



**DRAFT**

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

**MINUTES  
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
August 23, 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:** Jim Cowie

16 **Others Present:**

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

19 **I. ROLL CALL CONDUCTED BY:** Amanda Deng

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

22  
23 Chair Lauing: Are there any agenda changes, requests or deletions?  
24

25 **III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

26  
27 Chair Lauing: I think there's one speaker card for an item that is not on the agenda, but a  
28 familiar face. David Carnahan.

29  
30 David Carnahan: Yes. Thank you, Chair Lauing and Commissioners. As you, I'm sure,  
31 know by now, if I'm here the City is recruiting for Boards and Commissions. Currently  
32 the City is looking to fill positions on the Historic Resources Board, the Parks and  
33 Recreation Commission, the Planning and Transportation Commission, and the Storm  
34 Drain Oversight Committee. One of the main reasons we come and speak at all of the  
35 Boards and Commissions is we encourage you, especially those of you whose terms are  
36 running out at the end of December, to reapply but more importantly that you reach out  
37 also for all the Boards and Commissions to members of the community that you know,  
38 that you think might be a good fit and also to get interested members of the public who



1 are watching or attending in person the information, making sure that they are aware. I'll  
2 try and do this very briefly. For Historic Resources Board, we're looking for three  
3 individuals, Parks and Recreation four, Planning and Transportation Commission three,  
4 and the Storm Drain Oversight Committee two. For all of these, the deadline is  
5 September 7th at 5:30 p.m. We'll have some flyers in the back, and I'll do a quick  
6 summary of the requirements. For the Historic Resources Board, one person does need to  
7 be a Palo Alto resident. All the other members don't need to be a resident, but there are a  
8 few spots for architects and a couple of other specific positions. The Planning and  
9 Transportation Commission does require Palo Alto residency. For the Parks and  
10 Recreation Commission, as all of you know, you need to be a Palo Alto resident and need  
11 to have a demonstrated interest in parks, open space, and recreation matters. For the  
12 Storm Drain Oversight Committee, members must be either a resident or an employee or  
13 owner of a Palo Alto business or an owner of real property within the City of Palo Alto.  
14 Again, deadline is September 7 at 5:30 p.m. We hope that you can spread the word for  
15 other members of the community to apply and also if your term is up soon, we hope that  
16 you will consider applying to continue serving. Thank you.

17  
18 Chair Lauing: Are all of these effective January 1 in terms of new terms?

19  
20 Mr. Carnahan: One of the terms on the Planning and Transportation Commission is an  
21 unscheduled vacancy, so as soon as the appointment is made, they will begin serving. All  
22 the other terms will begin on December 16th.

23  
24 Chair Lauing: Any other questions? Thank you.

25  
26 Mr. Carnahan: Thank you.

27  
28 Chair Lauing: We have another "not on the agenda" item, Shani Kleinhaus.

29  
30 Shani Kleinhaus: Thank you, Chair Lauing and Commissioners. I usually am the last  
31 minute when I submit letters on anything, because I'm the environmental advocate for  
32 Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society. We work all around, all the cities in the area.  
33 Usually I'm last minute. I really tried hard to get a letter to you ready in time for  
34 everybody to read it. Somehow, it didn't make it to you. I wrote two with Sierra Club  
35 and Audubon. You have them now, but I sent them a while ago. The concern I have is  
36 that there's other mail that you're not getting. I don't who else writes letters and doesn't  
37 know and follow up to find out that the Commission didn't get their letters. I don't know  
38 where things break, but it would be good if you fixed it. Thank you.

39  
40 Chair Lauing: Thank you.

1 **IV. BUSINESS:**  
2

3 **1. Approval of Draft Minutes from June 28, 2016 Parks and Recreation**  
4 **Commission Special Meeting.**  
5

6 Chair Lauing: Our next item of business is the approval of draft Minutes from June 28,  
7 2016.  
8

9 Approval of the draft June 28, 2016 Minutes as corrected was moved by Commissioner  
10 Reckdahl and seconded by Commissioner Hetterly. Passed 5-0-1  
11

12 **2. ITT Antenna Field Site in the Baylands**  
13

14 Chair Lauing: The next item of business is an interesting one, the ITT antenna field site  
15 in the Baylands. Assistant Director O'Kane will give a little bit of a status on that.  
16

17 Kristen O'Kane: Good evening, Chair and Commissioners. I'm Kristen O'Kane,  
18 Assistant Director with Community Services. This item today is just an informational  
19 item transmitting, first of all, the Council staff report of June 27, 2016 but asking Council  
20 to purchase an exclusive easement from Global Wireless for a 36.5-acre parcel within the  
21 Baylands. This is a parcel that everything else around it has previously been dedicated as  
22 parkland, but this 36 acres was never dedicated because of an exclusive easement that  
23 was still on the property. The City of Palo Alto owned the actual property, but the  
24 easement on top of it didn't allow us to have that property dedicated as parkland. At the  
25 June 27th Council meeting, Council did approve the purchase of the easement. Now the  
26 City will have full control of that site. I did provide a map to all of you. You can see on  
27 Map 3.1 the overall property that's referred to as the former ITT property. Within that  
28 property is the 36 acres, and that's on Map 3.3. The cross-hatched part is the part that we  
29 will now have full control over. One of the next steps then is to dedicate this 36.5 acres  
30 as parkland. In the Baylands Master Plan, there's actually a policy included in the  
31 Baylands Master Plan that we think allows this to happen without the Commission  
32 making a motion to do so. Our next step is to proceed with starting the process to getting  
33 this 36.5 acres dedicated as parkland. We will be coming back to the Commission with  
34 that. Another step that needs to happen is there are some structures on the property. One  
35 of them has been designated as eligible for being on the National Register of Historic  
36 Places. Staff needs to go through the process of determining what will happen to those  
37 structures, what the best step forward is for those. I think moving forward one thing we'd  
38 like to do is possibly take the Commission out to the property, show you the property,  
39 show you the structures that are out there, and then we'll be making a recommendation to  
40 the Commission as to what we think should be the best step forward with those  
41 structures—there are some antennas out there as well—and then ask for your feedback on  
42 that. These are all steps that will be happening in the future, but we are getting the ball



1 rolling on getting this property dedicated as parkland, and then also assessing the site and  
2 those structures to see what we can do.

3  
4 Chair Lauing: There are actually a couple of speakers that want to speak to this item, I  
5 believe. I will call on the first one, which is Herb Borock, before we have Commissioner  
6 comments. Three minutes, thank you.

7  
8 Herb Borock: Thank you, Chair Lauing. Good evening, Commissioners. I'm handing  
9 out something I got today from the County Recorder's Index of Recorded Documents that  
10 shows that there was a deed transfer from Globe Wireless to the City on July 28th. It  
11 would seem that the actual document is not online. You have to go down to San Jose or  
12 contact the Director of Real Estate on the fourth floor. It's a question of coordination  
13 among staff whether the sale has already happened. Of course if it has, then we can  
14 proceed to do the dedication which will require some work in Public Works to perhaps  
15 draw the boundaries again, and this time without the exclusion in the middle of the  
16 property because the Park Dedication Ordinance currently would first indicate the  
17 boundaries of the entire 151-acre parcel and then say except this piece of 36.5 acres. It  
18 seems to me it's really a simple clerical problem to prepare the Park Dedication  
19 Ordinance. I heard what sounded like contradictory things from Ms. O'Kane. First, you  
20 said that the Baylands Master Plan indicates that you did not have to bring a Park  
21 Dedication Ordinance to the Commission first, that it could go directly to the Council.  
22 Then, I thought she said that they'd be bringing it to you. If it doesn't have to come to  
23 you, then it shouldn't be coming to you and should go directly to the Council. It seems  
24 that this is something that could be done fairly quickly and be on the Council's Consent  
25 Calendar just as the staff report was. Then, you can go ahead and see what you might  
26 like to recommend to do. I mean, if there's any other or further type of construction  
27 substantially one way or another, that would require a Park Improvement Ordinance, but  
28 first you have to get the ordinance to dedicate the whole thing as parkland, and that will  
29 take two readings of the Council, and then waiting 31 days to act on that. I would hope  
30 by your next meeting that you'd have a status report or either it's actually been before the  
31 Council already or you'd have an actual date. Thank you.

32  
33 Chair Lauing: Great, thanks. Let's see. Next is—I don't even have to look—  
34 Ms. Kleinhaus.

35  
36 Shani Kleinhaus: Thank you. This is very exciting, and I'm really glad to see that the  
37 ITT property is moving forward to becoming dedicated parkland. I would encourage the  
38 City to remove the antennas, to remove all the other buildings whether there's something  
39 that's been there and it's old and it's really in the wrong place. Potentially you could open  
40 that to the public like the 7 acres up on Foothill that the public was invited to look at and  
41 consider what could be done with it. Here, I think, native restoration or just leave it alone  
42 and removing all the guy-wires that birds can collide with, and really giving it back to



1 nature would be really important. Especially since the capping of Byxbee, a lot of the  
2 habitat that was available to birds has been diminished. This is really exciting. It  
3 provides a great opportunity. Hopefully it will become part of nature. Thank you.  
4

5 Chair Lauing: Thank you. The next speaker is Doria Summa.  
6

7 Doria Summa: Hi. Good evening, Chair and Commissioners. Doria Summa from  
8 College Terrace. Just very briefly, I wanted to thank everybody, staff and all of you and  
9 the Council, for purchasing this property and for the intention to restore it to natural open  
10 space. I just urge you to get it dedicated as parkland as soon as possible. Thank you.  
11

12 Chair Lauing: Thank you. Now Commissioner comments on the status report.  
13 Commissioner Reckdahl.  
14

15 Commissioner Reckdahl: First off, how's the habitat there? Are we going to have to do  
16 any restoration or has it been left untouched by and large?  
17

18 Daren Anderson: Good evening, Daren Anderson, Open Space, Parks and Golf. The  
19 36.5 acres, there's sections of it that have some pickleweed. By and large, it's been razed  
20 because they put the buildings on that portion. It's not very good habitat. The policy in  
21 the Parks Master Plan does call for turning it back into marshland. It would require  
22 restoration.  
23

24 Commissioner Reckdahl: How about the areas outside of where the road is? Is that ...  
25

26 Mr. Anderson: The areas outside the 36.5 acres is good habitat. It could be better with  
27 increased tidal flow, and there was a project that was done in 1988 where they put in a  
28 connecting pipe from the old yacht harbor to bring tidal water into that portion of the  
29 wetlands. It has improved it, but I think with more flow it would be better. It's  
30 something Public Works has talked about. I think it's something we investigate in the  
31 future.  
32

33 Commissioner Reckdahl: It's still attached ...  
34

35 Mr. Anderson: It is connected.  
36

37 Commissioner Reckdahl: ... by a pipe?  
38

39 Mr. Anderson: Yes.  
40

41 Commissioner Reckdahl: How big a pipe is this?  
42

1 Mr. Anderson: I'm not sure.  
2

3 Commissioner Reckdahl: The driveway, are we going to be using that as a driveway? Is  
4 there any way that we can incorporate that at Byxbee or are we going to be getting rid of  
5 the driveway?  
6

7 Mr. Anderson: I think that's really something for the public and for the Commission to  
8 weigh in on. I think it's a very viable opportunity to have that be a part of the trail. One  
9 option to consider is putting some sort of bridge so that you could go from the ITT  
10 property directly over to Byxbee and create a good nexus of trails. That's something for  
11 the public and the Commission and the Council to weigh in on.  
12

13 Commissioner Reckdahl: I personally would like that just because right now when you  
14 come off the Bike Bridge, you have to backtrack quite a ways, over a half mile, and then  
15 cut back again and backtrack again to get back to Byxbee. This would be a much more  
16 direct route. I'd request when we talk about Byxbee that we have the path going up the  
17 other way. I did check that out later, and there's just too much water there. We would  
18 have to have a significant amount of fill to have the path go around the other way. What  
19 are the plans for that road that runs right on the edge of Byxbee right now? That  
20 construction road.  
21

22 Mr. Anderson: It would be public access at some point.  
23

24 Commissioner Reckdahl: That will be just a ...  
25

26 Mr. Anderson: A trail.  
27

28 Commissioner Reckdahl: ... trail open to the public.  
29

30 Mr. Anderson: Open to the public. Like many of the trails at Byxbee, also used by some  
31 of the staff to maintain pieces of it, yeah.  
32

33 Commissioner Reckdahl: Also, the other thing about that driveway is right now it has a  
34 nice view of the freshwater lagoon. That would be very good for birding or just for  
35 watching nature in general. I would be leaning towards keeping that driveway and  
36 incorporating that as a trail. That's it. Thank you.  
37

38 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Hetterly.  
39

40 Commissioner Hetterly: I just have a couple of questions. First, I assume that whatever  
41 decision-making needs to happen around the buildings and the antenna field is unrelated

1 to the Dedication Ordinance, and that can move forward immediately without waiting for  
2 that process. Is that correct?

3  
4 Ms. O'Kane: That's correct. We're going to move forward with dedicating the parkland  
5 as quickly as possible. There will be a longer analysis of the actual structures that are  
6 there.

7  
8 Commissioner Hetterly: Can you clarify what the process is for achieving that  
9 dedication? Does it need to come back to us? Does it go straight to Council? How does  
10 that work?

11  
12 Ms. O'Kane: Can you address that, Daren?

13  
14 Mr. Anderson: I believe it'll go straight back to Council. We'll work with the City's real  
15 estate staff and put together the necessary documents and get it to Council on the Consent  
16 Calendar most likely.

17  
18 Commissioner Hetterly: What is the timeline that we might expect that to happen?

19  
20 Mr. Anderson: I'm not quite sure. I think we can start working on it ASAP though, this  
21 week.

22  
23 Commissioner Hetterly: One month, six months, eight months?

24  
25 Rob de Geus: (inaudible)

26  
27 Mr. Anderson: Yeah, I would guess a month.

28  
29 Commissioner Hetterly: Thank you very much.

30  
31 Chair Lauing: This might be too early of a question, but do you anticipate that with  
32 increased traffic we'd have to have some other kind of parking facility out there?

33  
34 Mr. Anderson: I don't think that site lends itself to parking. It's surrounded by wetlands,  
35 and I don't think it's a good spot. It's something we should be looking at as you analyze  
36 the site for best uses. My personal opinion is it's not suitable for that. It would be more  
37 of a pedestrian access, pedestrian and bike.

38  
39 Chair Lauing: I think a tour for folks that would like to see it would be a great idea.  
40 That's really cool. Do you have any comments?

1 Commissioner Cribbs: Can you talk about if you decide not to designate some of the  
2 structures? Do you have to designate all of them as historical or do we have that choice?  
3

4 Ms. O'Kane: It's my understanding that not all the buildings are eligible to be registered  
5 as historical. That's going to be part of the process. I don't know which ones and how  
6 many.  
7

8 Commissioner Cribbs: Thank you.  
9

10 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Moss.  
11

12 Commissioner Moss: I think this is a great opportunity. I'm all for having open space  
13 useful for lots of people. I hope that that building of historical significance will be made  
14 into some kind of a facility like the Lucy Evans building where there will be classes or  
15 tours or maybe a museum of some sort, a historical museum. I would love it if there was  
16 a little bit of a parking lot very near the road, Bayshore Road, so that people could walk  
17 in. There would be more access to the marsh and to this facility. I'm thinking like the  
18 children's Discovery Museum building near the Golden Gate Bridge on the north side of  
19 the Golden Gate Bridge. That mix of old buildings and a museum is a fantastic  
20 opportunity. If we could have that mix, that would be great. Also, there should be some  
21 historical signage that describes the history of that facility. I was fascinated by the staff  
22 report that you sent me. That's it.  
23

24 **3. Update on Service Delivery Options under Consideration for Aquatics**  
25 **Program.**  
26

27 Chair Lauing: The next item on the agenda is update on service delivery options under  
28 consideration for the aquatics program.  
29

30 Kristen O'Kane: Thank you. This is also an informational item, just to let you know that  
31 we will be coming back in September with a larger item related to aquatics. What we'd  
32 like to share with you today is just an update on where we are. As you likely know, the  
33 past two summers we've contracted out our swim lesson program, our Learn to Swim  
34 program, for the summer season. This was a result of difficulty in staffing the program,  
35 getting staff but then also retaining staff during the summer. To maintain the quality of  
36 service that we wanted, we ended up contracting out that program. While we were doing  
37 that, we've also been analyzing whether or not we should be contracting out our program  
38 in the long term. This would be either just our Learn to Swim program, the whole  
39 aquatics program or perhaps none of it. We're in that evaluation process now. We're  
40 considering things like what will be the cost to the City, what will be the cost to the  
41 customer, will the quality of the program change and in what way. We're talking to  
42 different user groups of the pool, the lap swimmers, the parents of the kids who attended



1 swim lessons as well as recreational swimmers. We're trying to get feedback from them  
2 on their thoughts behind this. We'll be coming back in September with the results of our  
3 analysis of those three different options. After we come to the Commission, we'll be  
4 going to Council with a recommendation as well. We just wanted to provide you an  
5 update on where we are. This past summer, we used Team Sheeper which is also the  
6 company that manages the Menlo Park swim facility. We've received some positive  
7 feedback from the community. We do evaluations after our programs. The results of the  
8 evaluations were very positive. We think they're a good company, and we think they can  
9 provide us with a quality service. What we need to decide is what's best for the  
10 community and what's best for the City. That's where we are.

11  
12 Chair Lauing: Any comments? Commissioner Moss.

13  
14 Commissioner Moss: I'm all for getting the most out of our assets. The pool is highly  
15 used now, especially in the summer. In your report, you indicate that after kids go back  
16 to school in August, there's still a whole lot of people who want to take swimming  
17 lessons, I guess, August, September, October, until it starts to get cold. Is that true? How  
18 many people are asking for swim lessons in those 2 1/2 to 3 months?

19  
20 Ms. O'Kane: One of the things that we have heard through the evaluation process and  
21 even through the master planning process is that people would like a longer swim season.  
22 They would like the aquatics season to go into the fall and start earlier in the spring, but  
23 also have a longer day as well, more options, more opportunities to take swim lessons  
24 and also do recreational swimming.

25  
26 Commissioner Moss: If the way to do it is to get an outside vendor, then that's fantastic.  
27 Will this take away jobs from teens during the summer?

28  
29 Ms. O'Kane: This is all part of the analysis that we're doing, looking at the different  
30 options. We're doing that analysis now to determine what the result would be.

31  
32 Commissioner Moss: I would hope that whoever you ask to do this, that you put in a  
33 clause that says that they should hire local teens when you can and then backfill from  
34 there. The other thing is do we have enough—you said that you were going to maybe  
35 have to upgrade the pool and the buildings. What happens when we do that? Is that  
36 scheduled, to upgrade the Rinconada Pool and make it the correct length and also the  
37 buildings and other things?

38  
39 Rob de Geus: Rob de Geus, Community Services. The long-range Rinconada Master  
40 Plan—or long-range plan I think we call it—which has yet to go to Council and be finally  
41 approved, has recommendations for improving not only the pool but also the buildings,  
42 which are quite old. The locker rooms do need to be upgraded. Specifically, is it

1 scheduled on the CIP? Not at this time. I think we're waiting for the long-range plan to  
2 go to Council for approval, and then have it scheduled. When the work happens, the pool  
3 is closed.

4  
5 Commissioner Moss: All right. That will impact how many people you can serve when  
6 that happens. This sets a really good precedent, having a longer period of use of the pool.

7  
8 Chair Lauing: Did you have a comment? Commissioner Cribbs.

9  
10 Commissioner Cribbs: I'm excited that you're looking at this. I think the more that we  
11 can use the water that we have, the better off we're all going to be, especially getting kids  
12 to swim and not have them drown since it's a big concern for everybody. Is it your  
13 thought that—maybe you don't know yet—they would contract for all aquatic services  
14 with one entity or you would parcel it out? How are you thinking about separating our  
15 swim team from the other things that are going on? Just probably not there yet.

16  
17 Ms. O'Kane: We're not quite there yet. If we were to contract out the lifeguards as well  
18 as the swim instructors, that would be one contract, if we were to go that way. We  
19 wouldn't separate that. There is the existing Masters Swim program as well as PASA, the  
20 youth swim team that's there. This is part of, again, our analysis that we'll bring back.  
21 Our intent is not to impact those programs. They would still be present at the pool.

22  
23 Commissioner Cribbs: Would your analysis also include perhaps a bubble for winter-  
24 time use for swimming lessons? A lot of private pools or private entities are really  
25 successful doing that, and they're usually busy all the time.

26  
27 Ms. O'Kane: You mean a cover over the pool?

28  
29 Commissioner Cribbs: Uh-huh. I mean a bubble that goes over the pool.

30  
31 Ms. O'Kane: Right. That's not in our analysis. We're not looking at that as part of this  
32 analysis.

33  
34 Mr. de Geus: Another good question. We put out an RFP for this, and then had  
35 responses. We allowed people to bid on one, two, three, or all of the functions. There's  
36 recreation swim, there's lap swim, there's the Masters Swim program, the competitive  
37 youth swim program, swim lessons. What am I forgetting? Birthday parties, and there's  
38 probably one other. People could bid on all of them. The bid that we're really looking at,  
39 they are open to taking the whole thing or part. We're sort of negotiating with them. It's  
40 important to understand that we have in the past contracted out part of it already. The  
41 Masters program has been contracted out for some time and so has the competitive youth  
42 swim program, while the other components have been in-house.

1  
2 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Reckdahl.  
3

4 Commissioner Reckdahl: In the report, you mention that a lot of the employees that we  
5 are hiring, lifeguards and such, are students and they go back to school. Team Sheeper or  
6 these other private entities, do they hire students also? Are they full-time employees?  
7

8 Ms. O'Kane: I think it's a combination. They have a larger staff, and I think they have  
9 more full-time staff that are working year round. They also employ students. I think they  
10 offer more incentives to their employees who are working their private company. They  
11 have a larger staff as well. I don't think they have the same issues that we have as far as  
12 retaining staff.  
13

14 Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm trying to understand why they don't have retention issues if  
15 we have retention issues. Are they hiring a different group or are they paying more?  
16

17 Ms. O'Kane: They are paying more, and they also provide benefits to staff who work a  
18 certain number of hours and over. That could be one of the reasons why they have  
19 greater retention.  
20

21 Commissioner Reckdahl: Do we have that option of paying the lifeguards more or are  
22 we constrained?  
23

24 Ms. O'Kane: That would be a Council decision. If we decide to continue this program  
25 in-house and one of the directions from Council is to do that, it could also be a direction  
26 from Council to increase the pay of our lifeguards and our swim instructors.  
27

28 Commissioner Reckdahl: I don't have any problem with the private company coming in  
29 and giving the services. Sometimes they have expertise and do a better job. I don't have  
30 an issue with that. I don't want to just do it because we decided not to pay them enough,  
31 and they return around and pay their people, and they're taking a cut. We end up paying  
32 more, but part of that's going to the private company. I want to be aware of that. Thank  
33 you.  
34

35 Chair Lauing: Anyone else down here? My only comment was related to that. It looks  
36 like your intent is to be cost neutral on the current program, not to do more cost recovery  
37 or to probably go in the hole where we'd have to be negative on cost recovery. Is that the  
38 goal going into this?  
39

40 Mr. de Geus: There's multiple goals that we're trying to accomplish here. I think  
41 primarily to use the asset that we have here and maximize its use for the community, the  
42 Palo Alto community in particular. The pool is actually underutilized right now in terms

1 of the hours that it's open and the number of swim lessons we can accomplish. We want  
2 to fix that. We want to serve the community better and improve access to the pool. The  
3 question for us is how do we do that. We're looking at a third-party solution to that, but  
4 we're also looking at an in-house solution. What would it take if we were to run a year-  
5 round aquatics program as a City organization? What would that mean we would have to  
6 pay in order to really do that effectively? We're evaluating both of those and even a third  
7 option, which we'll share with you next month, the results of that analysis and also some  
8 of the community feedback. I would add, though, that we highly subsidize the swim  
9 program right now and the swim lesson program. It's likely that the cost of swim lessons  
10 will increase either way in order to make it pencil out, so that it's not costing the City  
11 more than it does now.

12  
13 Chair Lauing: Thank you.

14  
15 **4. Approval of Dog Park Recommendation.**

16  
17 Chair Lauing: Now we are on to Item 4. We're doing a sound check. One of our many  
18 viewers out there called in and said that our audio is a little soft, so we're going to check  
19 that. I'm not going to sing for the sound check. We're just going to have the guy do it.  
20 Item Number 4 is the approval of a dog recommendation. We do have a couple of  
21 speakers. I'd like to go ahead with that. Herb Borock.

22  
23 Herb Borock: Chair Lauing and Commissioners, I support the recommendation, both  
24 having at least one and preferably both of these near-term parks having dog exercise  
25 areas and also having this proposal go separately and not wait for the Master Plan to be  
26 completed. Currently on the Council's tentative agenda, the Master Plan—I guess that's a  
27 Study Session on the status of the Master Plan—is scheduled for the Council meeting in  
28 four weeks on September 19. The dog parks aren't there because you haven't made a  
29 recommendation yet. Once you do, it'll take a while for a staff report to go through the  
30 normal process of finding an agenda date and having the Manager's Office review it three  
31 times over a five-week period and make edits before it's approved and gets there. I would  
32 suggest that it be at a time on the calendar when it's convenient for people to come, not  
33 do it near the December holiday period, but some time when people have an opportunity  
34 to participate. When the dog exercise areas were first tried out on a temporary basis and  
35 then made permanent on three parks, that started with four parks, and the fourth park was  
36 Eleanor Pardee. That didn't get a permanent dog park. At a later date, there was another  
37 attempt to have a dog exercise area at Eleanor Pardee. In both cases, the neighborhood  
38 was opposed, and there were also many fewer households with dogs than we have now.  
39 You've had people come to you from the north end of town, encouraging you to support  
40 dog exercise areas in parks in the north end of town. They need to organize themselves  
41 to come to the Council, because I expect opposition from neighbors of both of these  
42 proposed parks. There's some sense of a feeling in some neighborhoods north of Oregon

1 Expressway that dog parks are only for people on the south side of town, that they can't  
2 (inaudible) north. Just in the same way as bathrooms in neighborhood parks somehow  
3 don't get put in neighborhood parks in the north, but it's done in the south. It requires  
4 essentially a new constituency of households that own dogs to come to the Council and to  
5 make their case. Decades ago when I was in a household with a dog and I was walking  
6 around all of Palo Alto, I never met anyone else who had a dog in that neighborhood.  
7 Now, it's much different. Thank you for bringing it forward and moving it along. I look  
8 forward to a status report next month that we have a date on the Council agenda. Thank  
9 you.

10  
11 Chair Lauing: Thank you. The next speaker on this topic is a familiar face, Shani  
12 Kleinhaus.

13  
14 Shani Kleinhaus: Thank you. Shani Kleinhaus. This time I speak for the Audubon  
15 Society and the Sierra Club. You also received a letter today, this evening, from Canopy.  
16 Dog parks are great. I use them; I have two dogs. Dog parks are not compatible with  
17 native habitat and birds and oaks. A proposal for a dog park at Eleanor Pardee Park in  
18 the middle of the oak grove is not compatible with the Urban Forest Master Plan. The  
19 planting that Canopy's already doing there is part of their re-oaking focus and the attempt  
20 to bring nature into urban parks as indicated in both the old and the now revised  
21 Comprehensive Plan. My recommendation is if a dog park is going to continue being  
22 recommended in Eleanor Pardee Park, it should not be near oaks. Oaks are the center for  
23 bird life and other creatures' life in the Valley. Dogs have impacts merely for their  
24 activity, but also they do produce a lot of urine in dog parks, and that's not really  
25 compatible with oaks and other native vegetation. Our recommendation is either not to  
26 have a dog park at Eleanor Pardee Park or, if it is to be there, then away from the oaks  
27 and the native restoration areas. Thank you.

28  
29 Chair Lauing: Thank you. That's the last speaker on that topic. I think we'd like to—  
30 there's a motion and this is an Action Item in the packet. I'd like to ask the dog parks ad  
31 hoc, Commissioners Knopper and Hetterly, and of course Staff Anderson to give  
32 background on it and the intent here, and then we can all ask questions.

33  
34 Commissioner Hetterly: I don't think I need to spend a lot of time giving background as  
35 we've had lengthy discussions about dog parks over the last very long time. The reason  
36 we have this in the packet tonight is, in fact, because we've been talking about dog parks  
37 for at least a decade and haven't made any progress. We had hoped—I think our last  
38 presentation we had recommended installing at least one near-term park prior to the  
39 completion of the Master Plan process because we really wanted to get the ball rolling.  
40 That's been delayed through an inability to be able to check in with Council. Staff has  
41 been trying to meet with Council for several months, and we just keep getting pushed  
42 back. They're finally meeting next month on the 19th. We wanted to make sure that we

1 had a formal action on the table to highlight for the Council, as they're thinking about the  
2 Master Plan, that an issue of dog parks in the nearer term is really important to us. That's  
3 the point of this motion. We're hoping that you all will support it. We also in the last  
4 week or so have gone back and forth with staff. We really wanted to put a cost estimate  
5 in the motion, but weren't able to sort out the numbers before it went in the packet. I  
6 think that we finally came to a number that the ad hoc is okay with and that staff is okay  
7 with. I'd like to propose amending this memo to include the following language in the  
8 last paragraph, second sentence in the last paragraph, to say "typical costs for a basic dog  
9 park range upward from \$30,000 depending on size and design. If water, benches, shade  
10 structures or additional amenities are added, the cost escalates." That's what we're hoping  
11 you all will support tonight in order to send in the packet to Council on the 19th. We'd be  
12 happy to answer any questions.

13  
14 Chair Lauing: Did you want to add anything, Abbie?

15  
16 Vice Chair Knopper: No.

17  
18 Chair Lauing: Sorry, what was that?

19  
20 Commissioner Reckdahl: I was asking whether the 30,000 was per park or total for the  
21 two. It is per park.

22  
23 Chair Lauing: Right. That's ...

24  
25 Commissioner Hetterly: That's not an exact number for an exact park. That's a ballpark  
26 figure so they have an idea of whether we're talking about a \$10 project or a \$1 million  
27 project. Doing it in advance of the Master Plan means more likely it will not come out of  
28 a CIP; it would have to come out of existing CIPs because the new CIP—to get it into the  
29 new CIP cycle would probably hit FY '18 which is a lot longer than we want to wait.

30  
31 Chair Lauing: Did you want to make a comment, Keith?

32  
33 Commissioner Reckdahl: My only comment is I think this is a very good idea. I  
34 wholeheartedly support it. I think it's well worth the money. We have a lot of people  
35 with dogs, and I think they'll appreciate both parks.

36  
37 Chair Lauing: Do you have any comments, anybody? It's all right; you don't have to.

38  
39 Commissioner Moss: I wholeheartedly agree with the recommendation as well.

1 Commissioner Cribbs: Me too. I think it's a really, really good idea that we move on as  
2 quickly as possible with the cost and start in with the pilot program and see how it all  
3 goes. I'd love to know what the process is once this is accepted, what has to happen then.  
4

5 Chair Lauing: I think we can go into that. I just want to make one comment. Some  
6 viewers or others would say this is out of phase with the Master Plan. I think we could  
7 all tonight say one of the top ten things we've learned, that we know we're going to do in  
8 the Master Plan is going to be put in at least one dog park. I personally don't feel that it's  
9 out of phase. There's a sense of urgency. The Commission has more or less committed  
10 as much as we can for a number of years to the dog owners that we're going to work on  
11 this, we're going to get it done. We tried way back at El Camino and got shot down by  
12 the environmental rulings there. We've been trying and trying, and we have this  
13 commitment. It's really not out of phase. Just putting one in there now is very consistent  
14 with the staff report and the other work that the dog committee has worked on tirelessly,  
15 and particularly Daren has worked so hard to come up with the right list of where to go  
16 and site maps and tremendous work. I think it'll get wide acceptance at Council. I think  
17 that's why I'm comfortable saying it's ready to go now. Did you want to add something  
18 else, Commissioner Hetterly?  
19

20 Commissioner Hetterly: I was just going to respond to Commissioner Cribbs' question  
21 about what the process is going forward. Putting this forward isn't asking Council to say  
22 yes, we're going to put a dog park here on this date. It's saying we want them to be  
23 considering that as part of the discussion since we're in front of them. The process, they  
24 wouldn't have the authority to do it right then on the spot anyway. If they give the go  
25 ahead and say, "Yeah, we're on board. We think this is a good idea. Let's look into it,"  
26 then staff initiates outreach specific to the neighborhoods we're looking at. As you will  
27 recall, in the Master Plan policy there's a list of a number of dog parks. We go down the  
28 list until we find something that works. After you get the public outreach from the  
29 surrounding neighborhood, a Park Improvement Ordinance would be developed, then  
30 bids would go out, contractors would be hired and it's built. Of course, there's that step of  
31 the funding. Staff would have to find the money.  
32

33 Chair Lauing: Did staff want to add anything to that summary from Commissioner  
34 Hetterly?  
35

36 Daren Anderson: No, I think that was it. If you said it, I didn't hear it accentuated  
37 perhaps, and that is the public outreach piece and how big that is as we determine which  
38 of these options we go with. I'm really excited about it, and I can't wait to help.  
39

40 **MOTION**  
41



1 Chair Lauing: Any other comments? Then it's the motion as amended by Commissioner  
2 Hetterly to add the cost estimate in there. All in favor of the motion as amended, please  
3 say aye. Any opposed. That passes unanimously. Thank you.  
4

5 **MOTION PASSED**  
6

7 **5. Parks, Open Space, Trails and Recreation Facilities Master Plan.**  
8

9 Chair Lauing: Item 5, Parks, Open Space, Trails and Recreation Facilities Master Plan.  
10 We have two speakers on that. Perhaps we could have those before we have a staff  
11 presentation that interfaces with the ad hoc presentation. The first speaker is Doria  
12 Summa.  
13

14 Doria Summa: Good evening again, Chair, Commissioners and staff. Doria Summa,  
15 College Terrace. I am the president of the College Terrace Residents Association;  
16 although, I am speaking for myself tonight. I am also on the Comp Plan Citizens  
17 Advisory group, where we're very interested in the future of our parks. I wanted to talk  
18 for a minute about an opportunity that I think exists at Mayfield Park, which is the library  
19 park in College Terrace. Adjacent to the park there's an empty lot. This lot is owned by  
20 a resident in College Terrace. It was used during the restoration of the library building as  
21 a temporary site for the childcare facility that went back into the library building. I don't  
22 know if you guys have thought about this or if it's too pie in the sky or crazy. The  
23 Neighborhood Association tried to pursue having the owner of that property make it  
24 available for a community garden, which we very much wanted. That didn't work out.  
25 Since the property owner is willing to lease the property, I think it would be a great  
26 location for a community garden. It's continuous to the Mayfield Park, and then the  
27 whole Mayfield Park could stay open for children in nearby apartment buildings to run  
28 around and play. I also noticed that there's a similar potentiality next to Boulware Park  
29 with the AT&T site that the Ventura Neighborhood Association brought to your  
30 attention. I hope you will look at those carefully. Maybe we can work creatively with  
31 you. The Neighborhood Association would love to assist in something like that. Finally,  
32 as a CAC member, the Comp Plan Advisory Citizens Committee, we're very concerned  
33 about the adequacy of our parkland acres per capita and the future of that and wanting to  
34 preserve a reasonable amount of park. Also, we're very concerned about the preservation  
35 of our natural open spaces. I would like to say that the Fry's site also has been discussed  
36 at the Comp Plan group as a great opportunity for a park and possibly even one that  
37 includes naturalization of the creek as it goes through the site or some sort of semi-  
38 natural state. Thank you very much.  
39

40 Chair Lauing: Thank you. The second to last speaker on Item Number 5 is Shani  
41 Kleinhaus.  
42



1 Shani Kleinhaus: Thank you again. Shani Kleinhaus with Santa Clara Valley Audubon  
2 Society and also for the Sierra club about the 10.5 acres of land that is available because  
3 the golf course is retreating. I sent you a letter about that. I looked through all the  
4 documents that were in front of you before and revisited some of the decisions that were  
5 made before, including the mitigations for trees that are being removed from the golf  
6 course. When I looked at all the different survey results, it looks like just as many people  
7 wanted sports fields as wanted nature, hiking and bird watching. If you look at the  
8 numbers, for example, of people with children, 460 wanted to have nature, hiking and  
9 bird watching on the 10.5 acres and sports fields got 522. Without children, the nature  
10 got more than the sports fields. Still, these things are split pretty well. In the letter I sent  
11 you, I summarized that in a table for you. The removal of the trees on the golf course  
12 would deal quite a blow to birds. There are a lot of birds in the golf course. They're  
13 using it quite heavily, and there's birds that we don't usually see in the more urban areas.  
14 Potentially and hopefully at least for the time being, the 10.5 acres can be used to  
15 mitigate those impacts and potentially to create a bird park which would be quite a nice  
16 facility. There are a lot of migratory birds that choose that area because it's so close to  
17 the creek and to the Bay and open space. It provides an opportunity that is not available  
18 everywhere in town. Given the interests of the community, it would be something that if  
19 it could be looked at as something to move forward with, the investment is not huge. It's  
20 not like an investment in actual facilities. You don't need to do CEQA for that. It's a  
21 pretty easy potential something to take on and move on fast. Thank you.

22  
23 Chair Lauing: Thank you. On this item I think we first want to look at the recommended  
24 changes that you've put into the new document from the ad hoc and review the policy  
25 changes and then get into the text of the chapters.

26  
27 Kristen O'Kane: We can do it that way. The way we have the presentation organized is  
28 we're going to just briefly introduce Chapters 1-4. When I get to Chapter 5, which is the  
29 policies and programs, I was going to go into more detail as to the changes that were  
30 made.

31  
32 Chair Lauing: Is that going to work for the ad hoc? Okay.

33  
34 Ms. O'Kane: Good evening, Kristen O'Kane with Community Services. I also have Peter  
35 Jensen here, Landscape Architect with Public Works Department. We're presenting on  
36 the latest of the Master Plan development. The first thing I'd like to do is—we're pretty  
37 excited to include in the packet the draft Chapters 1-5. I'd like to emphasize that they are  
38 draft. We felt excited to see the culmination of all the work that has been going into the  
39 Master Plan and to see what the Master Plan is developing into and what it will look like.  
40 As we go through the first four chapters, there shouldn't be anything in there that is really  
41 new to the Commission. Everything has been shared with the Commission, and the  
42 Commission has provided feedback on it. Chapter 1 is really the introduction to the

1 Master Plan, why we did the Master Plan and went through the process, including the  
2 planning process that we embarked on to do the document. Chapter 2 describes the  
3 elements of the Master Plan, specifically what parts of the system the Master Plan covers.  
4 This is the parks, trails and natural open spaces, the recreation facilities as well as  
5 recreation programming. Chapter 3 is the needs and opportunities chapter. This includes  
6 a description of all the technical analysis and assessment that we did as well as the  
7 community outreach process. It includes the data summary and then opportunities to  
8 include in the Master Plan. Chapter 4 is really where we start to get into the meat of it.  
9 Chapter 4 describes the principles of the Master Plan, which really represent the vision of  
10 the Master Plan. It also introduces the reader to the six goals of the Master Plan. Also  
11 included in Chapter 4 are the system concept maps. These are the maps that we've shared  
12 with you before. These are the pollinator pathways, the trail pathways between parks,  
13 and then also the park search area. Chapter 5 is the document that you've all spent a lot  
14 of time commenting on. This is the goals, policies, and programs document. At the last  
15 Parks and Rec Commission meeting, which was in June, we received comments from the  
16 Commission. Those have been incorporated. Since that time, we've also received  
17 additional comments from the ad hoc committee. Those comments have mostly all been  
18 incorporated. There were two comments related to moving a program from one policy to  
19 the other that I chose not to move. The program is still there, so it's still represented. I  
20 just wasn't comfortable moving it to a different policy. I did include in the packet all of  
21 the changes that were made from the ad hoc. A lot of it was just moving things around,  
22 but there was some language change as well as some new program. Also in the packet, at  
23 the end of the table that was included, there were additional programs that staff made. I  
24 wanted to make sure that those were included as well. If there's any comments on those  
25 changes, we can discuss them now.

26  
27 Chair Lauing: Did you say now? I thought you were going to go the other direction.  
28 That's fine. We want to now take a look at the policies. Those are redlined in terms of  
29 the changes that the ad hoc suggested. We can shift over to that. The ad hoc has  
30 reviewed your redlines and said that they're basically fine. Do you guys want to make  
31 any comments on those or just wait for questions from other Commissioners? Just do the  
32 questions from other Commissioners on our recommendations for changes there. I'd just  
33 state that the ad hoc met at least two, maybe three times between the last meeting and  
34 now, and we've had a lot of correspondence with the Assistant Director on a lot of stuff.  
35 We've been active. Commissioner Moss, did you have a question or comment? I thought  
36 you raised your hand.

37  
38 Commissioner Moss: I have several questions about (inaudible).

39  
40 Chair Lauing: This is just on the policies, the redlined policies.

41  
42 Commissioner Moss: (inaudible)

1  
2 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Cribbs?  
3

4 Commissioner Cribbs: No, I don't.  
5

6 Chair Lauing: I guess we're good to go there. No changes there. Do we want to go back  
7 to the chapters then? I'm sorry; I thought you didn't. Go ahead.  
8

9 Commissioner Hetterly: I just remembered it. It's based on actually the comment we  
10 heard from the public earlier today. I wondered if there were two areas that maybe we  
11 could add into the policies and programs. Sorry, Kristen. One was in the Audubon and  
12 Sierra Club letter. They talk about a band of native trees along creek channels including  
13 concrete channels. We had added a policy, 4.C.3, about a low-impact buffer zone along  
14 creeks. I wonder if we can just add something like "a low-impact buffer zone with native  
15 tree planting along those creeks," just to make sure we cover that piece of it. The other  
16 was the idea raised about Mayfield. I don't know about the AT&T site, whether it might  
17 be a possibility there or not. The idea of securing a long-term lease from a private  
18 landowner for sites adjacent to parks that we want to expand. I know there are policies in  
19 here that talk about pursuing partnerships with community organizations for that kind of  
20 thing. There was nothing about pursuing lease agreements. That seems like yet another  
21 way that we could expand the system without having to purchase the real estate. I  
22 wondered if we could add that also to that suite of policies.  
23

24 Ms. O'Kane: Yes. Thank you also to the Master Plan ad hoc group. I know you  
25 reviewed many times the policies and programs. We've gone back and forth many times.  
26 Thanks for the time spent on that. We appreciate the extra set of eyes and insight. I  
27 guess I did skip over Chapter 1-4.  
28

29 Chair Lauing: Pardon?  
30

31 Ms. O'Kane: I did skip over (inaudible) back on Chapters 1-4. We're ready for that now.  
32

33 Chair Lauing: Do you want to do it chapter by chapter, just so there's some organization  
34 for the panel?  
35

36 Ms. O'Kane: Chapter by chapter, I think, is fine unless there's overall comment on the  
37 first four chapters. They should flow from one stage to the next. If there's comments on  
38 that, on the flow, if there's any obvious omissions or gaps in the first four chapters, we'd  
39 like to hear that as well.  
40

41 Chair Lauing: Unless the Commission has other ideas, I think we should take it chapter  
42 by chapter, unless somebody wants to comment on the preliminary data or just reference

1 back there. Chapter 1, anyone? Is it standard to do the terms upfront? Is that the basic  
2 way to do it? The glossary, excuse me.

3  
4 Ms. O'Kane: It is. It could go into an appendix as well, but I think it makes it obvious to  
5 the reader that they're there. I think we're open to restructuring those.

6  
7 Chair Lauing: Chapter 1. Commissioner Moss.

8  
9 Commissioner Moss: I was going to suggest that you put the glossary at the end, but  
10 that's okay I guess. I wish that a lot of the process could be put as an appendix and  
11 summarize Chapter 1 to like a quarter of it. Put the meat of the process in the back.  
12 We're way down the path already. If that's going to delay it, then leave it the way it is. It  
13 seems like we want to get to the meat, and we've got 40 pages to read before we get to the  
14 meat. That would be my only comment about Chapter 1.

15  
16 Chair Lauing: I actually have quite a number on Chapter 1. Here and in a few other  
17 places—it's just a structural comment—there's jargon that may not be entirely clear. We  
18 can point that out as we go along. The first page there, we need holistic guidance for  
19 managing parks and so on. That gets a little bit—I don't know—touchy feely to me.  
20 Right away in the beginning we're talking about a planning process. We're talking about  
21 community needs, which is good. Then, we're talking about current and forecasted  
22 demographic and recreation trends which, as we get into the meat of it, as I think we'll  
23 see, we're still very short on demographic trends and data, which we discussed at the last  
24 meeting and about the last ten meetings. At some point, we've got to get that forecasted  
25 data in here. I was a little concerned about the wording on page 5, community and  
26 stakeholder engagement. You said that the Master Plan was designed to be community  
27 driven, which is absolutely true, but in a sense that's at least equal to data driven. It's not  
28 just getting impressions from citizen interest groups and then making a call, I don't think.  
29 Again, it's back to the data orientation and the numbers where that can be valid and where  
30 it can be operative. I think the engagement methods as itemized there are quite good and  
31 quite straightforward. People should know about this. I don't mean this at all as a  
32 negative; I've mentioned it before. At some point, I think, we have to put in here that  
33 these are not necessarily statistically projectable kinds of things from the numbers of  
34 people that we've heard from and the splits and so on, so that we don't hear two years  
35 from now some Council Member quoting these statistical reliable things and therefore we  
36 should do X instead of Y. There's valuable data, but it's not survey data. I appreciate the  
37 specifics on the numbers of respondents in certain areas, 487 on page 7 for comments on  
38 park quality, 16 shareholder interviews. It's good to know exactly how many folks are  
39 giving these impressions, 731 respondents. Over on page 12, again it's the data question.  
40 The Plan is based on sound information and the best available data. I guess now is the  
41 time to ask where is that going to be. Is that going to be embedded in these chapters or  
42 can we have a preliminary chapter that talks about forecasting and so on? Later on in

1 here, the only two demographic items that are referred to are, I think, children under 18  
2 and that there's a growing senior population. That's not much of an analysis to tie a lot of  
3 actions to for the next 20 years. I guess I'd just like to know where it's going to be and  
4 when.

5  
6 Ms. O'Kane: There's a lot of data that we've collected. Some of it will be in the  
7 appendices. There's a memo that MIG did on the demographic analysis. That's  
8 something that could be in the appendix. I think we'll have to choose what goes in there.  
9 Otherwise, the document is going to be ...

10  
11 Daren Anderson: (inaudible) binder.

12  
13 Ms. O'Kane: It's going to be like the green binder. It's going to be this thick. Some of it  
14 will be included in the appendices, but some of it won't. We can possibly link it to the  
15 website in the Master Plan. We want to do a thoughtful process of deciding what will go  
16 into the actual document. Rob and I spoke earlier today, and we agree the demographic  
17 trend analysis needs to be beefed up a bit. We'll work on that and get the more-detailed  
18 information in the appendices.

19  
20 Chair Lauing: There's at least a couple of aspects to that. One is to have it, population  
21 data, growth, segmentation data of a number of segments where we think we're going to  
22 take action. As Commissioner Reckdahl mentioned at our last meeting, it's almost like  
23 we're looking in the rearview mirror, because some of this data only goes out two years  
24 or three years, and then we're going to guess the rest of the way. It changes so much that  
25 we'd also like to get something that's a little bit more long term from whatever source.  
26 Somewhere people are making forecasts about what's happening here. If it's a Master  
27 Plan for 20 years, I agree with some of the comments that staff has made that we can't  
28 implement for the next 20 years and say what we're going to do 20 years from now.  
29 Getting a feel of what might change, I think, the example that Commissioner Reckdahl  
30 used was maybe at some point the aging population could safely be projected to go down  
31 because they don't live forever and maybe they move at that point. It just seems we're  
32 making a lot of conclusions so far without showing what the data is even to us, let alone  
33 to Council. I think that's really a need that we have to have. I didn't actually quite  
34 understand what the last bullet points were for recreation program analysis. One is what  
35 we just talked about, demographics and recreation trend analysis, which I don't see. I  
36 don't really know what a planning environment summary is. I could guess it's a  
37 (inaudible) review. Whatever it is, it ought to be precise in terms of what you're saying  
38 there, I think.

39  
40 Rob de Geus: If I can chime in. Several of what you're mentioning there, Chair Lauing,  
41 are reports that MIG have written. They're on the website. There's probably 20-plus mini  
42 studies, reports that they've written, some of which we've had them do a couple of times

1 to get it right. Even then, we weren't satisfied with all of them. I understand that. That's  
2 what it's referring to.

3  
4 Chair Lauing: Is this Palo Alto specific data or some of their national trends and sports?  
5

6 Mr. de Geus: It's both. Some of it is local; some of it is regional; some of it is national.  
7 Several of those reports will be included as appendices to this report. What we might  
8 look at, as Kristen and I were talking, some of the specific data in those reports should be  
9 pulled out and actually put in the chapter, because it's too thin in some areas. It's just not  
10 enough information to tell the reader what's happening, what are the big trends that we're  
11 seeing in some of these demographic areas. We're also working closely with and will  
12 continue to with the Planning Department and the Comprehensive Plan that they're  
13 working on. They're doing a lot of projections on growth. We want to be aligned with  
14 their assessment.

15  
16 Chair Lauing: Right. One of the things that is in the ad hoc memo, that we passed out at-  
17 place tonight—this was a memo that I exchanged with Kristen on the 14th. The findings  
18 that we talked about last time too is kind of where this thing starts. Those sort of  
19 summary conclusions have to be right up front, and a lot of that is going to be driven by  
20 "pick this one out." Seniors are getting much bigger, so we have to make sure we have  
21 programs for that. I don't think we want big things like that in the appendix. I agree with  
22 you it doesn't have to be 83 pages of data before we get to the thing, but there has to be  
23 enough up there to say why are we doing anything here. If it's not there, then I don't see  
24 how we can tell somebody we have to do a lot for seniors in this case that I made up. I'm  
25 not saying that's what we need to do. The findings have to be not just interesting but  
26 actionable. We want stuff up there that's not just "that's kind of cool, something might  
27 happen," but what are we going to do because this is real. Growing segments, we've  
28 talked about since Day 1. The reference matrix on page 13 is also talking about a large  
29 number of possibilities. Was that all the things that was—I think you're referencing there  
30 all the projects that we could do to line up with the areas of focus and so on. I'm pretty  
31 sure that's what you mean by that on 13. That may be Peter's department. A detailed  
32 reference matrix with supporting documentation identifying needs and opportunities.  
33

34 Commissioner Hetterly: (inaudible)  
35

36 Chair Lauing: Right. Before I make my comment, I want to make sure that's what we're  
37 talking about. To me that was more like opportunities than needs. A need is something  
38 that—we've talked about this before too. If we find that there's some gaps that you guys  
39 figure out and the data figures out, that's a need. That comes, we've already said, before  
40 feedback on preferences from the citizens, because that's a real gap. A lot of that matrix  
41 wasn't, I don't think, meant to do gaps. It was meant to fill in things like make parks  
42 more comfortable and welcoming, which might mean when we do a restoration we put

1 benches in there. That's a little bit different than a gap. My concern is it makes it sound  
2 here like we've got all this figured out with data, and that's not really data. That's a list of  
3 projects that we could do. I just want to make sure that we're clear about what we're  
4 talking about here in terms of the intent. I don't think we should be claiming this as the  
5 holy grail of "this is what everything has pointed to, and now we just pick off this chart  
6 the best things to do." That's all my comments on Chapter 1.

7  
8 Mr. de Geus: Can I just add something to that? I'm not sure I agree with that  
9 perspective, respectfully. That matrix, we did use the word opportunities and carefully  
10 so, but it was needs and opportunities. It was meant to point—the reason we say needs  
11 and opportunities is because we can throw the word needs around pretty loosely. We  
12 have a pretty darn good parks and recreation system. All the things we want to do are not  
13 all needs. A lot of them are opportunities. We did look at gaps and changing  
14 demographics and other things where we're projecting gaps into the future. That large  
15 matrix, which we spent a lot of time on, has all these different sources of information that  
16 we gathered in all these different ways to try and identify where we felt the needs and the  
17 gaps and the opportunities exist. To say that it's just opportunities and didn't really look  
18 at needs and gaps, that certainly wasn't the intent, and I don't think it was the outcome  
19 either.

20  
21 Chair Lauing: I think what I just heard you say is it's more opportunities than needs,  
22 which is basically what I'm saying.

23  
24 Mr. de Geus: I think I said that. If I did, I didn't mean that. It's a combination of needs  
25 and opportunities. We used opportunities as a word specifically so we don't call  
26 everything a need that might be a "nice to have" or a want or an enhancement. They're  
27 different. True gaps and needs, that's what we ought to focus on first and make sure we  
28 get that right.

29  
30 Chair Lauing: Right. They should have higher priorities because they're defined as gaps  
31 by staff, that we need to get this stuff done. There are certain things that, if we got no  
32 votes for them from the community, you know that they're a gap and we would need to  
33 do them, which is good. That's fine because you're using your judgment to determine that  
34 there's that gap there.

35  
36 Mr. de Geus: It's fundamental to this whole planning process. If we don't have faith in  
37 the information we gathered from the public through all of these different sources to  
38 develop essentially Chapter 5, which is the goals, policies, and programs, then it's not  
39 much of a Plan. We better believe that we've gone through this process and concluded  
40 that these are the areas we should invest in most and first and in this order because of all  
41 of this feedback and data that we've gathered over this period of time. I feel pretty good  
42 about it, but I'm getting a sense that maybe you're not.

1  
2 Chair Lauing: I don't think we're there yet, if that's what you're saying.

3  
4 Mr. de Geus: I don't think we're there yet either, but I think we're a long way there.

5  
6 Chair Lauing: Should we move on to Chapter 2?

7  
8 Commissioner Reckdahl: I have a follow-up. One thing that still bothers me about the  
9 needs assessment is we can look at things like playing fields and look at when they've  
10 been reserved and when they haven't been, but we can't look at swing sets. Do we have  
11 enough swing sets? It's all anecdotal; we don't have any way of measuring whether we  
12 have enough swing sets or open play areas where kids can just frolic. We don't have a  
13 very good idea of whether we have sufficient capacity for the population. We have really  
14 good data in some areas and just a paucity of data in others. That's the thing that still  
15 bothers me about our needs.

16  
17 Mr. de Geus: It's imperfect, I think, for sure and it'll never be perfect. We'll never get all  
18 of the data. Tomorrow, the data will be different again because we have new people  
19 coming and going and people getting older and so on. Do we have enough data that we  
20 can make some reasonable assumptions and decisions about how to develop a goal and a  
21 set of policies and programs? I'd like to think we do. We certainly have worked hard  
22 enough as a team, both the Commission and staff. I was just a little concerned that  
23 maybe you weren't quite as far as we were in terms of our confidence as to where we're  
24 headed here. I'd love to hear other Commissioners' points of view.

25  
26 Chair Lauing: Why don't you go through some of the other chapters, get more feedback  
27 on the chapters?

28  
29 Commissioner Moss: I want to make one comment about data collection. I don't want to  
30 get into analysis paralysis. I think we have a ton of data. I think we have to do the best  
31 job we can with what we've got so far. I have a bias for action. I want this done. You  
32 said you do the best with what you've got. I don't see any glaring—you've covered a lot  
33 of bases. That was my comment with Chapter 1. You've covered so many bases that I  
34 don't know if I need to hear or read about everything you did. I'd like maybe a three-page  
35 summary that you did these kinds of things and these kinds of things and these kinds of  
36 things and maybe you had this many people or many comments, and then put the rest of  
37 that stuff in the back. I might get overruled. That's all I want to say about that.

38  
39 Chair Lauing: Chapter 2. Let's start down here. Commissioner Reckdahl.

40  
41 Commissioner Reckdahl: On page 17, down at the very bottom, when they go through  
42 the system today, it talks about some of the descriptions. For example, native species and



1 less manicured landscapes are generally not present. That's another thing where you're  
2 making these statements. Are they objectionable or not? It's just kind of data. I would  
3 like to see some actionable. Are we planning to address this? Is this something that we  
4 think is acceptable, not acceptable? I would like to see some follow-through on some of  
5 these statements as opposed to just making statements. A collection of facts. I think we  
6 should really say what we're going to be doing with these facts. We see this sprinkled  
7 throughout the chapters, statements of where we're at and no tying that down to what  
8 action is going to be taken. Page 19, on the table, for example, the Stanford-Palo Alto  
9 playing fields down near the bottom, that is not owned by the City. That is owned by  
10 Stanford, and we leased it out. We really should correct that. Also, El Camino Park is  
11 the same thing. We lease that from the City. For the Stanford playing fields, I think we  
12 have 40 years left on the playing fields, and then it reverts back to Stanford. What about  
13 El Camino Park, do we know the terms of that lease? Does it have a sunset?  
14

15 Mr. Anderson: Yes, it does. It was extended right before we did the water reservoir, the  
16 emergency water reservoir in our park project. I want to say it's something along those  
17 lines of 2045, but I'm not positive.  
18

19 Chair Lauing: I recall that.  
20

21 Commissioner Reckdahl: Those are two cases. I think everything else on that page is  
22 owned. That's a big deal. If Stanford says, "No, we want to build a hotel at El Camino,"  
23 we would be out playing fields, and it would be very hard to find that chunk of land  
24 elsewhere in Palo Alto. Page 26, we're listing other providers. I'm not quite sure why  
25 we're doing this. It's a slippery slope when you start listing groups outside of the City. I  
26 can see if these are private groups that contract with the City or give services on City land  
27 or something like that or partners, then it makes sense to say these people help us out.  
28 The way I read this, this is just a bunch of groups that do similar things that we do. I'm  
29 not sure of the purpose of that.  
30

31 Chair Lauing: Can I just tag-team on that comment? It almost implies that maybe we  
32 don't have to do as much as a City, because we're getting backed up by that. We don't  
33 control it, and we can't control the quantity.  
34

35 Commissioner Reckdahl: On one hand, we don't control it. It could go away tomorrow,  
36 and we don't have any recourse. On the other hand, it does soak up demand if you try  
37 and balance demand and what we have. For example, my kids swam at Greenmeadow.  
38 A lot of kids swim at Eichler. Both of those are private pools. If they weren't around,  
39 we'd have a lot more demand and a lot more people complaining that we don't have  
40 enough swimming pools. In that sense, maybe they do belong in an asset, but we don't  
41 have control over them. It also just gets to be data overload, I think, also especially when  
42 we start going into private companies, private gyms and all this other stuff. I guess my

1 question is why are we having it in here and what does it buy us. How does it make the  
2 report better?

3  
4 Commissioner Moss: I think it's really useful to have it here because of what you just  
5 said about knowing all of the facilities that we have in the City, and that the City-owned  
6 parks are just a portion of that. We do want to leverage these. We talk a lot about  
7 partnering with other groups. These are the groups that we're going to partner with to  
8 provide enough, because we cannot provide all the swimming lessons in that Rinconada  
9 Pool that are needed. You don't put in here—you put private gyms and fitness centers but  
10 also swim clubs or swimming pools. I think it's important to show what we've got in the  
11 City. This is an inventory of what we've got in the City.

12  
13 Commissioner Reckdahl: You could have a whole chapter on recreational opportunities  
14 in the City that aren't offered by the City.

15  
16 Commissioner Moss: This is a pretty good list in general. I don't know what else you'd  
17 add besides maybe swim clubs.

18  
19 Commissioner Reckdahl: My example of Greenmeadow and Eichler. There are a lot of  
20 kids that ...

21  
22 Commissioner Moss: I would have private gyms, private fitness centers and swim clubs.

23  
24 Commissioner Hetterly: Plus tutoring.

25  
26 Commissioner Reckdahl: I just don't ...

27  
28 Mr. de Geus: Can I offer something here? This chapter is intended to represent existing  
29 conditions of the system and not get at solutions, which come later, to issues that are  
30 here. In reality, recreation services is not something the City does on their own. For  
31 perspective of the reader of the Plan, providing some information but not all information  
32 about the private sector and nonprofit sector that also provide some recreation  
33 programming is relevant. That doesn't mean because they do it, they'll always do it or we  
34 don't need to do it. I don't think that's the intent. The intent is that there are other people  
35 in our community providing recreation services, and that is part of the landscape that we  
36 work within as a City providing recreation programs.

37  
38 Commissioner Reckdahl: I see both sides. It does give me pause, though, when we start  
39 spending too much time on assets that we don't control. That was my thought. Let's see.  
40 That's all my comments on Chapter 2.

41  
42 Chair Lauing: Abbie. Commissioner Moss.

1  
2 Commissioner Moss: On the first page of Chapter 2, you say elements of Palo Alto's  
3 parks and trails. Could you use the word inventory instead? This is a list of what we've  
4 got. Elements or maybe "inventory colon: elements of parks and rec." I don't know.  
5 This is the inventory, and it seems like that would be a little bit easier for people to  
6 understand. That was on ...

7  
8 Chair Lauing: Is that it?

9  
10 Commissioner Moss: No, I've got two more. I love charts. On page 22, you have Table  
11 2, Palo Alto facilities. Is there any way you could add the number of pools, one; the  
12 number of dog parks, three; the number of community gardens, four; the number of  
13 community centers, three; and other facilities, four, to that chart? That really summarizes  
14 nicely the rest of the wording. It was a great start. I just went through the rest of the  
15 sections and just added those to the bottom of that chart. On page 25, the circular chart,  
16 is there any way to split youth and teen sports from youth and team aquatics? I think  
17 those needs are quite different. I think they should probably be split, if you can. We  
18 already covered my last point on page 26. That's all I had for Chapter 2.

19  
20 Chair Lauing: My comments on Chapter 2 are that this is probably useful to have  
21 somewhere, including the location of the parks. Given that this initially, not exclusively,  
22 is for Council, I think this could be an appendix. Everybody knows where the parks are.  
23 We've got pages here talking about community gardens and picnic areas and so on. It  
24 could be compressed or put into an appendix. I think the charts are helpful, but there's  
25 not much learning that's going to be done, I don't think, by the Council Members. Again,  
26 I know that they're not the only audience for this. It just seemed like there wasn't much  
27 content here that was going to be new. It just kind of delayed getting to more of the  
28 meat. Others of my comments have been mentioned. There was some repeat of some  
29 paragraph at the top of 27; maybe that was intentional. The same paragraph that came  
30 earlier in the document. I probably won't be able to find where now. Maybe that was  
31 intentional, because you were doing an introduction and then a summary. That's all my  
32 comments on two. Shall we move on to three or did you guys want to ask anything about  
33 two? Chapter 3.

34  
35 Commissioner Reckdahl: I had one comment.

36  
37 Chair Lauing: Go.

38  
39 Commissioner Reckdahl: Thirty-eight is an example of this, at the bottom of 38. We're  
40 saying we're having some problems here. The current policy of everyone plays is widely  
41 supported but makes expanding these programs difficult without sacrificing quality due  
42 to limited gym and field space. Again, are we going to address this or is this something

1 we have to live with? As a reader, I read through it and said, "Are they bothered by  
2 that?" It seems like it bothers me. What are we going to do to reverse this or are we just  
3 going to say, "No, we can't do anything"? I don't know how to do that.  
4

5 Chair Lauing: You're hitting on a point that I want to bring up. This is my most  
6 important point in this chapter as well. It's the same data-driven question. This is just a  
7 statement of fact without anything to back it up. As we're sitting here right now, we don't  
8 know if we need gyms or fields, so how can we put this in the document? Maybe you do  
9 because you've seen different data, but we haven't seen that data. It's making the  
10 assumption in the document that we need field space and gym, it seems like.

11  
12 Male: (inaudible)

13  
14 Chair Lauing: Bottom of 38, under recreation program opportunities, bullet point 2.

15  
16 Commissioner Hetterly: I actually think that's one of the areas where we actually do have  
17 data that middle school sports are over capacity. Field demand, I think, we don't have  
18 much on, but middle schools sports, I think, was clearly documented in the recreation  
19 piece.  
20

21 Peter Jensen: On field demand, currently we have a booking policy that basically is  
22 allowing people to use it, but we know there's a lot more demand for using that. We  
23 know that there is a higher demand for sports fields. From the community surveys, that  
24 was one of the highest responses, adding capacity or more sports fields to our system.  
25 From those two data points right there, I would say it ranks very high to add or enhance  
26 the fields that we have.  
27

28 Chair Lauing: Even in the policies, I think we used the word enhance capacity now  
29 instead of actually "more fields." I'm just wondering if something like middle school  
30 athletic programs are largely over capacity. Instead of going halfway there in terms of  
31 explaining the problem, we should either go all the way there and explain the data and  
32 what it is, so it's got some teeth, or we shouldn't be commenting ad hoc on limited gym  
33 and field space. I think that's part of what you're saying.  
34

35 Commissioner Reckdahl: The way this particular paragraph is worded, it seems like  
36 limited gym and field space is a given. There's nothing we can do because gym space is  
37 limited. We could say, for the other side, we could expand it if we had additional gym  
38 space. That puts a much different spin on that same fact.  
39

40 Mr. de Geus: I think we could look at some rewording in that way. Again, I would say  
41 this isn't where the solutions are. That's Chapter 5. That's where we define the goals,

1 policies, and programs to address these needs and opportunities and gaps that have been  
2 identified in this chapter.

3  
4 Commissioner Reckdahl: As an opportunity, I think if you word it the way I worded it,  
5 it's an opportunity.

6  
7 Mr. de Geus: Yeah.

8  
9 Commissioner Reckdahl: Here it's just saying it's a constraint. I think we want to word  
10 things as opportunities. What can we do to get rid of this constraint?

11  
12 Mr. de Geus: Also, just as a reminder, the City has no gyms. We don't own any gyms.  
13 The School District has gyms. There's no community gym in Palo Alto. There's a  
14 question about are we short gyms in this community. There's no question. We definitely  
15 are.

16  
17 Chair Lauing: Again, I think we're saying the same thing. The conclusions are later, but  
18 it seems like it's either making a conclusion here or sort of leading the witness by making  
19 it sound obvious that we need gyms and we need field space. Sorry, Keith, go ahead. I  
20 just thought it time to ...

21  
22 Commissioner Reckdahl: No, that's very good. There's other comments here. Higher on  
23 the page, it talks about dog parks are almost entirely located south of the Expressway and  
24 things like that. Again, we're talking about constraints as opposed to what can we do to  
25 solve that problem. That'd be my take on this. I don't think all of the facts are worded in  
26 terms of opportunities.

27  
28 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Hetterly.

29  
30 Commissioner Hetterly: I have a lot of comments on this chapter. Listening to the  
31 discussion that just came before, I think a lot of my comments revolve around a different  
32 understanding of what you meant by needs and opportunities. As I read this and the way  
33 my brain works, I thought needs are problems we have to solve, unmet needs that we  
34 want to fill, gaps, preferences maybe also. Opportunities wasn't we could build a park  
35 here or—I can't think of an example now. I thought of opportunities more along the lines  
36 of we have all these needs and we have all these constraints, but having surveyed the  
37 system and understanding what our community preferences are, we have opportunities to  
38 build in more flexibility, to create new partnerships, to plan comprehensively for  
39 distribution across areas, that kind of thing. Just to give you the context of how I was  
40 thinking about needs and opportunities. My comments are really first, I think, this  
41 chapter has too much about methodology. There's a lot of real estate dedicated to talking  
42 about the matrix. When you have a whole chapter in the front talking about process, how

1 the analysis was done, I don't think it needs to be repeated here. I kind of see this chapter  
2 as one of the really meaty pieces of the entire plan. It's essentially the only place to  
3 represent what our needs assessment is. Without that, how do we justify what it is we  
4 want to do. I felt like the needs were expressed largely in these bullets as community  
5 support as opposed to needs. I think what we're saying is these are things the City should  
6 invest in to meet the community needs. Whereas, all this terminology about neighbors  
7 support this or the community supports that made me feel like if we had a ton of money  
8 to invest, these are things that are popular. That was a tone issue that struck a nerve for  
9 me. I also don't think it addresses any of the big overarching needs that didn't necessarily  
10 emerge from community engagement. You all have a sense of needs that Joe Resident  
11 wasn't going to raise in a community outreach process. There's no section in this chapter  
12 to address those. That could include things like Cubberley. We use those gyms  
13 extensively. We use those fields extensively. Our future access is very uncertain. We  
14 have no idea if we'll continue to be able to use those facilities. Therefore, it's a big need  
15 for the community either to lock in long-term use or to find an alternate location for that  
16 kind of activity. That seems to me a big need that should be represented in this chapter. I  
17 think the 7.7 acres and the 10 1/2 acres at the Baylands are kind of in the same category  
18 where those are needs that we're aware of, but that the community hasn't necessarily  
19 filtered up, and they should be addressed here. The demographic analysis, I think, we  
20 must have spent hours and hours and hours about that when it first came around. I think  
21 we hoped that it would come back around reflecting that input and it never did. I don't  
22 know what changes were made in the interim to that piece, that bigger piece that the  
23 consultants did. The trend analysis is supposed to tell us basically what the community  
24 doesn't yet know that it needs. It's supposed to tell us where we're headed and, therefore,  
25 what we need to do to meet those future needs. The key trends that are bulleted here tell  
26 us very little about the trends, especially looking forward. Steady growth doesn't really  
27 tell us much. It would be meaningful if it looked forward and anticipated that we've had  
28 steady growth for the last 30 years, but the Comprehensive Plan that's under  
29 consideration has scenarios for significant increases in housing. We may well have  
30 significant increases in population. As the Comp Plan focuses on more multifamily units,  
31 then we're talking about more families in houses that don't have yards, and the parks are  
32 going to have to fill that gap. That, I think, is some important data to put in the  
33 demographic trends, because that's a likely trend we're going to face as we try to resolve  
34 our housing crisis. Average age of residents is increasing, but that doesn't really tell us  
35 anything except that the average age is increasing. It would be more useful to have  
36 something saying, for example, the population over 55 has grown at this rate over the last  
37 ten years, and we expect it to grow at this rate over the next ten years. That actually tells  
38 us we've had a lot of seniors, but we're going to have a lot more seniors. Maybe we don't  
39 have enough supports for them. We have lots of bike commuters; that's not a trend. I'm  
40 not sure what it tells us to advise our planning, except that we want to have access by  
41 bike to a lot of different things. The focus on commuters kind of distracts from even that  
42 point. I'd like to see actual numbers represented in the demographic bullets about things



1 that are actionable in terms of the planning. I'd like to see a second section under the  
2 demographic trends that says something like therefore, since we see this on the horizon,  
3 we're going to focus on these things or we're going to enhance services in these areas.  
4 Kind of answering the "what about the trends" question. I think we could have a  
5 paragraph about that in this section. Opportunities, as I say, you see differently from me.  
6 What I expected to see in terms of opportunities—I didn't see any of it here—were things  
7 like now that we know all this, we have an opportunity to strategically strengthen what  
8 we have. We have an opportunity to build connections for people and nature more  
9 comprehensively across the whole City. We have an ability to target opportunity to serve  
10 more diverse needs through flexible facilities and cross-functional usage. We can  
11 accommodate more intensive use with enhanced investment in maintenance or more  
12 durable turf or strategic water usage. There are a lot of opportunities that we can pursue  
13 as a result of everything we know here, that really are opportunities as opposed to just  
14 things that might—opportunities to solve some of the needs identified as opposed to just  
15 nice things to have. Finally, on this section, the second bullet on page 33 identifies as a  
16 key community theme strategic enhancements and improvements needed to better meet  
17 evolving needs and trends, adapt to growth and changing demographics. Those concepts  
18 are kind of lost in the rest of this chapter certainly. It seems to me that they're kind of  
19 fundamental to the overarching purpose of this entire plan. How do we meet the growing  
20 and changing needs of our community, given the constraints of the system? I would love  
21 to see the chapter rewritten to define that as the challenge. How are we going to meet our  
22 changing needs within the constraints of the system while remaining true to our values?  
23 Then, we identify current gaps and preferences, anticipate future needs with the trend  
24 analysis and highlight opportunities to meet that challenge. I think you can do that  
25 without doing any further research. I think we have enough stuff in the binder to be able  
26 to lay out that argument. This is the chance to make the argument that these are the  
27 needs, these are the challenges we face, and this is how we're going to get there from a  
28 strategic, big-picture perspective as opposed to a policy and programs perspective. I  
29 think this chapter just doesn't reach the bar in terms of specifics. I think there's a lot of  
30 talk throughout the document, especially in the methodology piece, about how data-  
31 driven it is. We're constantly talking about how data-driven it is, but then we don't  
32 provide any of the actual data in the report. I don't think we need to integrate the whole  
33 memo that MIG did, but we should pick out the key points that support our conclusions  
34 that drive our recommendations within the body of the piece.

35  
36 Mr. de Geus: Can I respond a little bit to that? I think that was helpful. I think we can  
37 do some things to make this chapter a lot better with data. I think it is thin on that. I  
38 found that really helpful, and we'll go back and rework that some. What I don't  
39 understand is the idea that we would talk about how we would solve the issues and gaps  
40 in this chapter. Are you suggesting that we merge Chapters 4 and 5, which are about our  
41 future and what we want our future to be and how we're going to get there, into one  
42 chapter, which is the needs chapter?

1  
2 Commissioner Hetterly: Sort of. When we got to four, I was going to suggest that we  
3 merge Chapter 4 into Chapters 3 and 5. We put the goals that are in Chapter 4 in the  
4 policy and programs chapter to introduce them. The other things, the other pieces of  
5 Chapter 4 maybe go—let me see. I've got to shift my thinking for a second. I think the  
6 maps that are in Chapter 4 really tie well into the community input. They look at the  
7 geographic areas of unmet need, the focus areas for improved connections. They're  
8 mindful of the intersection with nature. That all ties together with the needs and  
9 opportunities. The principles tie into the Chapter 3 discussion of areas of focus. I  
10 thought standing alone Chapter 4 didn't add enough value to justify standing alone. I  
11 liked the three maps and I liked the concept of a multilayered system, but I don't think it  
12 illustrates how the goals and principles will play out across the City. Those three maps  
13 really address specific issues. They don't fully address or communicate the entire vision  
14 that's represented in the goals. I don't want to overstate the impact of planning around  
15 that broad physical context when those three maps don't really tell us anything about the  
16 quality of facilities and inclusion. They don't tell us about capacity and variety and  
17 quality of uses. They don't tell us about encouraging active and passive use, innovation,  
18 data-driven management and sustainability efforts. Those are all specific goals among  
19 our six goals, but the three maps don't address those issues. That why I would move the  
20 maps into the analysis, Chapter 3, and the goals into the policies and programs, and the  
21 principles into Chapter 3. I think I said that. Just to babble a little further. Those maps, I  
22 think, are a good introduction to a discussion of opportunities if you're thinking of  
23 opportunities the way I was, in terms of expansion, of supply, of access, of natural  
24 systems. If you supplemented those maps with some narrative about cross-functionality,  
25 flexibility, collaborative use of public space, strategic investments to manage intensity of  
26 use, then you create a whole picture of what the needs are and the opportunities are.  
27 Then, you go to Chapter 5 and say these are our goals, and these policies are going to tie  
28 those together.

29  
30 Chair Lauing: Did you have anything, Abbie?

31  
32 Vice Chair Knopper: No.

33  
34 Chair Lauing: I'm now going to be very short. That was exactly what I was going to say.  
35 I'm not trying to claim it. I'm just saying that's exactly right on point in terms of what I  
36 was talking about earlier, about needs and opportunities and how you need to focus it  
37 around the data-driven. I just want to ask one formatting question, because you also  
38 asked for that in this section. Page 43 and 44 actually have the same graph, I think. I  
39 didn't quite understand what—you went from areas of focus. I think the first line on top  
40 of 43 is supposed to be a bullet point offering more of existing programs, and then there's  
41 some copy that starts "these areas of focus were used" such and such. You concluded  
42 that a smaller number of participants placed a very high priority on improvements. I





1 don't understand this whole section. I don't understand the objective of this. Are we  
2 trying to conclude in that one paragraph that—let's see. Second from the top, analysis,  
3 the results reflect strong interest heard throughout the process for (1) community center  
4 space, (2) integrating nature and (3) making parks more welcoming. Are you trying to  
5 make a conclusion that those are the three most important points that residents have voted  
6 for? This whole section on page 43 and 44 was confusing to me.

7  
8 Mr. de Geus: You're talking about page 43?

9  
10 Chair Lauing: And 44, yes.

11  
12 Mr. de Geus: Isn't it talking about the survey and the results of the survey?

13  
14 Chair Lauing: It starts out talking about areas of focus on 42. I think it continues type-  
15 wise over to the top line, and that was supposed to be a bullet point on page 43. It's  
16 offering more of the existing programs, classes and events. Is that an area of focus?

17  
18 Mr. de Geus: I'll have to go back and check. It could be.

19  
20 Chair Lauing: Then it says these areas of focus were utilized to review the direction. I  
21 wasn't clear about why any of this on page 43 or 44 necessarily related to areas of focus  
22 and why you were concluding around those three "highest ranked."

23  
24 Mr. de Geus: We used the areas of focus for a challenge, where we gave community  
25 members a certain amount of money and they had to allocate it across the areas of focus.  
26 This is describing that (crosstalk).

27  
28 Chair Lauing: You're describing the results of one feedback mechanism. Again, I'm not  
29 sure how that addresses needs. Other comments on Chapter 3? Commissioner Moss.

30  
31 Commissioner Moss: On page 34, the third bullet, you talk about universal design and  
32 access. I don't know how many people know what universal design and access is. You  
33 either put it in the glossary or something to do with disabilities or inclusiveness. You say  
34 it in the second part of the sentence, but it's not that clear. You use that universal design  
35 and access several other places in there. If you just mention it once, what it is, that'd be  
36 great. In the next bullet—this is a question for all of us—is this just for local residents or  
37 is it for residents and businesses? Are we prioritizing facility availability for Palo Alto  
38 residents and businesses or just for Palo Alto residents? They've got just Palo Alto  
39 residents, and I was wondering if you include businesses as well. Is that a priority or not?

40  
41 Ms. O'Kane: Commissioner Moss, this section describes feedback we've heard from the  
42 community, so the community specifically said Palo Alto residents.

1  
2 Commissioner Moss: That's all I had for Chapter 3.

3  
4 Chair Lauing: Number 4. Sorry. Commissioner Hetterly.

5  
6 Commissioner Hetterly: I just have a couple of minor comments on Chapter 3. Page 37,  
7 at the bottom of the page just above geographic needs and opportunities, it's talking about  
8 the geographic analysis identified some things that are highly desired by the community.  
9 The second bullet says equitable access to natural open spaces. I don't remember that  
10 being something that was highly desired by the community. I'm not sure what it means.  
11 I'd like clarification of that. On page 38, at the top of the page, the third bullet says dog  
12 parks are almost entirely located south of Oregon Expressway. They are entirely located  
13 south of Oregon. Take out "almost." Finally on page 39, the third bullet at the top talks  
14 about the Art Center and the Junior Museum and Zoo and how many of those programs  
15 have wait lists, partly due to limited space in the specialized buildings. I remember this  
16 being something of a question during the analysis phase. As I recall, there was no  
17 analysis done about programs offered by the Art Center, the Junior Museum and Zoo, and  
18 the Children's Theatre. When they did that program analysis with enrollment and  
19 capacity, facilities were not included in that analysis. Was that correct or am I  
20 remembering that wrong?

21  
22 Mr. de Geus: We did include the program analysis of the Junior Museum and Zoo and  
23 the Art Center and Children's Theatre. We had the managers of those two programs meet  
24 with MIG and share data with them.

25  
26 Commissioner Hetterly: That program analysis is inclusive of these groups as well?

27  
28 Mr. de Geus: It's not as comprehensive as the analysis done on the recreation programs,  
29 but they did do some.

30  
31 Commissioner Hetterly: Thanks. If you could clarify that equitable access to natural  
32 open space, I'd like to know what that's about.

33  
34 Chair Lauing: Chapter 4.

35  
36 Mr. de Geus: I'm not sure—sorry. Just on that question about equitable access to open  
37 space. I'll have to go back and look at this a little further. I recall there was discussion  
38 and data around access to the Baylands. For some residents, it's easier to access, and  
39 some it's really difficult. Partly why we want to build another bridge over 101 for  
40 improving access. I think that's where it might come from. We'll go back and look.

41  
42 Chair Lauing: Chapter 4 comments? Commissioner Moss.

1  
2 Commissioner Moss: On page 62, I love charts. That's ...

3  
4 Chair Lauing: That's Chapter 5. Did I get this wrong?

5  
6 Commissioner Moss: Actually, it's not a chart. On the upper right-hand corner, you  
7 have population standards.

8  
9 Commissioner Hetterly: Where are you?

10  
11 Commissioner Moss: Page 62.

12  
13 Chair Lauing: Are we doing Chapter 4?

14  
15 Commissioner Cribbs: That's five.

16  
17 Commissioner Moss: Sorry.

18  
19 Chair Lauing: Nothing on four?

20  
21 Commissioner Moss: No.

22  
23 Chair Lauing: Keith.

24  
25 Commissioner Reckdahl: (inaudible)

26  
27 Chair Lauing: Go ahead.

28  
29 Commissioner Hetterly: I have a question on four, on the bikeways and pedestrian routes  
30 to parks and recreation facilities. You've got the map.

31  
32 Chair Lauing: Page?

33  
34 Commissioner Hetterly: Page 51. My question is do these connections that are identified  
35 on the map differ from the Bike and Pedestrian Transportation Plan in significant ways.  
36 If so, I think it would be useful to show what's new, what we're recommending to  
37 supplement that bike plan. I'll leave it at that. Thanks.

38  
39 Chair Lauing: Abbie? I had a couple on four. Just another jargon or clarity of language.  
40 On page 50, envisioning the future of the system, talking about guiding the creation of a  
41 multilayered system of parklands and connections that serve both people and natural  
42 systems. Maybe those are park terminology, but it didn't seem like great English.

1 There's a reference under the search areas to Figure 12. I see them as Figures 6 and 7 and  
2 8, but I never got to 12. That's on page 50. It identifies areas where Palo Alto residents  
3 lack access to parks, which is a really important map that you guys have created. I want  
4 to make sure Council Members can find it. That's all I had. We're on to goals. Since  
5 that's kind of a separate thing and that's before you got to implementation, maybe just  
6 reference the rest of the ad hoc report that we put in that note to you. As we said, we  
7 didn't think that all this would be covered, and it's not, and that's fine. We're just trying to  
8 raise the key issues going forward. The first one, as I've already mentioned, was findings  
9 and data driven. The second one is basically prioritization and timeline, and that's  
10 upcoming and soon. The quantification has kind of come full circle from a very tight  
11 quantitative program to something less than that. We'll look forward to finding a middle  
12 ground there. A middle ground rather than just "we'll figure it out later." We're still  
13 trying to do a Master Plan for 20 years, not for 3 years. I hope there's that way forward in  
14 terms of how to prioritize future things. The project budgets, I know you still have a lot  
15 of work to do on that. I guess our question was do you want to do 5,000 budgeted  
16 projects or does it make more sense to look at 20 right now, big ones and small ones. It  
17 just seems like a lot of work to be spec'ing out all these projects. That said, we  
18 understand that Council's going to say what does this cost in the first five years and the  
19 first ten years and so on. If there's a way that you could reduce your work load there.  
20 Another item that we brought up before is there are some projects that are going to  
21 probably need some more research to take data-driven action. Those should be called  
22 out. The research costs rather than the project costs need to be identified. That could be  
23 dedication of Foothill parks or need for gyms or many more items. We need to get a  
24 plan, and then we're going to do the research, and then what. Sort of X, Y, Z so we make  
25 sure that we get to it. Otherwise, if we don't do this research on some of these projects,  
26 either nothing will happen on them or potentially well-meaning folks in the future will  
27 skip the research and just say, "It sounds like a good idea. Let's do it." We lose the  
28 prioritization there over the next 20 years. We haven't done that yet, but it'd be great if  
29 we could figure out what those are that need research and get that underway as part of the  
30 Plan. Any questions on that? We're on to the ... Do we want to look at goals in any  
31 more detail or did we already do that with the redlines? On to seven.

32  
33 Mr. Jensen: Chapters 6 and 7 are being prepared now. We wanted to touch on a couple  
34 of things. Chapter 6, focusing on the site concept plans more specifically for parks and  
35 facility locations. As you know, the site concept plans have been online to review as well  
36 as review at the May Fete Parade event at a community meeting, of course, by the group  
37 here as well as staff and the project team. That survey closed or the site concept review  
38 closed its online review for the community a few weeks ago. This is a few of the  
39 feedback that we got from that. Twenty-seven of the 36 concept plans did receive  
40 comment. Some of them just received one comment, but there was at least a comment to  
41 the majority of the plans, which means that it did get fairly good circulation to the  
42 community. Two hundred seventy-one comments were received online, and



1 approximately 30 written comments were produced from our locations at different  
2 facilities around the City, libraries and Lucie Stern center. Those are being added to the  
3 comment list now. They were not part of the summary that was included in the staff  
4 report; it just included the summary of the 271 comments that are online. Chapter 6, like  
5 I said, does just focus on the concept plans. From that, we do have a few neighborhoods  
6 that formed committees that supplied some response. The Barron Park neighborhood is  
7 looking at both Bol Park and Juana Briones. They are going to bring back their  
8 recommendations to us soon. The Ventura neighborhood formed a little committee and  
9 submitted their response to the concept plans, the aspects they liked and did not. Those  
10 two pieces of feedback from those specific neighborhoods are also being considered.  
11 How we are going to use that information? It was basically a way to verify that those  
12 things we see in the surveys before, as far as being high priority, like bathrooms and dog  
13 parks, providing nature in parks, held true for looking at inserting them into parks. The  
14 majority of those elements that we saw in previous surveys held up in this one as well.  
15 There were things that did come to light, that some neighborhoods did not like in the Park  
16 Plan, which will be considered when the plans are finalized and moved into the Master  
17 Plan. Basically we're getting this information to provide guidance to what new amenities  
18 are included in the Master Plan. We know now that not all items shown on the concept  
19 plans can be done just for time and budget purposes. It'll help to complete timing and  
20 budget analysis, and that is being developed for Chapter 7. That's Chapter 6, which  
21 focuses on the site concept plans. Like I said, they're being reviewed and produced now,  
22 limiting the number of amenities that were on that with direct feedback views from the  
23 community. We can take questions about Chapter 6 or we can move to Chapter 7 and do  
24 them together. We'll move into Chapter 7 and do a review of that. Chapter 7 is the  
25 implementation. Like I said, both Chapters 6 and 7 are under development right now and  
26 inform the strategic direction for implementing the Master Plan. The recommendations  
27 are for the near term which is 0-5 years, the mid-term which is 6-10 years, and the long  
28 term which is 11-20 years. The structure for that chapter is an action plan, funding today  
29 and tomorrow, a review of the funding that is necessary to implement the Master Plan,  
30 and the recommendations. Evaluating future projects and the process will take a progress  
31 report of methodology, which is basically check-ins with the Master Plan, are we  
32 achieving what the Master Plan is asking us to do, and then a call to action. That is the  
33 structure of Chapter 7. There's two samples in here. One of a capital project action plan  
34 and one of a program Master Plan. This first one is an action plan for a capital project.  
35 It's basically derived from the program that we have, 2.E.2, which is the City will actively  
36 pursue adding park restrooms at the following potential locations, basically drawn from  
37 the program in Chapter 5. It identifies those locations here. This graph starts to show  
38 how that will be laid out in Chapter 7 and visually represented. This calls out—you can't  
39 see the left side, but it references the 2.E.2. It references the location of what the  
40 program is, where those projects are slated for individual parks. It goes through and  
41 identifies the year in which those projects will be implemented as well as the cost for  
42 implementing and the additional operating cost that will be involved with maintaining



1 those things on a yearly basis. This shows the action plan for the restrooms which is a  
2 high priority. The years only extend out to 2026, because we'd like to do those sooner  
3 than later. That's basically how it was chosen for those specific years. The next sample  
4 is one for a non-capital project, mostly for programs. Create a robust volunteer  
5 recruitment and management program, which is Program 1.I.1. Again, this breaks down  
6 in the same way. The graphs here are samples of what the finalized graphs could look  
7 like in Chapter 7. This one, again, identifies developing the volunteer opportunities and  
8 doing that in basically 2020. It does not yet provide an estimate of the costs or the  
9 operation costs to that. It gives you an idea of how the action plan will be set up as far as  
10 when and how much that will be discussed in Chapter 7. Now we'll take some feedback  
11 on the approach and the format to Chapter 7 and Chapter 6 as well. I'll open that up to  
12 the Commission.

13  
14 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Reckdahl.

15  
16 Commissioner Reckdahl: Right now the prioritization in Chapter 7 is kind of vague, how  
17 we're going to do that. We may iterate along the way. We only have so much money, so  
18 what can we spend? We could look at those charts and say we're going to stretch things  
19 out because we can't afford it. Are we going to say this is what the need is and here's the  
20 price tag at the end? Are we constraining ourselves by need or are we constraining  
21 ourselves by capital?

22  
23 Mr. de Geus: It's the latter. The need is driving the action plan. By the way, the charts  
24 up there are early drafts. They may change a little bit. They give you a sense of how  
25 we're thinking the action plan will look, which really takes the goals, policies, and  
26 programs and gets more specific as to what we're trying to do. The action plan is very  
27 specific; it starts to talk about specific capital projects and program investment. I think  
28 it's fair to say that the action plan will change. It will evolve and be something we need  
29 to evaluate annually to some extent as things change. That's something we've been  
30 talking about internally, how much of the action plan gets included in the Master Plan.  
31 We cannot create an action plan for 20 years that's going to be in any way real. To Chair  
32 Lauing's point, costing out every one of those projects across 20 years would not be a  
33 sensible thing to do right now. We couldn't do it accurately, and we'd spend a lot of time  
34 on it. The nearer term investment and capital we can get more specific with the budget  
35 and so on. The further out we go, the analysis is going to be less so in terms of the  
36 costing. To your question, it's not driven by budget. It's driven by community  
37 preferences, the community gaps that we identified, growth, and those five criteria that  
38 we've defined as a group in terms of how we'll prioritize projects.

39  
40 Commissioner Reckdahl: We'll plan it out and say this is what we think needs to be  
41 done. It'll have a price tag, and the Council will look at that price tag and say, "Where

1 can we find the money? Do we have to put a bond measure? Can we pay for this  
2 ongoing?"

3  
4 Mr. de Geus: We're still figuring some of this out. We're going to have be a little  
5 careful. We don't really want a price tag for the whole 20 years, because we don't know  
6 what that all is going to cost. It's going to be frightening to look at. The Council's not  
7 going to want to approve it. How can we be specific enough that gets action to those true  
8 needs and gaps that we know are there, but is not too scary for the elected officials to say,  
9 "We're behind this, and we're going to approve it. We're not writing a blank check."  
10 Finding that balance in the final writing of the report is going to be the work over the next  
11 couple of months with the Commission, to try and get that balance right. It'll be good to  
12 check-in with the Council this next month. We don't have that yet. We're just working  
13 on it.

14  
15 Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you.

16  
17 Chair Lauing: Commissioner Hetterly.

18  
19 Commissioner Hetterly: On page 1, in the first paragraph you say this final chapter will  
20 be a tool kit that builds the case and provides key information for implementing the Plan.  
21 Hopefully the case was built in Chapter 3 and Chapter 5. This is really a tool kit with  
22 tactics to implement the strategies that are in the policies and programs. I would rephrase  
23 how you couch this implementation plan, the action plan. I appreciate you showing the  
24 charts. I'm hoping that it won't just be a giant spreadsheet, that there's going to be some  
25 narrative describing what the action plan is. We'll see that when we see it. On page 2,  
26 the last bullet under action plan, the separate analysis for long-range, high-investment  
27 capital projects. I'm not sure exactly what that analysis is going to look like, so I'll look  
28 forward to seeing that. I hope that it will not just identify a long-term need and then punt  
29 to the future how we're going to deal with it, but it'll dip its toe in the alternative  
30 strategies that we can use to chart a course to actually meet those needs. The progress  
31 reporting methodology, I have a lot of concerns about. It seems that the indicators in the  
32 bullets are very timid indicators and not very closely tied to the goals. This is on page 3.  
33 The first bullet, remaining catch-up costs compared to original 2011 inventory, that's  
34 really about measuring progress towards the IBRC goals. I don't think it's about  
35 measuring progress towards the Parks and Rec Master Plan goals, though it's a part of it  
36 of course. The number of users in preserves as opposed to parks, I'm not sure we have  
37 expanding usership in open space necessarily as a goal of this Master Plan. I think  
38 measuring users in parks would be much more informative than users in open space;  
39 although, I understand that's harder to tally. I would like to see indicators along the lines  
40 of park acreage added or dedicated in priority search areas, percent increase in funding,  
41 number of new partnerships resulting in more shared space, more funding, more  
42 coordinated services. That would be with PAUSD, Stanford, Friends groups, nonprofits,

1 businesses, property owners, whoever they may be. Increased participation in teen  
2 programming, I'd like to see more take-up. I think that's an indicator of whether we've  
3 been successful in designing programs that meet that identified need. Number of new or  
4 more services for seniors, acreage or square footage of native planting or habitat added.  
5 If in determining what parks were under-used we tracked the usage there, then it'd be  
6 useful to track any increased usage at those underutilized parks. Number of dog parks,  
7 restrooms, gardens created. Number of facilities serving new activities including nature  
8 play. Number of dog owners using fenced dog parks. It'd be great to know that because  
9 if we built a dog park, we have more people who are abiding by the law in exercising  
10 their dogs within the dog park. Those are the kind of indicators that directly tie to the  
11 goals and actually allow Council and the public to see that we meant what we said, and  
12 we're doing it. Thanks.

13  
14 Chair Lauing: Abbie.

15  
16 Vice Chair Knopper: To Jennifer's point just now, I was just thinking about every year  
17 when you recap to Council, this is what we implemented in 2018 and this what we had  
18 taken from the Master Plan, how we recap that so we can keep moving forward. You  
19 want to tout your success and say, "We developed this five-year plan. This is what we've  
20 done," and then moving forward. Is it going to be different than the way you've been  
21 doing it? You're developing this whole new playbook for the City. Every year you go in  
22 and you say, "We've done this. We've done that. This has been successful. That hasn't."  
23 Are you going to want to do things differently since you're going to have this bible, so to  
24 speak, of programs now? Do we want to include that somehow in this final chapter,  
25 saying this is what we're recommending and how that communication is going to be  
26 moving forward?

27  
28 Mr. de Geus: That's a good question. Obviously we haven't drafted this yet. These just  
29 represent some examples of things that we want to do. We will be doing things  
30 differently, hopefully better, more strategic, a little longer term even. At the same time,  
31 we want to be able to fit the way we're planning both program improvements and capital  
32 improvements in a way that's aligned with the capital budget process, so we can smoothly  
33 fit in the hopes and expectations of this Plan into the five-year capital plan and beyond.  
34 This is a 20-year Plan; we're going to have a timeline that goes out 20 years, just  
35 recognize the last 10 years is more likely to shift.

36  
37 Chair Lauing: I concur again with Jennifer's comments. My comment on the last one is  
38 this whole thing needs to be a strategic plan. It's a strategic implementation plan. When  
39 we talk about action plan, it almost gets by definition tactical. I don't want to get into the  
40 nomenclature, but this has to be strategic. These bullet points on reporting methodology  
41 didn't feel strategic. Appreciate the detail that Commissioner Hetterly put in on that.  
42 Similarly, if there's stuff that you really need to get done in the fourth year and it just



1 costs too much, then it still should probably be in there as a strategic objective. Like any  
2 other capital budgeting stuff, things get lopped off the bottom, because you can't afford to  
3 do them. At least you've stayed true to the strategy that was developed in all the work  
4 that's been done to say this is a high priority. If we decide we can't do it in the first five  
5 years, it's still a high priority and we had a budget constraint. An action plan in this kind  
6 of document isn't a budgeting plan. It's still a strategic plan. That was the kind of  
7 overview that I had on this. Others?

8  
9 Commissioner Cribbs: In regards to if it costs too much and it drops out of the list or  
10 something like that, if there's a way that we can encourage in the report the opportunity to  
11 look for a way to find the funding or to create a vision that people might be enchanted by,  
12 there could be a way that we could get something done even if it seems to be too much  
13 money in the budget.

14  
15 Chair Lauing: Concluded on that item? Schedule.

16  
17 Mr. de Geus: I did want to add we had agenda planning with the Clerk's Office and City  
18 Manager. The dates are always moving around for items. We got bumped from the 19th.  
19 We're pushing to actually go earlier on the 6th. We would have liked the 12th, but that  
20 couldn't work. I didn't want to wait any longer because, as you all know, we've been  
21 moved out enough. We're scrambling a little bit to get the report finished and completed  
22 by this week so that we can actually go on the 6th and give Council a delayed update. It's  
23 September 6th. Related to your memo we talked about earlier, we'll include that as well  
24 for the 6th. It's an hour and a half.

25  
26 Chair Lauing: The other points in your draft Master Plan, fall '16 which is now. When  
27 you say winter approval, is that winter approval by Council?

28  
29 Mr. de Geus: Yeah. I'd like to see us complete this Plan by the end of the calendar year  
30 for the Council Members that are leaving and also for the Commissioners that have done  
31 so much work on this. I don't know if you're renewing or what. If we can complete it  
32 this calendar year, I think that'd be great.

33  
34 Chair Lauing: That would be four months, a little bit less. Any comments on schedule or  
35 content or other direction? Should we put more content into the next meeting so we can  
36 make sure we stay on track? We spent a couple of months in sort of abeyance here. Was  
37 there another comment?

38  
39 Commissioner Hetterly: I just wanted to make another plug for in Chapter 3 or Chapter 7  
40 that you have some stated emphasis on the maintenance issues that are associated with  
41 growth. Not only are we going to have to do the catch-up and keep-up from the IBRC,  
42 but as we have more intense use of limited facilities, wear and tear is going to increase

1 more and more and more and more, and this Plan should acknowledge that and articulate  
2 a strategy for serving it.

3  
4 Chair Lauing: If there's more growth in housing and population, that's going to  
5 contribute as well. Thank you for that effort.

6  
7 **6. Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates.**

8  
9 Chair Lauing: The Director's Report. No, sorry. Ad hoc committee reports. We might  
10 have a short one on gyms. Do you want to make any comments on that?

11  
12 Commissioner Cribbs: No, not at this time.

13  
14 Chair Lauing: Any other ad hocs? I think all others have reported.

15  
16 **V. DEPARTMENT REPORT**

17  
18 Chair Lauing: The Director's report.

19  
20 Kristen O'Kane: I will start just with some announcements of some upcoming special  
21 events that are occurring. On Saturday, September 10th, the City is partnering with the  
22 YMCA to offer a Palo Alto community health fair. This will be at Mitchell Park  
23 Community Center from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. Again, on September 10th.  
24 September 16th is the annual Moonlight Run. We did have to readjust the route of the  
25 5K run because of the creek project. We did get a new route, so that's still moving  
26 forward. October 2nd there is an expo, a bike and alternative transportation expo that the  
27 City is working on. We've just started planning that. I don't have a lot of detail on it at  
28 this time. I can provide that as we get it. I'm going to turn it over to Daren now, who's  
29 going to give a brief update on the golf course construction.

30  
31 Daren Anderson: The good news is the golf course project is underway. We started on  
32 July 11th mobilizing the project team and bringing in Wadsworth, the contractor who's  
33 working on that job, bringing in their trailers and mobilized their entire operation. Part of  
34 that was a wetland and endangered species and cultural artifacts awareness training for  
35 their team. As they're excavating soil and digging down, should they find anything,  
36 they're trained on what to do. Putting in our erosion control and storm water protection  
37 plan measures. They're finishing right now installing the wetland salt marsh harvest  
38 mouse and tree protective fencing. The next step—this is the big one—is the earth work  
39 that will start up very soon. That'll be the reshaping and contouring of the golf course  
40 utilizing the stock pile. That'll continue on until March 2017; that's a good long stretch  
41 we'll be working with the earth and soil. Concurrently with that, we'll be doing the  
42 drainage and irrigation and those aspects. Around April 2017, they'll be building the new



1 cart paths and constructing the greens and growing in grass. Once the turf is established,  
2 the project will be complete. That'll be right around October or November 2017  
3 tentatively at this point.

4  
5 Commissioner Reckdahl: The golf course is completely closed down?

6  
7 Mr. Anderson: Yes. With the exception of the driving range and the putting green. Of  
8 course, we still have the Bay Café and the pro shop open.

9  
10 Commissioner Reckdahl: They're staying open—the pro shop is going to have enough  
11 business to stay open?

12  
13 Mr. Anderson: Yes.

14  
15 Chair Lauing: It's such a relief to actually be building it after all this effort and debate  
16 and delays and bureaucracy. Just speaking for all of us, it feels so good to be underway.  
17 Did you have any others? Commissioner Moss.

18  
19 Commissioner Moss: I want to echo the Audubon Society's concerns about how we have  
20 to take out 80 percent of the trees. Is that really, really necessary? Also, the part that's  
21 over near the Baylands Athletic Center, is that part of the same project? Take out 90  
22 percent of those trees.

23  
24 Mr. Anderson: The tree removal part of the golf course was debated heavily as we  
25 worked through the project planning stages. I think we retained as many trees as we  
26 could. I think it was kind of a necessary part of the project. If you're going to  
27 reconfigure the whole golf course, there's not a lot of ways around some of those trees  
28 coming out. Yeah, I think that unfortunately is necessary. We did put in mitigation plans  
29 to address that by increasing habitat both at the Baylands—that's nearby habitat-  
30 beneficial improvements—and up at Pearson-Arastradero Preserve with caging of, I  
31 think, 650 oak saplings to protect them.

32  
33 Commissioner Moss: Is it possible to plant more mature trees than saplings?

34  
35 Mr. Anderson: This isn't planting them. This is protecting them with caging. I don't  
36 believe the funding would allow for too much more additional planting.

37  
38 Chair Lauing: The design is a Baylands design. It's supposed to be integrated with the  
39 Baylands look. Those trees are actually not native and don't have anything to do with the  
40 Baylands.

1 Mr. Anderson: Although it wasn't really factored into the mitigation, the reduction of 50  
2 acres of irrigated turf. In its place, though not trees, there are a lot of Baylands native  
3 shrubs that offer high habitat value. It's just a different variety.  
4

5 **VI. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**  
6

7 Chair Lauing: Did you have anything else for announcements?  
8

9 Commissioner Reckdahl: I have (inaudible).  
10

11 Chair Lauing: Go ahead, Keith.  
12

13 Commissioner Reckdahl: Last month we talked about Lucy Evans, and they're supposed  
14 to start construction in September. Is this early September or late September? When are  
15 we going to be starting the Boardwalk?  
16

17 Daren Anderson: I don't have a start date. Next Commission meeting, I'll bring you an  
18 update.  
19

20 Commissioner Reckdahl: We're really tight for scheduling. If the start date slips, we  
21 may lose our window and the Boardwalk will lose a full year. I'm very anxious.  
22

23 Peter Jensen: I do have a small announcement. It's not a large project, but the Wilkie  
24 Way pathway connection into the Somerset—I think that's right—Hills residential area is  
25 not yet complete but should be open. I would say it's 95 percent completed. Open to the  
26 public hopefully next week or the week after. That is allowing access into that new  
27 residential area which was built a few years ago. It has an open area park in it with a  
28 playground. It's very close to Monroe Park, so those two parks can now work in  
29 conjunction. The playground equipment there is a lot more robust than what we find in  
30 Monroe Park. The park is not as big as Monroe, even though Monroe is not very big in  
31 itself. It does allow access from that surrounding neighborhood to that facility.  
32 Something we've been working on for a while.  
33

34 Chair Lauing: Anne.  
35

36 Commissioner Cribbs: Is there an update on Cubberley and the rental process?  
37

38 Rob de Geus: There is now that you mention it. We've put out an RFP for Foothill  
39 College leaving. They're leaving by the end of September. We received 28 or 29  
40 responses. This last Friday, the staff did a mapping exercise to see how many could be  
41 accommodated in all the different rooms. There's some 40,000 square feet being vacated.  
42 It's a big puzzle. We're not there yet, but we think we can accommodate a lot of folks,



1 which we're very happy about that. We're at the point of having a draft of what we think  
2 we can do and are reaching out to the different potential renters this next week.

3  
4 Commissioner Moss: Is that no two-story construction or anything like that? It's just  
5 existing facilities.

6  
7 Mr. de Geus: That's right. The existing facilities at the Cubberley Community Center.  
8 Foothill College had a great deal of space. It's just a little scary because we've got to  
9 generate that revenue that the City's counting on. At the same time, it's able to  
10 accommodate a lot of nonprofits and people that need space. That's been kind of  
11 exciting.

12  
13 Commissioner Hetterly: Is there any further progress with the School District on  
14 designing a planning process under the compact?

15  
16 Kristen O'Kane: We've been meeting with the School District every few months. They  
17 are going to their Board in October to ask for more direction on what they would like to  
18 do with the property. They've discussed having a school there. They've discussed  
19 possibly some other uses. We're meeting with them to stay in touch, but we're waiting on  
20 this School Board meeting in October to be able to take it to the next step.

21  
22 Chair Lauing: How about Avenidas? That's not necessarily in our bailiwick, but they  
23 were here once. Is that moving forward or what's the status on that?

24  
25 Mr. de Geus: That's moving forward as well. Interestingly, they would love to see  
26 Cubberley as a temporary location for them when they're rebuilding. They're still at least  
27 a year away before beginning.

28  
29 Vice Chair Knopper: I have a quick question. Has the State of California talked to the  
30 City? Is Zika a concern here, like mosquitoes? I don't know what kind of season it's  
31 supposed to be. Is it rainy, is there supposed to be a lot of water? Currently we have  
32 none, so I don't think a mosquito is an issue. I was just wondering.

33  
34 Mr. de Geus: Daren probably knows more about this. I think West Nile is a bigger issue  
35 here, because of the type of mosquitoes we have. The mosquito that carries the Zika  
36 virus is not generally in this area. That's not to say I'm not a bit nervous about it. Daren,  
37 do you have anything?

38  
39 Mr. Anderson: I would just say that we're in close communication with Santa Clara  
40 County Vector Control. We haven't received any notifications of threats in our area.

41  
42 Chair Lauing: David.

1  
2 Commissioner Moss: You had mentioned that—Jim Cowie and I are going to Midtown  
3 on the 18th, I think it is. We're supposed to talk about the Master Plan. What portion of  
4 what we've talked about here are we allowed to talk about or not allowed to talk about?  
5 Can we talk about everything?  
6

7 Chair Lauing: Yep, it's public.  
8

9 Ms. O'Kane: Yes, absolutely. Commissioner Moss and Commissioner Cowie will be  
10 attending the ice cream social of the Midtown Neighborhood Association just  
11 representing the Parks and Rec Commission, but also there to answer questions on the  
12 Master Plan process. I'll be there as well for support. Anything that we've discussed here  
13 is public information.  
14

15 Vice Chair Knopper: David, I wouldn't really worry. I did it last year, and I was covered  
16 with vanilla ice cream. There wasn't much time for questions. It was a lot of scooping.  
17 They'll put you to work.  
18

19 Commissioner Hetterly: I just warn you that one of the issues that they're very concerned  
20 about in Midtown is the prospect of a dog park in Hoover Park. You are likely to get  
21 some questions about that. You might want to read the dog park staff report before you  
22 go just so you're armed with some info.  
23

24 Commissioner Moss: I also know about the—also the Matadero Creek Trail caused some  
25 questions, so I have to be able to talk about that a little bit.  
26

27 Chair Lauing: Rob.  
28

29 Mr. de Geus: I would just add, Commissioner Moss, to listen more, I suppose. That's the  
30 main thing that you want to do, listen to the residents. If they ask you questions about  
31 where the Commission stands on something, unless the Commission has taken a vote and  
32 a position on something, then you wouldn't suggest what you think about this park is a  
33 Commission perspective when it's not.  
34

35 Chair Lauing: Good counsel. I just wanted to make a comment that I'm going to as  
36 many of the park concerts as possible. I went to Patti and Tuck Saturday night. The  
37 place was slammed, jammed. We need a much bigger park there. Judge Lucky does a  
38 good job of rallying the troops. The comment I wanted to make is that we do it for  
39 community, and that's working because there's a lot of times more community than there  
40 is listening to the concert, particularly the children. That's great because that's one of the  
41 objectives. You meet your neighbors, and you meet new people. The kids run wild, and

1 they're safe. It's just really cool. People thanked me for putting on the concert, if they  
2 know I'm on the Commission. I go, "It's the least I could do for the community."  
3

4 Mr. de Geus: I missed you there, Chair Lauing. I was there too with my family. It was  
5 fun. Talk about safety. I don't know if you saw those kids. There were kids up in the big  
6 redwood tree, maybe 40 feet up. I was like, "Is that for real?" My son, 12-year-old  
7 Jacob, said, "Can I do that, Dad?" I said no.  
8

9 Chair Lauing: Yeah, I was kind of stage right, meaning off to the left, but it was really  
10 crowded. Anything else? Jennifer.  
11

12 Commissioner Hetterly: I just want to make a quick announcement. The Comp Plan  
13 Advisory Committee has been working on the Land Use Element for quite some time  
14 now. It looks like we are going to finally—we may finally move off of that and onto the  
15 Natural Environment Element. At the very least, we'll have an introduction into that  
16 element at next month's meeting, September 20th if anybody's interested. That's really  
17 the element that has the most guidance about our open space and natural ecosystems.  
18

19 Chair Lauing: I hear you're putting in a couple of hours a week on that committee. Is  
20 that right? Very intense. David.  
21

22 Commissioner Moss: The Baylands Conservation Plan, that's moving along. You're  
23 going to have something to look at in the next month, I guess.  
24

25 Ms. O'Kane: That's correct. Daren and I have drafted the scope of work for the Baylands  
26 Comprehensive Conservation Plan. We've distributed that to other internal stakeholders  
27 that might have a vested interest in that. We've received some comments. We're also  
28 going to have some of the environmental groups review that. We'll also send it to the ad  
29 hoc group of the Commission. You can expect that, I would say, in the next couple of  
30 weeks.  
31

## 32 **VII. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR SEPTEMBER 27, 2016 MEETING**

33

34 Chair Lauing: The next item on the agenda is tentative agenda for the September 27th  
35 meeting. We could put the Master Plan on there. Do we expect the Zoo to be back?  
36

37 Kristen O'Kane: We do. That should be in September. We'll also come back with  
38 analysis of the aquatics programs that we're working on. We'll also be having a  
39 presentation on our special events that we do through Community Services, what we've  
40 accomplished last year and what we're planning on moving forward with this year.  
41

42 Chair Lauing: Is that going to be a short one?

1  
2 Ms. O'Kane: Yeah, that'll be a short one.

3  
4 Chair Lauing: The first three that we mentioned are going to be long.

5  
6 Ms. O'Kane: We can talk about that. If it's better to move it to a different date, that's  
7 fine.

8  
9 Chair Lauing: I think it'll depend on how much content you have on the Master Plan. If  
10 you can get through six and seven and revise some of the stuff we've got, that's going to  
11 be content laden.

12  
13 Ms. O'Kane: I thought it would be nice to share something other than the Master Plan at  
14 our meetings.

15  
16 Chair Lauing: We agree. The aquatics is good. The Zoo will be fun. Probably the  
17 special events is 20 minutes, 30 minutes.

18  
19 Ms. O'Kane: Max. As we get closer to the date, we can talk about it.

20  
21 Chair Lauing: Any other things for that agenda? I think we're done.

22  
23 **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

24  
25 Chair Lauing: I would entertain a motion for adjournment. Don't have one. Did you  
26 move?

27  
28 Meeting adjourned on motion by Commissioner Hetterly and second by Vice Chair  
29 Knopper at 9:45 p.m.