr. Jensen: We're working off paper.

31
32 Chair Lauing: How quaint. Comments?

33
34 Vice Chair Knopper: I had a question. I think it's more clarity that I need with regard to
35 the order of magnitude for a cap cost versus an operating impact. As I was reading this,
36 the additional points of clarification regarding these costs—I'm trying to ... If a large
37 capital project is very expensive, three dollar sign expensive, yet it falls across a variety
38 of different departments, for instance a new bridge which would affect infrastructure,
39 planning, biking, pedestrian, park, the whole nine, how do you evaluate that cost? I think
40 I'm having a hard time figuring out how these dollar signs would work. Would each
41 department—maybe I'm confusing myself and over-thinking this. Would each
42 department have an operating budget for this particular project? Would it be just the

1 capital cost of building said project? Do you know what I mean? Am I being unclear in
2 my question? I'm just a little confused (crosstalk).

3
4 Mr. Jensen: I think the system set up for that is that the capital cost would be the initial
5 amount per the construction or implementation of whatever the project or program was
6 going to be. However that is done, either CSD is working on the project, Community
7 Services, or Public Works is working on the project, the funding is coming from that
8 source. It's not split out between different departments. It's just based on the cost of
9 implementing that. That's the capital cost. It's not divided between pieces from different
10 departments to make that amount. It's just the full amount. The magnitude of the
11 operating cost for our purposes usually does revert back to Community Service because
12 they're the ones that mostly maintain or do the programming themselves. That then cost
13 would mostly be on Community Services to cover the operating cost or the upgrade, the
14 maintenance, the continued programming costs that are associated with that. It's all those
15 costs that allow it to keep going after it's been implemented.

16
17 Chair Lauing: The purpose of this, Peter, I think it's just so you can with the dollar signs,
18 one, two or three, just give indication of the scope. It doesn't even necessarily have
19 anything to do with prioritization.

20
21 Mr. Jensen: No, it does not.

22
23 Chair Lauing: It's just kind of giving a hit that this one is expensive, this one's cheap.

24
25 Mr. Jensen: It's giving you an insight. That's basically what it's for in our purposes.

26
27 Vice Chair Knopper: It's not like a—it says some projects will likely be funded through
28 other departments, etc., and the order of. That particular measure is not being used as a
29 ranking specifically. It's just like this is going to cost plus \$5 million.

30
31 Mr. Jensen: Right. It's to give you an idea of how much something is going to cost. If
32 you're looking at something that is a program that doesn't have a lot of upfront cost, that
33 may be a consideration in the long run for how high it is on a prioritization list, because
34 you could maybe do it faster. That's more about sequencing though. That's the other
35 thing to talk about. The list is scored on the criteria which doesn't base a lot on how
36 much something costs. We're trying to rank a list that doesn't really look at that.

37
38 Vice Chair Knopper: (crosstalk) the criteria.

39
40 Mr. Jensen: We just want to know what we'd like to have. The next step of that is to
41 look at the sequencing which we'd start to look at how much something cost. From our

1 previous discussion before about capital improvement and getting the budget for new
2 projects, you can see that it is kind of this five-year program that goes along.

3
4 Chair Lauing: That's good.

5
6 Vice Chair Knopper: Thank you.

7
8 Chair Lauing: Other comments on this? Commissioner Hetterly.

9
10 Commissioner Hetterly: Should we expect for most of these that there would be a capital
11 cost and an operating cost associated with most of the projects and programs?

12
13 Mr. Jensen: Most of them, yes.

14
15 Commissioner Hetterly: Is there also—does the capital incorporate the staff cost for the
16 construction, creation, if it's a facility? If it's a facility, there's a lot of management that
17 staff does to get it up and running. That's different from the ongoing annual staff cost.

18
19 Mr. Jensen: Yes.

20
21 Commissioner Hetterly: Where does that money—which bucket does that money ...

22
23 Mr. Jensen: That comes from the capital cost.

24
25 Commissioner Hetterly: That goes in the capital cost. My only comment would be I
26 think that it would be nice to start at a lower number on the magnitude of capital cost.
27 Like have up to 500,000, and then 500,000 to 1 million, and up from there. Simply
28 because I think there are several items on the list that wouldn't come close to that, and it
29 does distinguish them. Thanks.

30
31 Chair Lauing: Any others? I just had a very simple one. You have order of magnitude
32 operating impact. I don't know why you wouldn't want to just use the word cost. That's
33 the whole point of that analysis, this is going to cost something or not.

34
35 Vice Chair Knopper: Sorry, a follow up. With regard to the operating impact, that's
36 within an annual year or a fiscal year. That's a question. The 200,000 per one year, so
37 it's an annual cost, just to clarify.

38
39 Commissioner Cowie: Are there likely to be any projects that have significant cost
40 savings in them?

41
42 Mr. Jensen: You mean eventually after you implement them?

1
2 Commissioner Cowie: Just from an operating standpoint. I know you lump zero and
3 negative as all the same. If there are any with sign negatives, it seems like that ought to
4 be called out separately. I mean, significant savings, that ought to be called out
5 separately. I think we ought to know the distinction between something that's essentially
6 a wash and something that actually saves a significant amount of money.

7
8 Chair Lauing: You want to go on to the second one then?

9
10 Mr. Jensen: Yes. The second part of the discussion about the criteria and the scoring and
11 the weighting. Last time we had a discussion, and a few Commissioners thought that the
12 criteria itself should be weighted, that the first three criteria carried more weight than the
13 last two as far as scoring goes. We were proposing a system of zero to five for the
14 scoring of that. We want to get more feedback on is zero to three okay for the scoring of
15 those last two items or do you want to take it down to two. I think it was felt by the
16 consultant that an odd number usually helps when you add them together to offset ones
17 that are matching. They felt that the odd number was easier for scoring purposes. I don't
18 know if that's true or not, because I haven't scored them all yet. That was their
19 recommendation for that. I just would like further feedback on that.

20
21 Chair Lauing: The ad hoc has had a lot of discussion on that point as well. I don't need
22 to do all the talking, if one of you guys would like to chat about that issue.

23
24 Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm not sure why the last two are even on the last. For
25 example, maximize public resources. We're costing these things and we're also rating
26 them. Wouldn't that maximizing public resource—can you clarify what maximizing
27 public resources means? Is it bang for the buck or is it something else?

28
29 Mr. Jensen: That's a good explanation of it, yes. Depending on the amount of funding
30 that you have and what we are trying to achieve with the Master Plan, do we want to tie
31 up our money with a large-scale project which some of them will be or do we want to
32 space that out over many different opportunities, projects and programs that have
33 impacts? That is something to consider.

34
35 Chair Lauing: We were just wondering if it was a little bit of motherhood and apple pie
36 that could be taken care of by very good judgment on the part of staff as they're making
37 those recommendations. Kristy.

38
39 Kristen O'Kane: I think one of the other intents of that was to not just consider internal
40 funding from the City but also external funding, partnerships, that might—one example is
41 if you look at the first three criteria, if you end up with things that are equally weighted
42 from the first three criteria, you could apply the maximize public resources, might help it

1 rise to the top if it is using partnerships and leveraging funding from other sources. That
2 might not just be internal funding.

3
4 Chair Lauing: We wouldn't have that data now to do the ranking. We wouldn't know if it
5 could be ...

6
7 Ms. O'Kane: It would be for future projects, because the Master Plan is long term. As
8 future projects come in, that might be a way that we could have something stand out from
9 the others.

10
11 Chair Lauing: How would we use that now? If we were going to rate a project and there
12 was a guess that we could get help building something, would that mean that that would
13 get a zero? Or would it get a three because there's a high guess? I don't quite get that
14 one.

15
16 Ms. O'Kane: It may be more applicable just to the future projects as opposed to the
17 rankings now.

18
19 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Hetterly.

20
21 Commissioner Hetterly: The other tricky thing about that, I think, is in terms of where
22 we might be able to leverage private funding or outside funding of some sort for certain
23 kinds of things, but particularly private funding. If it can be scored highly in the scoring
24 criteria that's applied to various things, you do run the risk then of giving a lot of points to
25 a project that a particular funder really wants to have but may not fit with what the
26 community needs. I think there's a risk of shifting the energies and focus of the City
27 towards projects just because there's money. Just because there's money for something
28 doesn't necessarily mean that we should do it. That, for me, is part of why I think that
29 should have a lower limit for scoring than the top three items.

30
31 Commissioner Moss: I do think it should stay there. It helps us with low-hanging fruit.
32 Also the example for you, the Paly High School swimming pool would not have been
33 built without the funding of somebody else. I think it should be here. Zero to three is
34 fine. You're going to tell us whether it's zero to three. We're not going to tell you; you're
35 going to tell us whether it's zero to three based on what the staff has heard about other
36 projects that may dovetail with this one. Right?

37
38 Mr. de Geus: That's right. I would add in addition to the potential funding opportunity,
39 there could be other opportunities. I'm trying to think of an example. Let's say the Junior
40 Museum was a little further along, and it was actually going to happen, and we knew that.
41 There was a project sort of adjacent to that or reasonably close, and there could be an
42 opportunity to create a synergy between a playground and the Junior Museum, and

1 maximize the public benefit by doing it at the same time so there isn't as much disruption.
2 Another example might be the Baylands Interpretive Center which is already underway,
3 and we have a CIP related to doing something. If a project on the list relates to the
4 Interpretive Center that further enhances what we're trying to do there, and we're already
5 sort of planning a construction project, it could rise for that reason too. We're already in
6 there and doing work.

7
8 Chair Lauing: Does that raise the same question which is you don't know that now?

9
10 Mr. de Geus: We know some of that now.

11
12 Chair Lauing: You'll have to make that decision in three years or five years or whatever.

13
14 Mr. de Geus: I think it's probably more relevant sort of as a working model for thinking
15 about how we develop future projects. There are plans underway now that we do know
16 of. The Baylands Interpretive Center is an example. We know that is happening now.

17
18 Chair Lauing: Keith.

19
20 Commissioner Reckdahl: Why wouldn't we have the net cost on the previous page, all
21 those costs be net costs? That's the cost to the City. If private sources are helping us, that
22 reduces the cost. Then just purely grade the project on are they a good project or not.
23 For every project we have, this is the grading for the quality of the project, this is the cost
24 of the project. That to me seems a simpler approach. You have one score for quality and
25 one score for cost as opposed to mucking it up and having (crosstalk).

26
27 Chair Lauing: Right now there's no score for cost. That was what we were saying in the
28 earlier session, that we're not going to use cost as a score. We're going to use it as an
29 indicator. If we need something that's \$50 million instead of \$1 million, it needs to be on
30 the 25-year plan. It's just sort of a signal as to the cost.

31
32 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Knopper.

33
34 Vice Chair Knopper: I kind of feel like this line item should be called private/public
35 partnership, because that's basically what we're talking about, or maybe state/federal as
36 well. It almost should be a tick box, like you check yes, this project probably has the
37 opportunity based on our knowledge, what's happening in the state and other
38 communities. It's almost like check yes, this is something that we should pursue versus a
39 numeric. You don't want to unfairly weight a project as other Commissioners were just
40 saying. If there's a check, go, this project could potentially, if the City is going to
41 actively be seeking that private/public partnership, if that is something that we're
42 committing to moving forward.

1
2 Mr. de Geus: I think the intent of this maximize public resources is beyond partnerships.
3 I think partnerships is one of them, but how it's defined now is create the most impact for
4 each dollar of capital and operating expenditure possible. Another way I read that is if
5 it's low cost but high impact, it's going to impact in a positive way a lot of people, then
6 that's something to consider to give it more points than something that has low impact
7 and affects s smaller number of people.
8

9 Chair Lauing: You see it as quantitative. If it affects 200 people instead of 2 people, that
10 would get more points in this category?
11

12 Mr. de Geus: It would be something to consider and think through yeah.
13

14 Vice Chair Knopper: Wouldn't that be realize multiple benefit? I mean, this is maximize
15 public resources, so you're speaking—I hate to be the (inaudible). Resource, to me,
16 equals the dollar sign. For instance, your example of the Junior Museum and Zoo they're
17 building. This would be a great opportunity for us to kind of swoop in and develop the
18 adjacency in Rinconada Park. This is how maybe their architect can give us a little bit of
19 this and that. All of a sudden our \$1 got \$100 worth of benefit. That's maximizing
20 resource. To me, this means money, not people ...
21

22 Mr. de Geus: You could spend say \$100,000 on a project. The impact it has on residents
23 and people that are interested in that particular activity, whatever that might be, that you
24 consider that. That could be a high number or a medium number or a low number.
25 Maximizing the resource, you may consider this is going to affect more people and
26 improve the quality of life for more people; therefore, it's a better use of that \$100,000
27 there than the lower number.
28

29 Chair Lauing: Trying to evaluate how many people it's going to impact isn't always easy
30 either. I wish it were, because I think there should be some quantitative thing in here. If
31 two people say we need cricket fields and they're massive, we can't do that. If 5,000 did,
32 I think we've got to consider it. There are other things like that piece of art is wonderful
33 and 50,000 people might go by it, so we should put \$2 million on it. It just doesn't work
34 completely quantitative that way. I don't know; maybe there's some way you could
35 combine the last two. That's also an efficiency if you can get some multiple benefits. If
36 you could play basketball and soccer and have a dog park. Again, to me, these are
37 seeming sort of like excellent management that you guys are going to do. I'm not sure
38 how that in the initial weighting gets scored. Maybe that's the issue; we should have a
39 scoring system for the initial weighting for the Master Plan, and then an ongoing here's
40 how you start to evaluate new projects going forward.
41

1 Commissioner Hetterly: Just to move off those last two and focus on the first two for a
2 second. One of the things that I struggle with, as I was thinking about projects and how
3 they would go through a scoring and trying to list what do I think, based on what I've
4 seen, are the gaps or what do I think are the community preferences based on what I've
5 learned from this process. I found that there was a lot of overlap between the two. A lot
6 of the gaps are things the community wants, but not necessarily consistent overlap. I
7 found further that, as I was thinking about gaps, many of the gaps I identified as this is a
8 significant gap was based on the community input. When you're scoring it if you give
9 five points for it fills an existing gap, and then you say that gap is a community
10 preference that ranked highly in the survey or whatever, you give it 5 points again. That
11 projects gets 10 points for addressing a critical, unmet need. Whereas, one that the
12 community identifies as a gap, but the City hadn't yet identified it as a cap or vice versa
13 that the City knows from your work running programs or running facilities that we really
14 need this new facility in order to keep operating properly. That counts to me as an
15 existing gap. Maybe it's an urgent and vital and important existing gap, but the
16 community might not be aware of it at all. That one doesn't get double points for critical,
17 unmet need. I struggled with how those two elements crisscross inconsistently and
18 wonder if it doesn't twist the evaluation somehow.

19
20 Mr. de Geus: I've been thinking about this a lot too, how would this play out. I had that
21 same sort of scenario running through. What would happen in that scenario? I think if
22 there was address community preferences and that came through strongly, then I think it
23 will be an existing gap. I don't think we as staff or Commission will say, "We're not
24 going to agree. It's not a gap." I think it will get the double points. On the other hand,
25 the other way, if we didn't hear it through the outreach—we know the outreach was pretty
26 comprehensive, but we didn't get everything. There's some gaps that we've identified;
27 staff or the Commission together we've identified. That's why it's still there and it gets
28 points. Right?

29
30 Commissioner Hetterly: Right.

31
32 Mr. de Geus: But it might not get points on the community preference, but we've
33 identified it. Do you follow me?

34
35 Commissioner Hetterly: You think it's appropriate for double points if we identify it and
36 they identify it.

37
38 Mr. de Geus: Yes.

39
40 Commissioner Hetterly: Then the question becomes how do you make that fill existing
41 gaps list. If you were making a list of the top ten gaps, do they come from us or you or
42 do they come from the community preference?

1
2 Mr. de Geus: It comes from all three. Together we come up with that list.

3
4 Commissioner Hetterly: I'll have to think on that some more.

5
6 Chair Lauing: One other thing we talked about in the ad hoc is should we weight existing
7 gaps more heavily because some existing gaps, as Commissioner Hetterly said, you guys
8 know more about than we do, even as close as we are, or many citizens. If there's a
9 safety issue, like curtains that are going to burn up in the Children's Theatre, then we
10 need to fix that. That's a gap. We wouldn't want it to come across for any reason to be
11 distorted that we're not giving full weight to the community input. That's the problem
12 with that. That's not really true; we're just trying to say that there are some gaps that
13 folks don't know about, so they wouldn't be able to opine on that.

14
15 Mr. de Geus: One approach we could take is—I'm just brainstorming a little bit here—
16 does it fill an existing gap or is it a community preference. If it hits either one of those, it
17 gets the same points.

18
19 Commissioner Hetterly: That's kind of what I was (inaudible).

20
21 Commissioner Cowie: Aren't all the top three proxies for demand?

22
23 Mr. de Geus: I think the ...

24
25 Chair Lauing: The third is more of a forecast than demand.

26
27 Mr. de Geus: That's what I was going to say.

28
29 Commissioner Cowie: But they're all about demand, right?

30
31 Mr. de Geus: It's going to be a gap if it's not a gap already.

32
33 Commissioner Cowie: Yeah. The bottom two are ROI essentially.

34
35 Commissioner Hetterly: The first one might not necessarily be about demand. If it's a
36 facility repair that's vitally important to keep the gym open, that's unaffected by whether
37 demand for a gym is going up or down.

38
39 Commissioner Cowie: I don't think you would prioritize it highly if the demand was
40 going down, if nobody wanted to use a gym anymore. I do think there is potential for us
41 to perhaps attribute too much significance to the numbers when the categories seem to

1 be—I mean, I raised this point last time. It feels like we're covering the same ground to a
2 certain extent. There seems like a lot of redundancy to me.

3
4 Chair Lauing: When you say the numbers, do you mean the scoring system?

5
6 Commissioner Cowie: Yeah, yeah. I think the first three are all really going after
7 demand. I think the last two are ROI.

8
9 Chair Lauing: Another thing that the ad hoc has talked about—by the way, we decided
10 not to do a report but just to chime in here just to make it more collegial. We talked
11 about a lot of different things. Now I forgot what we talked about. I just blanked out on
12 what the actual point was. I know what it was. We think that collectively this group
13 from the big study and everything else could probably at the retreat in two weeks sit
14 down and come up with the top 20 things that this City ought to be doing based on all of
15 this stuff without having any calculators in our hand. If it was top 25, 26 down is a little
16 bit different. Then it gets into more judgment and tradeoffs. Maybe we should do this
17 first thing at our retreat. That would kind of show that this kind of meticulous scoring of
18 400 projects by this for the initial sorting may not be essential.

19
20 Commissioner Cowie: I guess I just worry that we're going to end up spending a lot of
21 time trying to be precise about something that really doesn't beg precision.

22
23 Chair Lauing: Or worse.

24
25 Commissioner Cowie: I think I fundamentally agree with you.

26
27 Chair Lauing: We could have some of these things that really shouldn't be used as
28 scoring, like public partnerships pushing something up on the list. We're all trying to get
29 it right. We're all on the same page here.

30
31 Mr. de Geus: I do think it's important that we have a process that we can defend and we
32 can share and that's transparent. This is the process that we've come up with, the scoring
33 and trying to identify how we would come up with the top 20 or the long list and put
34 them in some order. I don't doubt we could come up with that just by spending a day
35 together and really sort of thinking it through. We need to define that filter that we're
36 working with and agree on that criteria. I think the public wants to see that and the
37 Council will want to see how did we come up with the top 20 or whatever the number is.
38 These seem pretty reasonable to me. I think you're right we shouldn't spend a whole lot
39 of time thinking about whether it should be zero to five or zero to seven. These are five
40 really important sort of criteria that we think are important. I think there's a lot of overlap
41 as well. How do we use this set of criteria to actually have that conversation to come up
42 with that top tier of policies, programs, projects is the question.

1
2 Chair Lauing: Just to address your question, I would suggest that if you could have a
3 very specific, written definition of what the last two really mean so that whoever is
4 scoring would know what they're scoring; if it does include public partnerships, if it does
5 include overlaps with four and five. Let's get the overlaps out so we'll know what the
6 scoring should be. Then we can figure out what the weighting should be. I think we
7 have agreed and it sounds like you folks have agreed that some weighting is appropriate.
8 Now we're just talking about these last two mostly and a little bit of overlap on one and
9 two. Were you finished?

10
11 Commissioner Cowie: Yeah, I think so. I mean, I think fundamentally I agree with what
12 Rob is saying. I worry that we're trying to be too precise and go around and around
13 trying to hit it exactly right. I'm just not sure the effort is worth it.

14
15 Commissioner Reckdahl: The thing I'm concerned about is that we'll rate them. We'll
16 score them all, do all this work giving them 2s or 3s or 4s, all this effort. We look at the
17 list and say that one shouldn't be that high, and we'll go back. We'll tweak it until we get
18 the list the way we want it. Then just form the list directly. Why should we muck around
19 with 3s and 4s?

20
21 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Moss.

22
23 Commissioner Moss: After listening to all this discussion, I view these as your way of
24 telling us important information that we can use to help you prioritize. You're not asking
25 us for this. We're asking you to give us these scores and the definitions, as
26 Commissioner Lauing said, so that it will help us to help you. I would like as much
27 information as I can get from you in order to better help you. If you feel comfortable
28 about these five categories and you can define them well for me, I'll be happy to take
29 your input and give you feedback.

30
31 Chair Lauing: If we are going to agree to chat about this at the retreat, which makes
32 sense because it's only the major thing we have to do in 2016, how would you like us to
33 address that? Beforehand or in the retreat? More of this kind of discussion or the ad hoc
34 meets again to kind of process it and sort of shape it?

35
36 Mr. de Geus: I think it would be good to have the ad hoc meet again with staff to try and
37 set it up so we have a productive retreat. I think the retreat represents a real opportunity
38 and a unique time to have this discussion to think about what are those top policies,
39 programs, projects that are going to move those areas of focus and really influence the
40 principles that we've defined as important for the whole system. We have to set it up
41 right though, because otherwise we could spend all day talking about lots and lots of

1 options. I think that's a good idea, Chair Lauing, that we meet again in advance of the
2 retreat. When is the retreat by the way? Do we have a date?

3
4 Chair Lauing: The fifth.

5
6 Mr. de Geus: It's pretty quick. I wonder whether it might be better to postpone it a little
7 later so that we can provide the kind of detailed information that, I think, the Commission
8 is going to need to be able to help with the prioritization. I'm not sure we're there or will
9 be there by the fifth. You'll need it in advance as well so you can have a chance to think
10 it through.

11
12 Mr. Jensen: I think it would be beneficial to take an initial stab at ranking the list per the
13 criteria and scoring that we have and looking at that list at the retreat that you're going to
14 have and get an actual list of how it plays out and then have that further discussion more.
15 Did that criteria work of scoring that? How do we feel about that list? Do we need to
16 apply another scoring or need to revise that of how that needs to go? I think that's more
17 fruitful for your conversation that day of looking at the list and developing it, to have
18 actually a ranked list and then just, as we've been talking about, that we're going to rank
19 it. I would like to get to that point where you have that, we can see how the process
20 went, have a further discussion about that. We haven't really discussed that option yet
21 with staff on that process, but I think that would be beneficial for you.

22
23 Chair Lauing: Any comments on that?

24
25 Vice Chair Knopper: Will the list be, especially since we have three new Commissioners
26 who just dove into the deep end really quickly on the Master Plan, cold meaning—this is
27 the last list that I saw which is like 700 million lines of data.

28
29 Chair Lauing: It's a lot shorter now.

30
31 Vice Chair Knopper: It's a lot shorter and with more specific information per project.
32 That feels doable.

33
34 Mr. Jensen: I think that there is further discussion just with the Commission, the ad hoc
35 and staff of the list itself and how it breaks down. I've had now a few weeks to really
36 delve into the list and look at it and break it apart. I have some ideas about how it can be
37 simplified and broken into segments that make sense on scoring them, that we need to
38 have further conversations about. That is evolving. This is definitely going to be an
39 evolving thing. At some point, I think, for your conversational point it would be nice to
40 get just to a prioritized list that we can start looking at and discussing. I think that would
41 be a good use of time for your retreat to do. I think Rob is right. I think February 5th is
42 too soon to have that list put together.

1
2 Chair Lauing: Did you have a comment?
3

4 Commissioner Hetterly: I have two comments. One is about the retreat. We don't want
5 to lose sight of the fact that the retreat is really important for organizing our work and our
6 thinking for the year to come. We don't want to displace that activity which is important
7 with an exclusive focus on the Master Plan which frankly we should be having in a more
8 public setting. I think we have to be careful about the balance there in terms of what
9 we're going to do at the retreat. Secondly, in terms of the list, one of the things that the
10 ad hoc was concerned about was that the list was very long and included a lot of stuff that
11 was really tactical decisions, that didn't have anything to do with policy or strategy that
12 would be guided or represented by or in the Master Plan. I don't think it's an efficient
13 way to move forward to have the full Commission going through every single item on a
14 long list, to do that kind of review. I don't know how much shorter the list is now, but I
15 think it would be very helpful to have it sorted out, kind of policy questions, major
16 strategic choices, that kind of thing. I hope that that's the direction we're headed.
17

18 Chair Lauing: I didn't understand that the assignment is to do that again, what we did last
19 time, before the retreat. It was just to kind of get a look at what your prioritization was to
20 date, so to speak. It's always hard to reschedule retreats. That could be another issue
21 here. I completely agree with Commissioner Hetterly that there's other sort of policy
22 issues and organization that we want to address, so we'll all know what the options are.
23 We could do an extra special meeting, if we need to do that, on just this topic if we don't
24 have time in the retreat. We could start the retreat with our organizational stuff to make
25 sure we get that done before we move to the Master Plan which we would then decide if
26 we can get it done or we have to schedule an extra meeting. We could do either of those
27 two things without probably changing the date. I don't have any problem with changing
28 the date as a policy matter. It's just it's always hard to schedule, because we did the
29 doodle poll. I don't know how much flexibility you had when you sent that out. That
30 didn't pass.
31

32 Commissioner Hetterly: I would suggest we keep the date if it works for everybody and
33 use it for the non-Master Plan. Don't use it for the "what do we do with the list" question.
34

35 Commissioner Reckdahl: We also could do the Master Plan and stuff but just stay at a
36 high level.
37

38 Commissioner Moss: That was what I was going to suggest.
39

40 Commissioner Cowie: I was going to say the same thing.
41

42 Commissioner Moss: If we could see something just to start, that would be great.

1
2 Chair Lauing: We need to do that as the second agenda item to make sure we get to the
3 first part. I don't mean 50/50 necessarily. I'm just saying batting order to make sure that
4 we get to some of the other stuff.

5
6 Mr. de Geus: I'm just not sure what staff would be bringing forward. We don't want to
7 bring something that's half done to the Commission.

8
9 Chair Lauing: Totally agree. Don't rush it for that date. If you don't have it, then maybe
10 we have to schedule a special meeting to stay on track.

11
12 Mr. de Geus: On the other hand, can we still use the retreat to some way advance the
13 work of the Master Plan? We may be concurrently working ...

14
15 Chair Lauing: I think we can.

16
17 Mr. de Geus: ... on the list, but then we hear from the Commission sort of a fresh
18 perspective about what do you see as the top, at least for the Commissioners that have
19 been a part of it for a long time. The new Commissioners have been doing a lot of
20 reading. What rises to the top in terms of policy and projects for you absent any list?

21
22 Chair Lauing: That we definitely want to do. Also I think that we could have another
23 discussion about the prioritization, because you said you're going to think about that a bit
24 in terms of what we're talking about here.

25
26 Mr. de Geus: I think that could work.

27
28 Chair Lauing: That's the plan? We basically already talked about item 3 on your list
29 here?

30
31 Mr. Jensen: Yes.

32
33 Chair Lauing: The ad hoc had one other thought which we actually spent again a lot of
34 time on. The areas of focus which were sort of drivers to the Plan. We looked at that and
35 have some suggestions for the discussion of the entire Commission. There are 12 areas
36 of focus. We thought there was a little bit of overlap in some of those. We're doing a
37 handout in place of some of the work that we've done in the last few days. There's some
38 for staff; although, I sent it in advance.

39
40 Mr. Jensen: The documents you're getting does have the areas of focus on it, but I did
41 also include the principles and the criteria on there. If you want to read all those
42 definitions, they are in that package.

1
2 Chair Lauing: The document that Peter passed out shows the existing areas of focus on
3 page 2 and 3. Again, as we've had the ad hoc meeting with staff, we thought about the
4 areas of focus could evolve here as the next phase of the Master Plan as being kind of the
5 objective, going beyond the guiding principles to the objectives. As objectives
6 particularly, they didn't work we didn't think—that's for you guys to decide—in the
7 context of these areas of focus. Two of these were consolidated. The first being there
8 were two items on programs, one about existing programs and another on new programs.
9 The idea was to just combine that into talking about we need to have a rich assortment of
10 programs and classes to meet various needs of residents of all ages and abilities to cover
11 both of those. The second being there was very specific language on sports fields and
12 dogs and things like that. We decided, as we talked about it, that maybe it was really a
13 broader issue the way to balance and serve the needs of user groups that are both sizeable
14 and underserved for the various dedicated facility space to cover things like dogs and
15 fields and potentially pools and things like that. That's an item of feedback. Other ad hoc
16 members can speak. Commissioner Hetterly.

17
18 Commissioner Hetterly: Just to give a little more context to that. The areas of focus
19 evolved as a tool to reach out to the public to help them prioritize among various kinds of
20 investments. Where do they want to make the most ... I think that's why sports fields and
21 dog parks were called out specifically, because those were particular things. It seems like
22 most of the groupings really taken together describe what we want the parks and rec
23 system to look like. That's why we're trying to see if we can make some minor changes
24 to make this still useful in the kind of overarching organizational sense for the Master
25 Plan. Those were some that we thought could be consolidated into a more generalized
26 piece. We'd love to have your input. Do you think that's a good idea, bad idea? Are
27 these ...

28
29 Chair Lauing: Not to mention when we did it, we were down to ten which made it sound
30 very scientific. Ten items only, not 11 or 12. Any comments?

31
32 Commissioner Cowie: Looks good.

33
34 Commissioner Cribbs: I think it looks good.

35
36 Vice Chair Knopper: Yep, looks good.

37
38 Commissioner Reckdahl: Did staff have any comments?

39
40 Chair Lauing: We talked about it with you, but then we wordsmithed it since we ...
41

1 Commissioner Hetterly: We told you we were going to do it, but I know you didn't get to
2 see it until late this afternoon.

3
4 Mr. de Geus: Yeah, we haven't seen it. We got it today. I want to look at it a little bit
5 and think about it.

6
7 Chair Lauing: I think it can still be tweaked. We wanted to get feedback from the
8 Commission Members as to if the consolidation kind of made sense, which we're getting
9 pretty unanimous approval on that.

10
11 Commissioner Hetterly: We're not going to call on you to say yes or no, just throw it out
12 there. I think we have general support.

13
14 Chair Lauing: Are there any other Master Plan items that we should review tonight?
15 (crosstalk) Commission that they want to ask about?

16
17 Mr. Jensen: I guess there is some next steps. We are planning on having the community
18 prioritization meeting on February 11th. That will be at the Embarcadero Room, 6:30 to
19 8:00. That will be the in-person community meeting that goes along with the
20 prioritization challenge. That's basically very similar to what you do online, but there is
21 much more group discussion with that and breaking different interests down into different
22 groups to start a conversation on the prioritization and then how that money can be
23 arranged. It's very similar to the online challenge as its format. It just allows more
24 interaction and discussion with people since we have a community group in the room.
25 That's on the 11th. We also are looking at having the third stakeholder meeting which
26 will also introduce the prioritization to get some feedback from them on that process.
27 We're looking at doing it on February 18th. Those are kind of the next big steps of this.

28
29 Chair Lauing: Neither of those meetings will have prior knowledge of what the online
30 survey said?

31
32 Mr. de Geus: When is it closing?

33
34 Mr. Jensen: The survey is closing on the 5th. We will have some results from that that
35 we (crosstalk) really share.

36
37 Chair Lauing: Published results?

38
39 Mr. Jensen: Yeah.

40
41 Chair Lauing: It could be more of a debate then if community members say no, that's not
42 right. Just checking.

1
2 Mr. Jensen: Currently, we are up to approximately 600 surveys filled out in full. There's
3 about the same amount that have been partially filled out that need to be looked at to see
4 how close they got to the end. We have been generating quite a bit of activity on the
5 prioritization challenge which is good.

6
7 Chair Lauing: Great. I mean, it does feel like we're making progress, and we're doing
8 the tweaks, and we're working together on it, and we're going to get there. It's just we've
9 got to plow through and be innovative and inspirational to get to the right answers.

10
11 Mr. Jensen: I think definitely last night's study session with Council was definitely a
12 hurdle over way to move forward. I think that definitely helped out with the process.

13
14 **6. Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates.**

15
16 Chair Lauing: The next item on the agenda is any other ad hoc committee or liaison
17 updates. Any additional ones? We covered CIP. We covered Master Plan and dogs. No
18 others, okay.

19
20 **V. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

21
22 Chair Lauing: Comments and announcements other than the published February 5th. I
23 just wanted to reinforce congratulations to Rob for building out his staff. Congratulations
24 to our new liaison. We'll try to go easy on you, but there's a lot of work. There's a lot of
25 work. And supervisors. We feel relieved for you, Rob. We just have to say that. You've
26 just been soldiering on without your troops there and doing great work 24/7.

27
28 Rob de Geus: I appreciate the Commission's support and soldiering on with me. Chair
29 Lauing helped with the interview process; I think I mentioned it last time. You guys do a
30 great job. I should mention Keith was there last night until the end, 11:30, with us on
31 this. Thank you.

32
33 Commissioner Reckdahl: One thing I did want to point out. Last night, the Council was
34 very positive. At the last meeting, the Council had a lot of attitude. They weren't happy
35 with some of the principles and things like that. They were very receptive. In fact, I
36 think one of the—was it Cory—said that he liked the principles, but most people did not
37 dwell on that. It was good feedback.

38
39 Chair Lauing: Did you have any follow-up comment on that?
40



1 Council Member Filseth: I can't speak for the whole Council. I think it's moved the
2 needle quite a bit since the previous meeting. I think there was a lot of happiness at
3 seeing that. I think good stuff.
4

5 Chair Lauing: Thanks. Commissioner Moss.
6

7 Commissioner Moss: One of the things that came out at yesterday's meeting was that
8 there should be a sustainability representative at all of these meetings, because everything
9 we do seems to have some component. Are you representing that here or is there some
10 other way to do that?
11

12 Mr. de Geus: I'm very aware of that. Sustainability is a theme that's embedded and needs
13 to be embedded in all of the planning that's happening right now, from the Comp Plan
14 and of course the Sustainability/Climate Action Plan and also the Parks Master Plan
15 among a number of other efforts. We're working closely with Gil Friend, the Chief
16 Sustainability Officer. He's reviewing all of these documents and will be reviewing the
17 list of projects and priorities that we put forward. It's definitely us, but we're working
18 closely with Gil as well.
19

20 Commissioner Moss: I thought I heard three things. One was the canopy and the impact
21 on our use of resources, also drought-tolerant plants and things, and then also the parking.
22 The amount of space for parking today versus what we'll need in the future and how
23 much of that could we turn into parkland, or something like that.
24

25 Chair Lauing: Did you have other announcements, Rob?
26

27 Mr. de Geus: I know that Kristen has a few, but I have a couple. There's a Council
28 retreat this Saturday at Mitchell Park. It starts at 9:00 as the formal start. There's a little
29 coffee and so on before. It runs until 2:00, I think. It's their annual retreat where they
30 discuss priorities for 2016. That'll be pretty interesting if you would like to attend. On
31 February 8th, the Community Services Element of the Comprehensive Plan goes to the
32 Council for review. It was February 1st, and it's pushed out a week. I wanted to let the
33 Commission know about that. That's something that we've been working on with the
34 Planning Department. This is the first element the Council's going to review of the
35 Comprehensive Plan. It's the work of the Citizen Advisory Committee largely, which
36 Commissioner Hetterly sits on. That could be very interesting to the Commission to tune
37 into as well. I wasn't going to bring up the golf course, unless you were. You probably
38 know more about the golf course than I do. There is some movement on the golf course.
39 The JPA is in a position now where they're really feeling more confident that they can
40 start their project even this year in fact, which could have an impact on the golf course.
41 One of the first things they need to do is move some utility, gas lines and other things.

1 It's starting to become more real that the golf course may also get its permits, and we can
2 close and actually start the project. Do you know any more than that, Kristen?

3
4 Kristen O'Kane: We had a meeting with Public Works today. Mike Robb [phonetic] said
5 the conflict with the golf course is the gas line that runs alongside the golf course. That
6 needs to be relocated for the JPA's project. We're talking with Public Works on what that
7 means for the golf course, because it will impact some holes. We're in dialog with Public
8 Works to sort of figure out what that means for the golf course if we don't also get our
9 permits in time to do construction at the same time.

10
11 Commissioner Hetterly: Is that because of a redesign of the JPA project? Is this new
12 news?

13
14 Mr. de Geus: No, it's not. Where the gas line is right now, if it stays there, the levee
15 would be right on top of it, because the levee's moving out. They have to move the gas
16 line out.

17
18 Ms. O'Kane; I have just a couple of announcements on some events that are coming up
19 and some events that we just had. On January 18th was the celebration for Dr. Martin
20 Luther King Day at Mitchell Community Center. This was a collaboration with the
21 Youth Community Service as well as the City of Palo Alto. We had over 200 attendees.
22 There were activities for kids. There were performances, food trucks. It was a great
23 event. Also, Mayor Burt spoke as well as East Palo Alto Council Member Carlos
24 Romero. Also on Friday, January 22nd, the Mitchell Park Teen Center held its grand
25 opening for The Drop which is a safe place for teens to go on Fridays from 6:00 to 9:00
26 p.m. We had about 60 teens stop by for the grand opening. This will be a recurring event
27 that happens every Friday at Mitchell as well. Coming up Saturday, February 6th, the
28 Palo Alto Youth Council is hosting the Palo Alto Strong, a teen movement to promote
29 resiliency and empathy, at Mitchell Park Community Center. This will focus on sharing
30 ideas to maintain social, mental and physical well-being for teens. The 2016 summer
31 camp and aquatics catalog comes out tomorrow. Following that, on Saturday,
32 February 20th, is our registration fair for the summer camp and aquatics program. That
33 will be from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. at Mitchell Park Community Center. A lot going on
34 and a lot of fun things happening.

35
36 Peter Jensen: I will touch on some projects. I give a lot of credit to CSD for overseeing
37 the Monroe Park renovation which is completed. If you haven't been by there yet, I
38 would encourage you to go by to see that. It looks really good out there. We did have
39 bid openings today for Bowden Park, and they look pretty good. We should be starting
40 the renovation of Bowden Park in the next couple of months. We're scheduling right now
41 the community gardens irrigation mainline project. We have a contractor on board now

1 and just setting up the timeframe to start that, looking at the end of February for starting
2 that project.

3
4 Chair Lauing: Moving right along. Go ahead.

5
6 Commissioner Hetterly: I just have a quick question for you, Kristen. On The Drop,
7 Fridays from 6:00 to 9:00 p.m., is it like the old Drop that was after school, that kids
8 register and then they can come and go during those hours or is this a drop-in Friday
9 nights for anybody and everybody? Is it a different kind of ...

10
11 Mr. de Geus: I do know the answer. This is a new thing we're trying to attract high
12 school teens to utilize The Drop. We already are open every day after school between
13 3:00 and 6:00 or thereabouts. Largely, it attracts a lot of middle schoolers which is the
14 same as the old Teen Center. This is a great facility, and we have food and other things.
15 We really want high school teens to also see it as a space that they can hang out and be.
16 They like to hang out in the evenings. It's a new program really targeted for Palo Alto
17 high school students.

18
19 Chair Lauing: Yes, go ahead.

20
21 Commissioner Moss: The MLK event, I went by there afterwards. It was really well
22 attended. It got spillover to the park, because the Magical Playground had hundreds of
23 people who moved from the MLK event to the playground and to other parts of the park.
24 Anything we can do to encourage organizations like YCS to do more events like that and
25 take more advantage of the parks would be fantastic. I think we have a pretty good
26 relationship, but YCS does have choices. They also have events in East Palo Alto, and
27 they have events in Menlo Park. If we can continue to have them use Palo Alto parks,
28 that would be great.

29
30 Chair Lauing: Thank you.

31
32 **VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR FEBRUARY 23, 2016 MEETING**

33
34 Chair Lauing: The next item on the agenda is to make an agenda, actually two of them.
35 One for the next meeting on February 23rd. Let's do that first, and then segue back to the
36 agenda for the retreat which we've already actually talked about a little bit. We were
37 supposed to have the Boardwalk back on the agenda for this month, and it didn't happen.
38 Will that be ready for the next meeting? Yep, I think so.

39
40 Kristen O'Kane: Yes.

1 Chair Lauing: We know the dog parks needs to come back preferably as an action item,
2 if we can get through any of those barriers, particularly on the El Camino Park. Go
3 ahead. Did you have a comment on that?
4

5 Ms. O'Kane: No.
6

7 Chair Lauing: Sorry. Other items that anybody up here knows about? (crosstalk)
8

9 Rob de Geus: Just on the El Camino Park. I was going to mention it earlier. Because it's
10 not City-owned land and it's Stanford land and it has the complication of the transit
11 station and the future thinking of what might happen with that transit station, that's not a
12 barrier, but it's more of a complication than say the Mitchell Park idea of expanding that.
13 In talking with the City Manager about the option of a dog park at El Camino Park, while
14 he wasn't against the idea, he did feel it was important that we first connect with Stanford
15 on the possible concept and get their input before we get too far ahead in making
16 recommendations.
17

18 Chair Lauing: That's in process now, right?
19

20 Mr. de Geus: Right.
21

22 Chair Lauing: We've got a month.
23

24 Mr. de Geus: I'll see how far we get.
25

26 Chair Lauing: Are you aware of others at this point, agenda items?
27

28 Mr. de Geus: I'd mentioned a couple of months ago that we were looking at alternatives
29 for service delivery for the aquatics program at Rinconada pool. We have two
30 contractors out there already that run our masters program and run our competitive swim
31 program for youth, PASA. The City runs the lifeguarding program and the learn to swim
32 program. We've been really challenged on the City side, our program, to find enough
33 lifeguards and swim instructors to really meet the needs and demands of the summer use
34 and early spring use. I recommended that we put out an RFP to see if there are other
35 options that make sense for the community. We took that to Policy and Services
36 Committee as well and the Council just to make sure they were comfortable with that
37 approach. We put that RFP out and have gotten the responses. We're evaluating those
38 currently. Before we really make a recommendation on that, I think it'd be good to have
39 the Commission's perspective on our options. That could be something that we could do
40 in February, I think.
41

42 Chair Lauing: Do you have a comment?

1
2 Commissioner Hetterly: I would love to have an update on the Cubberley planning with
3 the School District, where that stands and what are the next steps.
4

5 Commissioner Reckdahl: We had talked about the cost of services study. The auditor
6 fee study was to be done late last year. The auditor fee study was to be underway, and it
7 was supposed to be done towards the end of the year.
8

9 Mr. de Geus: They haven't completed the study. I know they've started the study. It's
10 with the auditor's office. I'll have to see what the update is, because we haven't heard
11 from them for some time, not since before the new year. I'll have to see.
12

13 Commissioner Reckdahl: The auditor's fee study, what is that?
14

15 Mr. de Geus: They're looking at the cost of services study and the fee schedule, the
16 Municipal Fee Schedule, and seeing if they're aligned. In short, that's what they were
17 doing.
18

19 Commissioner Reckdahl: What's the status? The cost of services study was done and
20 completed, and it's been published.
21

22 Mr. de Geus: And approved.
23

24 Commissioner Reckdahl: Can you send out a link to that?
25

26 Mr. de Geus: I can.
27

28 Chair Lauing: If there's no obvious agenda items, which there may be by then. Sorry, go
29 ahead.
30

31 Commissioner Reckdahl: We also had Interpretive Center signage. Is that underway at
32 all?
33

34 Mr. de Geus: No, it's not underway yet.
35

36 Chair Lauing: Let's shift back over to the retreat. There's a couple of things that we've
37 traditionally done that I think folks think is helpful at the retreat. One is what we call sort
38 of a look back, just a quick summary on a page or two of the things that we've addressed
39 in the past year. I think it'd be particularly helpful this year with the new folks. There's
40 also sort of a look at what might be on our agenda to deal with in the future year. We
41 kind of try to winnow it down or prioritize it. You can guess that Master Plan is on there
42 for this year. We'll see what else can fit that is urgent and/or ideas that are brought to that

1 retreat by Commissioners or staff that we should take a look at. There's kind of a
2 structural piece where we look at what do we need to do to get these things moving,
3 which includes looking at the existing ad hoc committees and potential future ones that
4 we should form and/or reconstitute or dissolve so that we have kind of a logistical way
5 forward, which of course can be changed at any time and should be. Ad hocs should go
6 in and out of existence. That's kind of the mechanical and strategic part that we deal
7 with. That look back is always done by the Vice Chair. Congratulations, you have your
8 first assignment. Everything for the retreat is also done by you.

9
10 Vice Chair Knopper: That's a lie.

11
12 Chair Lauing: And you make the sandwiches.

13
14 Vice Chair Knopper: No.

15
16 Chair Lauing: Actually we get some help from folks on that. There's pretty good food at
17 that. That's sort of the overall view of it. We will try to figure out which part of the
18 Master Plan we can go into a little bit more depth on. We were also going to squeeze in
19 some time specifically to talk about dog parks as we discussed earlier tonight. Are there
20 any other things that I haven't covered? I know it's pretty general; it's not too specific.
21 Yeah.

22
23 Commissioner Cribbs: I'd like to hear a really short update of our relationship, the City's,
24 with the School District and how we're sharing facilities; where we intersect; if we don't,
25 what the opportunities are.

26
27 Chair Lauing: Okay. That's going to be a full four hours with lunch at the end. You're
28 not going to tell us what you're making though, right? That's that. Are there any other
29 items of discussion? Rob.

30
31 Mr. de Geus: Just happy Australia Day everyone.

32
33 Chair Lauing: I think we should have a motion to adjourn in honor of the Australian new
34 year.

35
36 **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

37
38 Chair Lauing: Do we have a motion to adjourn?

39
40 Meeting adjourned on motion by Commissioner Hetterly and second by Vice Chair
41 Knopper at 9:20 p.m. Passed 7-0