MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
February 27, 2018
CITY HALL
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California

Commissioners Present: Anne Cribbs, Jeff Greenfield, Jeff LaMere, Ryan McCauley, Don McDougall, David Moss, and Keith Reckdahl

Commissioners Absent: None

Others Present: Daren Anderson, Kristen O'Kane, Natalie Khwaja

I. ROLL CALL

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS

Chair McDougall: Are there any changes, additions, requests relative to the agenda? The agenda includes Baylands Comprehensive Plan discussion, a review of the retreat experience we just had, and other announcements, other updates. If not, we'll begin with Oral Communications from the public.

III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Chair McDougall: I have two cards. We'll go with—do I have more cards? If there are speaker cards, could you please … Thank you. I have three cards, so we'll allot 3 minutes apiece for discussion, up to 3 minutes. The first speaker is Adnan Boosie [phonetic].

Adnan Boosie: My name is Adnan Boosie. I'm a resident of Palo Alto. I've been playing tennis. It's first generation. My son plays tennis. My grandson playing tennis. The rumors are that they're going to convert three courts that I've been playing for over 20 years to pickleball. This is not acceptable by me or by most people that play tennis there. The reason is there are other courts across the way that are occupied Saturday, Sunday by coaches that are appointed by the City or permitted by the City. If they convert these other three courts to pickleball, there will be no tennis courts to play. The people that play this
pickleball come from all over the area, Milpitas, Fremont, Santa Cruz. 90 percent of them
in my opinion are not resident of Palo Alto. There are more courts like Rinconada. There
are more than ten courts. Here, we have limited courts, and they're limited because there
are coaches that coach most of the day there. The parking is just impossible, impossible.
I definitely oppose this idea of converting. People don't have to come in droves and bring
their dogs and food and all that to the courts. Also, the lack of parking for all these people.

Chair McDougall: Thank you.

Mr. Boosie: Thank you.

Chair McDougall: We went through this the last item with the tennis people. If you insist
on clapping, which is inappropriate in this chamber, then we won't continue with the
presentations. The next is Jon Park.

Jon Park: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I am a tennis player. I want to thank you
for letting us play tennis at Mitchell Park. We really appreciate that. My group consists
of working professionals, university students, and longtime friends. They would love to
be here tonight at this meeting, but many work late hours so they can't be here. I'm
representing them. Today is our tennis night, and we are at work or school during the
daytime, so evening is the best time for us to play. It's time for us to play and get together,
compete, and spend time together. I would say it will be a sad day when nearly half the
existing courts at Mitchell Park would be permanently converted to another sport. During
warmer days, sometimes we would wait up to an hour even with the seven courts. I can't
imagine what it would be like with only four courts. On Tuesday evenings, two of the
courts are allocated to lessons. With only four courts, only two would be available for
tennis. During the times when I do wait for a court, I see other players play. Sometimes
you'll see young kids playing first time with their parents or friends. Other times, I've seen
some college-level players that are nearly professional. It's incredible. Sometimes I see
elder ladies and gentlemen playing, and sometimes their serve is so much better than mine.
Tennis remains a very popular sport. Sports fans see international competition such as
Wimbledon, U.S. Open, and many others. Kids watch that on television. Those are
promoting tennis, so there will be a constant influx of new tennis players as these
tournaments play out thrilling points. Federer with his athleticism and smart playing is not
just a top ten pro, but he is an incredible athlete. Venus Williams' come back from an
autoimmune disease to become once again one of the top tennis players in the world is
incredible. Bryan brothers' abilities are just incredible, out of this world. Just imagine
when a young child sees these players play and they want to go out on the courts. They go
out to Mitchell Park, and they see that half the courts are converted to another sport. It will
be really disappointing to young kids. I along with hundreds of other tennis players that
are not able to make this meeting today urge you to keep the courts open for tennis. If we
do that, we can actually share between the pickleball and tennis. If you convert completely
to pickleball, we can't play tennis.

Chair McDougall: Thank you, Mr. Park.

Mr. Park: We really appreciate your time. Thank you very much.

Chair McDougall: Next speaker is Jennie Chen [phonetic].

Jennie Chen: Hi. I'm also a tennis player, and I'm a Palo Alto resident. When this whole
thing started, we learned that the City of Palo Alto is making this consideration because
they feel that those three courts over the bridge are not heavily used by the tennis players.
That's totally untrue. I really challenge the Park and Rec to come by and see these courts,
especially on a summer night. I sometimes have to wait for half an hour to an hour for a
court. Those three courts are definitely used by the tennis players. The assumption that
they're not used is false. I believe I read a mission statement somewhere in the City of Palo
Alto that we want to have multiuse of our resources. If these were converted to pickleball
court, that becomes single use and defeats the whole purpose of the City's mission since
our resources are scarce. When the tennis community learned about this potential change,
we started a petition. So far we have collected about 130 signatures against this conversion.
We have, I think, two petitions going out. One is by Palo Alto Tennis Club, and one is by
a small group of us that we're just collecting signatures. We have two sets of petitions
going. My petition now has over 130-something signatures against this conversion. I
challenge the City to come by to see the courts. They are heavily used by the tennis players,
especially on summer nights. I do want to also point out in south Palo Alto only Mitchell
Park has lighted tennis courts, and that's seven of them. If you take away three, there's only
four lit courts left. That is totally insufficient to basically provide for the south Palo Alto
tennis community. Thank you.

Chair McDougall: Thank you. The last speaker will be Monica Williams.

Monica Williams: Good evening. I'm Monica Engle Williams. I'm a big tennis fan, having
played for over 60 years. I was a member for over 25 years of the Palo Alto Tennis Club
and also served on its Board. I'm now a new fan of a sport that has been around for over
50 years but has only recently been discovered by Californians. It's pickleball. I started
playing 4 years ago with 10 guys I met at the paddle tennis courts. They found it hard to
find paddle tennis partners, so they took up pickleball after paddle tennis champion Tom
Foladare discovered the sport when visiting LA. This group of 10 has now grown to over
400 players. Every weekday we average 40 players, except on Wednesdays there are over
50. Saturdays there are over 70 players, and Sundays there are over 80 players. Three
hundred sixty players each week playing on only three tennis courts. We put up 11
pickleball nets and are hoping the City will find a way to provide multiple dedicated courts
as many cities have done all over the nation. I want to thank all of you and the Community
Services Department for listening to both tennis players and pickleball players alike and know that you will take into consideration all the facts and figures that you have gathered and hope that you can soon make a final decision regarding tennis and pickleball court access that will benefit the majority of the whole community. If there's any way we can help contribute to the cost, we're willing to start a pickleball raising campaign. Our group has over 100 Palo Alto residents who play regularly at Mitchell Park. If any of you are in any doubt and think pickleball may be a fad, please listen to this very carefully. The Indian Wells Tennis Garden near Palm Springs is the second largest tennis stadium in the world. This is where almost 20 years ago 17-year-old Serena Williams beat then 21-time tennis champion Steffi Graf. Nine years ago, Mr. Larry Ellison purchased this $77 million sports complex in Indian Wells. An agreement has recently been signed for the Indian Wells Tennis Garden to host the national pickleball championship for the next 5 years. You've guessed it. Larry Ellison now plays pickleball. The 2018 USPA pickleball nationals will be there on November 22nd. For the past 2 years, CBS Sports has covered the national pickleball championships. There's no doubt that pickleball is here to stay. Please come on over. It's a sport for generations. We had a 6-year old playing on Sunday.

Chair McDougall: Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Williams.

Ms. Williams: Thank you for your time.

Chair McDougall: Thank you. Thank you all for your comments and observations.

IV. DEPARTMENT REPORT

Chair McDougall: We'll move on to our next agenda item, which is Department Report.

Daren Anderson: Good evening. Daren Anderson, Open Space, Parks and Golf. I want to give you a couple of updates on various things within Open Space, Parks, and Golf. First on the golf course, we're in negotiations with a new company to manage the golf course. That's moving along well. We're close to an agreement. We're targeting a grand opening for the weekend of April 28th. On the parks front, our next park renovation is scheduled for Boulware Park. We're going to do a community meeting on March 6. Also under the parks section, we've got our bids for building the Peers Park dog park due on March 6th, the same date. By late April, we should be starting construction. Construction should be about a month or so, and the hope is by late May or early June we'll be opening that dog park. On Open Space, for a long time now we've discussed the closed trails at Foothills Park. In the last update I gave you, unfortunately there was one plant that wasn't in bloom during our previous surveys. We had to do another survey for this particular plant. That's happening this week. Once that's complete, we'll work with Planning to move on to next steps. The one challenge I foresee is there are woodrat nests adjacent to some of the trails on Costanoan. On Los Trancos Trail, the other trail that has these issues, there are no nest obstacles. We might split them depending on what I hear from Planning in terms of delays.
for additional environmental review due to those nests. I just want to keep you in the loop on that one. Every time I come to the Commission, I'll give you a little update. We're working on it actively.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Daren, would the City of Palo Alto workers be doing this or will we have to put this out for bid?

Mr. Anderson: This would be via a contract. The ad hoc committee working on Buckeye Creek and the 7.7 acres met with staff on February 22nd to discuss a game plan for when we open that property. Again, that topic will go to Council on April 16th. That's Buckeye Creek and the 7.7 acres recommendation that came from the Commission. The ad hoc had some good creative thinking on next steps and planning. Some of the ideas range from making sure we engage with Friends of Foothills Park to contacting our Landscape Architect, which I have done, about putting together a drawing that could show some possible uses of the 7.7 acres when it's time to engage the public again for how we might use that. Peter Jensen will help put together that conceptual drawing that shows some possible uses for the site including restoration over time. The other idea was to see if we could invite some Council Members up to see that property in advance of the April 16th meeting. We're investigating both of those options. I'll get into this more obviously in the next topic. At our last public meeting on the Baylands Conservation Plan, a member of the Public Works team came and spoke and gave a couple of updates that I wanted to pass on to you. One has to do with Byxbee Park, which is why I've got this open. This aerial view shows Byxbee Park highlighted here. You see it in the light brown color. It's a former landfill. Former landfills settle periodical and have to be brought back to grade. Right now we've got some settlement happening in several areas. Public Works is going to come in and do about 10 acres of settlement, meaning they're going to bring in soil and raise that back to the necessary grades. It's going to be happening in the next couple of weeks. They figure every year they'll have to do little segments like that for quite sometime to bring it back to compliance.

Commissioner Cribbs: Daren, where does the soil come from that you're getting?

Mr. Anderson: I don't know. They import it. They do have a screening process. When they originally capped this and capped different portions over time, they have a rigorous screening process for what's acceptable and what's not in terms of capping material. They'll apply that to whatever import they bring on this one too.

Commissioner Cribbs: Is it an opportunity for any revenue at all?

Mr. Anderson: Typically not. I don't see this being a revenue one. There might be some exchange for free grading. That often happens. Our staff doesn't have to pay for outside contractors to do that. The one thing we're looking at is an opportunity, as we're bringing these low areas back to fill, for burrowing owls. Part of the conflict with owls being there...
is the burrowing rodents, which aren't allowed. If we're adding fill, maybe there are some ways around that. That's one element we're looking at. The other one is a real challenge with invasive weeds on that site. With bringing in this new fill, what happens most often in my experience is an invasion of different invasive weeds. Can we find a creative way to stem that invasion and hopefully encourage some natives? We've got a couple of ideas that we're willing to look at for that one too.

Chair McDougall: Daren, we have some questions.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Excuse me, Daren. Any chance the overburden at the 7.7 acres could be used for fill?

Mr. Anderson: I don't think so. We looked at that overburden, and it's very difficult to move, very expensive just to truck it out of there.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Just thought I'd ask.

Mr. Anderson: That's a good question. Were there any other questions on Byxbee?

Commissioner Cribbs: The meeting on Boulware Park on the 6th of March. At what time is it?

Mr. Anderson: I'll send an email out at the end of tonight and advise all of the Commission on that. I want to say 6:30.

Commissioner Cribbs: There is that aquatics meeting at almost the same time.

Mr. Anderson: Peter's advised me it's 6:30 at Ventura Community Center.

Chair McDougall: Daren, you have another question over here, I believe. Jeff, did you have a question? Thank you.

Mr. Anderson: Another Public Works activity—we just looked at Byxbee. To the lower left is the Renzel Wetlands. There's a freshwater pond at the lower left. Public Works has been trying to deal with the berm on that pond and the faults in it. It's leaking, it's breaking apart. For a long time, they've tried to fix it. Most recently, they engaged with our Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan stakeholders to see if there are opportunities to expand this freshwater wetlands into an upland invasive weed area and have more freshwater wetlands, which would benefit the treatment plant to discharge more water there. In working with the regulatory agencies, Public Works has learned that's not feasible in the near term. They've got to address these repairs more immediately than that. They were given clearance to repair it from the inside. Within the next probably 6 months, they will make repairs to the berm along there. That means draining it and getting rid of the cattails that have choked off capacity throughout that area. I should mention that area gets
1 million gallons of treated water a day from the treatment plant. The water flows through there, into Matadero Creek, and into the flood basin. The last update that Public Works shared with us at that meeting …

Chair McDougall: Daren, in the CIP that I saw recently, the money for that was 1 or 2 years out. Does that influence anything?

Mr. Anderson: For repairs on this?

Chair McDougall: Yeah.

Mr. Anderson: It wouldn't be. Money for the emergency repairs will be covered through small capital funds in the water treatment plant facility.

Chair McDougall: We can use the money for something else?

Mr. Anderson: They won't be touching parks money for that one. Two more. The LATP site, let me show you that. This one's hard to see. I left it high visual because I wanted to give you context. Here's Shoreline Lake. Here's the rest of the Baylands. There's this little property here called the LATP site, the former Los Altos Treatment Plant. The City owns this property, bought it, I believe, in '74. There's a building on there. We're having some conversations about the LATP site for our Baylands Plan, what to do with it, what's going to become of it, can parts be incorporated into the Baylands, that kind of thing. Public Works shared that there's a building on there that they're going to have to take down. Someone suggested it may be salvageable. Unfortunately, it's not. The photos of the inside are worse than this, where it's collapsing, the wood rotting. I wanted to give a heads up to those that are familiar with that site, that that building will be taken down relatively soon. That concludes my part of the Department Report.

Chair McDougall: Can I ask one more question? Back to Byxbee Park and the sinking land. Is that expected to happen in six or seven more places or just in that one place? How long does it take? Should we think of creating some signage and what not so we don't have the "what the hell's going on" problem?

Mr. Anderson: Yes to the latter. We need some signage. The Rangers will also be floating around the park. We have a kiosk at the Byxbee Hills restroom, so we can post this information about why is this happening, what we're doing, the long terms plans. Unfortunately, it's not isolated to one spot. It will continue in several areas. It's just endemic to landfills. There are areas of Byxbee that were capped more recently. It was broken into A, B, and C areas. This whole back side was capped recently relative to some of the other parts that were capped in the late '80s or early '90s. I expect this area to settle more frequently and sooner. Right now, they're starting in this area. When I was actively working at the Baylands as a Ranger, I saw areas where the trail dropped 6-8 feet. I
wondered why that elevation was there. I thought it was maybe a design element. No, it had settled. The entire trail had collapsed significantly. I expect the same. I think they're going to correct it more frequently.

Chair McDougall: Thank you.

Kristen O'Kane: Good evening. Kristen O'Kane, Community Services. I have a few announcements as well. Two community events. The first is our summer camp fair, which is this Saturday, March 3rd, from 11:00 to 1:30 at Mitchell Park Community Center. This is a free event that highlights the different summer camps and programs that the Community Services Department offers. We will have staff there who can assist people in planning their children's summer camps and helping to arrange different schedules for the summer. That is a part of our summer camp draw series. We can't register individuals that day, but we can help them fill out their form. The actual forms for registration are due by March 16th for the draw. The second event that Commissioner Cribbs mentioned is a community meeting the same day unfortunately as the Boulware Park community meeting, March 6th. It's scheduled for 6:00, but Commissioner Cribbs made a good point to me earlier today that the time is a bit early for some people. We might see about moving it a little bit later. The meeting is to discuss the next step in our aquatics program. As you know, we currently have a third-party provider that is providing aquatics programming to the community. Their contract expires December 31, 2018. We're in the process of going out for bid again or we will be going out for bid shortly. We want to hear from the community now on what sorts of things we can improve, what may not be working well, what other types of aquatics programming the community would like to see at the pool. This is the first step in a process of getting community input as well as specific pool users' input prior to us finalizing any future contract for the pool.

Commissioner Cribbs: Kristen, how do people know about that meeting?

Ms. O'Kane: The meeting has been posted at the pool. It has also been sent out to our email list of pool users. We've also sent it to the specific lap swimmers who have designated themselves as a steering committee. We've reached out to the Masters and PASA, who unfortunately won't be able to attend because they'll be at an event. We've encouraged them to supply their comments to us through email in advance. There will be additional community meetings and opportunities for input and engagement as we continue the process.

Commissioner Moss: This is not talking about stopping working with Team Sheeper but tweaking it. Right?

Ms. O'Kane: It'll be a new RFP process. Their contract is done December 2018. We are going to start a new process where we could potentially have other bidders to supply aquatics programming and management to the City.
Commissioner Moss: Will this new contract be longer? It seems like a lot of work. I would hope these contracts would be more like 2, 3, 4, 5 years.

Ms. O'Kane: It's likely that it would be longer, but we have to negotiate that in the contract RFP process.

Vice Chair Greenfield: My understanding is the timing we did on the last contract—since we were doing something new, we wanted to build in an "out" if we needed it. I think that's a fair way of characterizing it.

Ms. O'Kane: Exactly. We've done this in phases. Initially it was an emergency basis. A few years ago, we didn't have enough staff to continue lessons and provide lifeguards. We contracted with Palo Alto Swim and Sport on an emergency basis. We did the contract with them to carry us through the interim. Now, we're going to do another RFP hopefully learning from the past process what works and what doesn't work in this kind of contract.

Commissioner Cribbs: I have a question about the summer fair for camps. Are you going to have information there for kids who want to be junior counselors and staff opportunities as well?

Ms. O'Kane: We have that there as well. Palo Alto Swim and Sport will be there as well to talk about different swim lessons and programs. We have aquatics camps that combine water time and land time, games. It provides a swim lesson during a multiple-hour camp. They will be providing information as well.

Commissioner Cribbs: How are we publicizing that event?

Ms. O'Kane: Natalie, could you help out on that one?

Natalie Khwaja: We have flyers that we've put up. I've posted the event on Nextdoor, on our social media. This is an event we do every year, so a lot of people are familiar with this and know it's coming up. All the community centers have it posted.

Commissioner Reckdahl: How do we decide what goes on the general email list and what doesn't? I would think a lot of these things should be broadcast to everyone who has the email list.

Ms. O'Kane: We have an email list through Active Net, which is the system we use to manage our classes and our rentals. Sometimes we use that, but it could include anyone who has ever registered for anything and their children and their family. It's quite a large list, but we can try to narrow it down. We can filter it maybe by people who have only registered for aquatics programs. We try not to just blast emails to people frequently, because we want people to open and look at them.
Commissioner Reckdahl: The tradeoff is if they get swamped, they ignore them. Also, some people aren't getting notified about meetings they might be interested in. A once-a-month summary of meetings that are going to be held in the next month would be useful. One email a month is not going to be objectionable. I would think there would be more of an upside than downside to that.

Ms. O'Kane: We can look at something maybe (crosstalk).

Commissioner Cribbs: What you're suggesting is news from Community Services that people would see every month perhaps. Do we ever buy ads any more or put calendar listings in the *Palo Alto Weekly*?

Ms. O'Kane: We do. We post our community events in the *Palo Alto Weekly*. We also have a lot of social media sites. We have Facebook pages. We're out on Twitter. We send out e-newsletters frequently. The word is getting out there.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I haven't heard anything, and I'm a Commissioner. Who gets the e-newsletters? How is that distributed?

Ms. O'Kane: You have to sign up for a newsletter.

Chair McDougall: It's an opt-in.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I get all the emails whenever there's a park—whenever something goes to Council, I get an email notification. What email list is that?

Ms. O'Kane: That's from the City Clerk's Office.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That's a different email list. How do people opt-in to get emails from the Parks and Rec?

Mr. Anderson: I can share a little bit about the stakeholder group I manage. I've got Friends groups specific to the Baylands, and they've signed up for that. When I've got Baylands-oriented stuff, I send them. I've got another group about dog parks, and I send them FYIs. I've got one for open space and parks. I'm a little more judicious about sending them out monthly. I've heard from my stakeholder groups, "Take me off. I don't want to hear from you anymore. It's too much." I've whittled it down to just before public meetings usually, that kind of thing, or some big movement on a project, but not the frequent reminders or updates. I usually save that for website or public meetings or notices in the park.

Chair McDougall: I would suggest that maybe we consider tabling this for now and pursue what kind of lists are available and how they're managed at some other time when staff has a chance to prepare some input for us. Would that be okay with everybody?
Commissioner Reckdahl: If staff could prepare what conduits we use for communicating with the public, that would be very useful.

Chair McDougall: The Chair will work with staff to see if we can come back with something on that subject.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I have a quick question regarding the camp draw. Forgive me if you've already communicated this to the Commission. Is this a different style draw, more equitable for anyone as opposed to a race to get to classes? There was some discussion a while back on that. I'm just wondering what the process is for getting into the summer camps.

Ms. O'Kane: The process is a lottery. You can submit your forms to any of the community centers by March 16. It's not a rush to get in; it's not a race. People aren't lined up outside the doors.

Vice Chair Greenfield: That's what it sounded like. Is this different this year from last year?

Ms. O'Kane: No, this has been the same way for quite some time.

Chair McDougall: Natalie, one quick question. You said there were posters; do we post those in the Library? That would seem to be a good place to put those.

Ms. Khwaja: We do. I didn't do it this time personally. Usually they post in the Library, at City Hall, and all the community centers. There are also a couple of notice boards, outside Rinconada for instance, that we post.

Chair McDougall: Next time, I'd like you to do it personally.

Ms. Khwaja: I'll work on that.

Chair McDougall: Thank you for that. Ms. O'Kane, anything else?

Ms. O'Kane: I am done with the Department Report.

Chair McDougall: If we're done with the Department, I will follow up on the communication list. That's a worthwhile question.
V. BUSINESS

1. Approval of Draft Minutes from the January 23, 2018 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting.

Approval of the draft January 23, 2018 Minutes was moved by Commissioner Cribbs and seconded by Commissioner Reckdahl. Passed unanimously.

2. Status of Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan

Chair McDougall: I'd like to move on to the Baylands Comprehensive Plan. I do have one public speaker. Ms. Kleinhaus, you have 3 minutes.

Shani Kleinhaus: Thank you. Chair McDougall and Commissioners, my name is Shani Kleinhaus. I'm a resident of Palo Alto. I'm the environmental advocate for Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society and on the Executive Committee for the local chapter of the Sierra Club. I have comments on the Baylands Comprehensive Plan. I'm on the stakeholder group. Thank you, Daren, for inviting me. The first thing I would like to recommend is you change the name of the Plan to Baylands Preservation Plan rather than management or conservation. The City of Mountain View did that for the burrowing owl; instead of burrowing owl management plan, they called it a conservation plan. I think it has a different sound to it. The vision generally is good almost. It should really recognize human activity and the loss of habitat (inaudible). This goes to one of the things that was very obvious in the last meeting of the stakeholder group. There's definitely a lot of people that want to use the Baylands for recreation. It's such a fragile, unique, and threatened ecosystem, and we have so little of that left around the Bay. Not every place should have that same level of intrusion from people. The vision of having preservation and conservation should trickle down throughout the Plan to everything we do. So far, the suggested language of the draft I've seen had a lot of great statements about resiliency and balance. We lost those things. We really need to focus on preservation and how to protect this ecosystem from all the things that people want to do to it, which is a lot, because everybody needs space these days. Why not the Baylands if we can put more commute trails and more recreation of this and that? We need to look at that in the same way that we look at the other preserves, which is where can we allow some activity rather than let's bring activity and balance. We can't balance anymore. Populations of wildlife, migratory birds, shore birds are declining so rapidly. We have a treasure in Palo Alto, more than any other city along the South Bay, and we need to take care of it. I would like to suggest that the Plan starts with the old Master Plan for the Baylands. Instead of trying to make the general "let's balance things," really look at the issues that are threats and the issues of conflict, whether they're natural like sea level rise or human-caused because people bring dogs to places to where they shouldn't. It's not like they shouldn't be there at all, but you need to look at where people can do something rather than "let's balance everything and see how we can push everything in here." The Baylands is not for everything; it really
isn't. It's natural, and people love it this way. People in Palo Alto seriously care about it. I would say everybody in the last meeting spoke about that. I didn't hear any other voice in the last meeting, and there are quite a lot of people there. Please don't use hazy and gray buzzwords; really focus on nature, endangered species, other species, migratory species, and the plight of the species that have nowhere else to go. Sea level rise is coming, and there's so little left for them. That is something we can leave to Palo Alto as we get older and young people come in, that they have a chance to see something that is being lost all over the Bay Area and fast. Thank you.

Mr. Anderson: Good evening. I'm here tonight to give you a brief update on the Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan. I'm going to call it either the Plan or the BCCP, probably the Plan. I'm going to cover the planning process, what we've accomplished so far, themes that have come out of the three community meetings, and some of the discussion at our most recent community meeting. The purpose of the Plan is to develop goals, policies, and prioritized actions to help manage the Baylands Preserve over the next 15 years. The Plan is intended to provide clear direction on how to manage the Baylands using an ecosystem-based approach. The intent is to guide protection of the Preserve's habitat, wildlife, and resources; to ensure stewardship and access to nature-friendly recreational opportunities; to help the City manage the Baylands in a way that we can thrive in the face of things like sea level rise or climate change and include some specific planning around Byxbee Park and the former ITT property. That's the Renzel Wetlands. We hired AECOM in 2017 to help develop this Plan. We put together a work plan that has 11 tasks. The tasks start at the beginning with create an existing conditions report. Their biologist came out and toured with staff for several weeks, looked at everything in the park, every way that we currently manage it, where our weeds are, where our recreation is, where our trails and interpretive signage are, and used that to create this existing conditions report, which I shared with you in your attachments. The other tasks include developing goals and objectives and priorities and recommendations around challenges like climate change and sea level rise and the design plan for Byxbee. Early on in the process of doing the interim plan for Byxbee, we came up with a new trail system, benches, signage, and all that. The intent was the Baylands Comprehensive Plan would come along and finalize those things. We'd take some lessons learned and say, "Here's the plan going forward, and this will be the final plan for what Byxbee will look like." We also formed a stakeholder advisory board, which consists of about 20 people that have been pretty good about showing up to our three meetings thus far and providing input. The steps completed so far have been to create this work plan on what we're going to accomplish, that existing conditions report, this stakeholder engagement plan. The stakeholder advisory group has met three times now. We met on October 18th and December 5th of 2017 and then again on February 15 2018. We also hosted the tour of the ITT property I mentioned to walk around the Renzel Wetlands and talk about what trails should or should not be there, what
should become of the building at the ITT property, what's the appropriate use. We collected a lot of feedback that will be incorporated into some recommendations that come before you for further discussion probably in another month or two, I would envision. At that first stakeholder meeting, we talked about what priorities the group wanted to see, what's important to you and what needs to be in this Plan. They ranged from recreation or, in many cases, what recreation shouldn't be allowed in the Baylands or where it should be allowed. We talked about wildlife, habitat, and resources. We talked about some of those big challenges. Sea level and climate change will come up over and over again because it's important when we're talking about planning for 15 years and beyond. Some community and organization partnerships like our partnerships with Save the Bay, Grassroots Ecology, Environmental Volunteers. What to do with that LATP site, Byxbee Park, and then the former ITT property. Just as a reminder, that's 36.5 acres that was recently made parkland. What are we going to do it? How will it connect to the rest of the Preserve, if at all? What to do with that building? At this meeting, our stakeholders suggested opening the meeting to the general public. I'm grateful to the stakeholders for suggesting that. We did so, posted it all over the Preserve. We got a few different folks that hadn't been part of the group before coming to the next two public meetings, which was helpful for diversifying our opinions. We also created the website that houses the material thus far and acts as another avenue for people to provide input. At our second community meeting on December 18, the group identified specific opportunities for Byxbee and the former ITT property. There were a myriad of different ideas, but they focused on hydrologic connections, which is especially poignant for the ITT area. A lot of people said this would be an awesome opportunity to look at how we might improve that habitat. A better tidal exchange is a big piece of that. We talked about trails, wildlife, and parking, how much is appropriate and where. We talked about the Measure E site at Byxbee, a 10-acre site that was taken out of parkland status for an anaerobic digestion system. I think that will come back online for Council to consider making it parkland in FY '22. Another big discussion topic was that historic building at the ITT site. There is like-minded thinking on a lot of things, but most folks were not in favor of keeping that building. They seemed to think the expense of restoration was far too great for the benefit. If you did keep it onsite, what would you do with parking, restrooms, and other amenities that would need to go with a facility like that? Not 100 percent agreement, but there was general consensus that the building would not be appropriate onsite. At the third and most recent public meeting on February 15, we got into the meat of the Plan, the goals and objectives. That focused around the same kind of topics. Our consultant is still compiling the notes and feedback, so I didn't include that in your package. I'll have that the next time we come back as well as condensing them into the beginnings of some chapters. There are a couple of interesting pieces of the last community discussion that I want to share with you. One was how we're going to address sea level rise. We're getting suggestions from the community on this. One interesting idea is the horizontal levee concept. I'm not sure if you've heard of this before. About a year ago, Oro Loma did an experiment to convert traditional steep levees into a flatter levee system that's supposed to mimic the natural slope.
of the area. If you plant it with sedges and grasses and irrigate it with treated water, this is an opportunity for habitat. You can also slow down waves and resist floods and protect infrastructure. That's some of the benefits of this. Some of the members proposed Palo Alto as another site to do another study for this kind of thing. In fact, Peter Baye, one of the leading ecologists in the Bay and who led the Oro Loma project, met with Palo Alto staff and discussed some of the options. It could be something down the line and an opportunity for this body to make that recommendation.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Excuse me, Daren. Where is Oro Loma?

Mr. Anderson: It's in the North Bay. They have a treatment plant, and that's the first site they did it. I could come back with more information if you'd like. It's helpful to see a drawing because it's hard to envision what they mean. I'm sorry I don't have one with me tonight. Next time I'll bring one. There was also an interesting discussion—I'm sure the ad hoc committee, who participated in this meeting, will add to this. There was also an element to balance recreation with environmental sensitivity. Our group has a lot of environmental stakeholders. It's a little tipped that way because they're passionate about the Baylands. They care, and they want to protect it. There is a definite feeling that we should err on the side of protecting this resource. Recreation, where appropriate, should fit in, but we're not looking at an equal balance. This place is for preservation was the opinion of a good many stakeholders. I'll let the ad hoc committee chime in on that and share some of the thoughts. The other piece is the vision. We put together a sample vision. By and large, people supported it with a few recommended tweaks, and that's with the consultant now. I'll get the feedback soon, and we'll probably have a revised vision statement for you. The next steps are to send notes and a summary to stakeholders, put them on our website, incorporate feedback on goals and objectives into corresponding chapters. In March and April, we'll be putting together those elements of the Plan and keep working on those parts you saw in the staff report. Ultimately, we're looking to have the Plan completed in December 2018. We'll return to the Commission several times between now and then for your input and feedback. This was how we broke up these tables at this community meeting. We had these rotating tables with topics, so everyone got to participate in each of the sub-discussion groups. They ranged from management and organization partnerships and public art, which is a piece of this Plan too. There is already a tremendous amount of public art in the Baylands. In fact, Byxbee Park was an art park when it was built. There are a number of features there that are public art. We want to be thoughtful as we go forward on where that public art goes, making sure it's complementary to the environment, to the rest of the Baylands. That's why this is included and why I want our stakeholders to have a say on this topic as well. Of course, we talked about Byxbee, ITT, Renzel Wetlands. That concludes my presentation. I'd like to offer the ad hoc committee the opportunity to share some thoughts. Again, I thank you for your participation in those meetings.
Chair McDougall: Thank you, Mr. Anderson. Mr. Moss, do you have any comments, Commissioner Moss?

Commissioner Moss: I thought the workshops were really well run. We got many ideas. It was terrific. I notice on the Plan itself that there is really no plan. So far, it's just existing this, existing land uses, existing management. Coming out of the workshops, there are goals and objectives and plans. I'm assuming this is a work in progress and the next five chapters will be about plans. Right?

Mr. Anderson: That's correct.

Chair McDougall: I'll add a comment as part of the ad hoc. The thing I thought was really interesting and a very specific outcome goes back to page 6 of your presentation, where it talks about the general goals and a balance between recreation and habitat preservation. I think the general discussion ended up saying maybe we want to have balance of recreation versus preservation throughout the whole City including the Baylands, including the Foothills, and including all the parks. In the Baylands and the Foothills specifically, we'd like to see an imbalance, and the imbalance would be in the direction of the habitat. I use the word habitat deliberately because nature is hardly relevant when we've got the ground sinking 4 feet out there. Notwithstanding that, it is a habitat without question. That was a key outcome of the third meeting and a cumulation of the first two meetings. One of the suggestions was we shouldn't talk about recreation; we should use the word access. We want people to know they have access; we want them to access it, but we don't necessarily want it to be interpreted as full-blown recreation. Like Commissioner Moss, I applaud the staff work, the consultant work, and the participants. We have so many of these stakeholder meetings where two people show up. We had 30, 40 people in the room. That was very impressive and well done. Do any other Commissioners have questions? Mr. McCauley.

Commissioner McCauley: Daren, when the Baylands Comprehensive Plan comes together, is it going to include the Baylands Athletic Center or is that totally separate?

Mr. Anderson: It is separate. We consider it a park versus open space. It won't look at the ballfields necessarily.

Commissioner McCauley: On the topic of balance, let me try and provide a little bit. I appreciated your comment, Daren, that you think the stakeholder group may be of a particular persuasion. I understand there are sometimes vocal and certainly passionate folks who feel strongly about the Baylands and its current and future uses. I am a little bit concerned about the feedback to date being primarily from folks who are going to quibble over preservation versus conservation, which is frankly not a distinction I totally understand. If there were to be some quibble over that, I would be on the side of conservation because these are dynamic spaces that will change over time. I don't know that we want to lock something into exactly what it is now or to decrease or try to tamp

APPROVED
down public access to our resources. I certainly don't want to advocate for recreation that's 
not appropriate for this space, but it's great that we have people run in the Baylands. 
Making sure we have the right trail system to accommodate those people is important. I'm 
not sure what we can do to capture additional feedback from people who presently recreate 
in that space. If there are things we can do, it would be great to try and draw them into the 
stakeholder group.

Chair McDougall: Commissioner Cribbs.

Commissioner Cribbs: Following on that comment, I was wondering about the 
stakeholders too. How young are the youngest participants in the meeting? Would it be 
beneficial to reach out to the Youth Council or some of the youth groups or even a couple 
of elementary school children who are interested in conservation or sustainability to get an 
opinion about what kids and youth want for the future of the Baylands?

Mr. Anderson: That's a good suggestion. I don't think we have much youth represented 
on the stakeholder committee. It's a more senior group. I've been ruminating on this too. 
Having worked at the Baylands for a decade or so, I know there are different groups, and 
some of them are less engaged. Getting them to come repeatedly to meetings in the evening 
is unlikely for some of those groups. There are other ways. There are user groups that we 
issue permits to and that we communicate with. A lot of youth come out through our 
partnership with Save the Bay to do restoration programs. Through those conduits, I can 
reach out to some different voices that might be valuable to this input. I've just been 
thinking on that. In talking with you, that makes a lot of sense and will provide some input 
to these other things we should be looking at, whether it's access and importance of trails. 
Hopefully we can find a really good compromise where we're still protecting all the wildlife 
and all the habitat while still addressing some of those concerns and the important parts of 
their needs.

Commissioner Cribbs: Thank you very much.

Chair McDougall: Commissioner Moss.

Commissioner Moss: This thing about recreation, it takes many forms. When I was biking 
through there today, I saw two professional dog walkers with eight dogs. What Shani said 
about wildlife taking precedence, when we talk about recreation, it doesn't mean a free-for-
all. There's going to be some pushback. Making sure we get all the stakeholder groups— 
one of them may be professional dog walkers. I don't know if these dogs are Palo Alto 
dogs or Mountain View dogs, but the bottom line is I don't think it's appropriate. You will 
get pushback, but we'll have to work that into the Plan even if it means some prohibitions.

Commissioner McCauley: David, just to clarify, were these dogs on leashes?
Commissioner Moss: Yes, they were on leashes.

Commissioner McCauley: It's the number of dogs that was troubling to you?

Commissioner Moss: Yeah. There were very few other people in the park. When people come to the park and there are very few people at 11:00 a.m. on a weekday, they think it's underutilized. When we talk about recreation versus preservation or conservation, underutilized has no meaning when you're talking about wildlife. They're there; that's where they live. I don't mind if it's quiet most of the time. Just because it's not used by humans every hour of the day doesn't necessarily mean it's underutilized.

Commissioner Cribbs: I had one more question, if I could.

Chair McDougall: I think we have some more here. I'll come back. Commissioner LaMere.

Commissioner LaMere: First of all, thank you for your work on this. I had a quick question. In looking through the Plan, one of the notes on nonrecreational uses was that there is traffic from people test driving cars. Is it a problem or is just a few cars that they notice or is it a path that's given to somebody when they go into the dealerships near there?

Mr. Anderson: Great question. It's a longstanding issue. For as long as I've been with the City, we've had to—probably on an annual basis, the Rangers talk to the sales crews about not bringing customers down the road for test drives, especially speeding. It's an ongoing thing. I wouldn't say it's a huge problem. Where they drive is where everyone drives, to the duck pond and the Nature Center. We don't want extra, unnecessary, nonpark visitors.

Commissioner LaMere: I appreciate that. The Rangers actually reach out to the car dealerships. That's great. Thank you.

Chair McDougall: Commissioner Reckdahl.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I had a question about those horizontal levees. Would we restrict what grows on there? If you had a natural shoreline with a collection of plants, would all those plants be acceptable for a levee or do we have to worry about roots degrading the levee?

Mr. Anderson: I don't have in-depth experience with these. There's only one that I know of in our area. I did read that Save the Bay was involved in that project and planted 70,000 plants on that area. They're intentionally putting what they want to grow there. Knowing how that ecosystem works, you're going to get volunteers growing. By and large, if you're getting tidal influence, it takes care of most of your weeds with a few exceptions. Most of what would come in in addition to what you've planted would probably be okay. Ideally, you wouldn't have to remove anything.
Commissioner Reckdahl: Is the LATP site considered parkland or open space?

Mr. Anderson: It's City-owned, but it is not parkland at this time.

Commissioner Reckdahl: If we came to the conclusion that we wanted that part of the open space, that would take Council to incorporate that?

Mr. Anderson: There is some Council direction on the LATP already in terms of how it's zoned. I'm sorry I don't have all the information handy. The next time I come I will. Part of the recommendation from this Plan could guide what we want to see with the natural elements. There are some jurisdictional wetlands within the LATP site. Right now, it's fenced off and separated from the rest of the Baylands. Part of the recommendation could be we want to include that or when that should be included and how, and should it be restored, that kind of thing.

Commissioner Reckdahl: If we wanted to do soccer fields there, for example, would that be feasible?

Mr. Anderson: It would not be feasible on the jurisdictional wetlands without going through a tremendous amount of permitting and mitigation work. There is an upland area that's developed. Currently GreenWaste is using part of that. I also know Public Works rents certain portions.

Commissioner Reckdahl: If we wanted to put buildings there, for example (crosstalk)?

Mr. Anderson: It'd have to check on the zoning. I know that governs it. I don't have all the information with me right now.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That's it. Thank you.

Chair McDougall: Commissioner Cribbs. Vice Chair Greenfield.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Is there any discernible call within the community for increased recreation or access in the Baylands?

Mr. Anderson: There have been comments in the past, especially while I was working on the dog parks, about putting a dog park on the 120 acres of Byxbee. There have been calls for events like bike races up and down Byxbee. Staff long ago, at the direction of the then-Director, made certain calls that some things were not acceptable and to focus mainly on nature-friendly recreational activities. Events like moto-cross were not permitted, but fun runs were permitted. We get lots of requests for running and some for geocaching.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Are there arguably appropriate requests for increased recreation coming in? It sounds like there are limited requests. Is there a question within the
Mr. Anderson: I'd say there is some demand for certain things like running. That's a very clear, longtime, consistent request. The City sometimes hosts running events, the Moonlight Run for example. We don't get requests for other activities as much as for running.

Vice Chair Greenfield: The running sounds like an appropriate area of focus for the Plan to consider. On a more philosophical level, I'm curious about the biggest challenges for the Conservation Plan moving forward. Is it the process? Is it a lack of resources, whether financial or otherwise? Is it consensus building?

Mr. Anderson: I think it's our recommendation on the ITT property, "our" meaning the stakeholders and this body. I know there are differing opinions amongst other City groups. Our Planning Commission is looking at it, and they have certain recommendations that are different. They have historical preservation in mind. We might be at odds on some of those things. The eventual funding of some of the recommendations for the ITT property will be difficult to manage. When we talk about increasing water flow from the Bay into that ITT property, that's no small feat. In many ways, you'd have to rework that land to get it to drain and flow properly. Some of those things are going to be challenging. This is all achievable, but to some degree getting agreement will be a challenge, but this Plan needs to achieve agreement. The process of debating and discussing the Plan is valuable.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Thank you. I applaud all your efforts on this process. The summary of the current status was excellent. I generally support the emphasis on conservation and preservation while maintaining access. That seems to be the general prevailing opinion. Keep up the good work, and thank you.

Chair McDougall: Do you have any other comments? If there are no other comments, I would like to reiterate thanking Mr. Anderson for an incredible amount of work on this. Your whole team is doing a great job. The whole approach is worthy of the City and the Baylands itself. Thank you.

3. **Review Outcomes from 2018 Parks and Recreation Commission Retreat**

Chair McDougall: The next item is review of the retreat and a discussion of that. Ms. O'Kane. You might notice I am making an effort to be a little more formal than we might have been. We don't particularly have an audience at the moment, but at times we do have an audience. We're better to be on the high ground than not. If any of the Commissioners want to send me a note or tell me to stop or take a different approach, I'm willing to listen to it. I would like to try and add some deference to our approach.
Ms. O'Kane: Kristen O'Kane, Community Services. I'm going to rely on you, Chair and the other Commissioners who were at the retreat, to correct anything that I may not have captured properly. I wanted to provide an update on the outcomes from our retreat, which was last Friday. I thought it was very productive. We accomplished a lot. It was great having Council Member Scharff there to weigh in on some of our priorities and some of our discussion points on what he thought Council might support and not support. That was very helpful. The first slide I have is a recap of the priorities that were discussed and agreed upon. The first was recreation. While this is quite broad, there were some specifics mentioned including aquatics, lighting, turf fields, seniors, youth, dogs, and inclusion. The next was field, court, and facility usage policy. The third was Foothills Park, specifically 7.7 acres and Buckeye Creek. The fourth is parks usage, development, and access. The fifth was the Baylands. I grouped those together to focus specifically on the 10 1/2 acres, the Baylands Conservation Plan, and the golf course. The sixth one was maintenance. This was discussed specifically to focus on maintaining what we have and ensuring we maintain what we have efficiently and sustainably. Did you want to add anything, Chair, to these priorities or did you want to have a discussion before I move on?

Chair McDougall: Is everybody with happy these as discussed? Any changes? I'd like to take this chance to thank Natalie for paying attention to us all day and feeding us and helping us with the whole thing. Thank you for that. Are there any comments on our priorities? Commissioner Moss.

Commissioner Moss: Did fundraising or funding come up especially with Council Member Scharff?

Chair McDougall: I would say Council Member Scharff was very generous with his support and direction and insight into the funding issue. He clarified that any funding approach would be specific to parks and recreation. It wouldn't be part of a larger effort that would include fundraising for other activities. It would be specific. He clarified that Cubberley would not be part of that conversation because it added too much complication to it. I forget the other one. We're going to talk specifically about the other approach we took, which was to list the topics.

Ms. O'Kane: That's correct. We did talk about fundraising. I know Commissioner Cribbs was hoping we'd have more time to talk about some fundraising efforts. Our discussion focused mostly on a potential ballot measure in the future and the current efforts of the City to do some initial polling on that effort. We didn't get into a great amount of detail about other fundraising.

Chair McDougall: I think the real interest was to identify what the net requirement might be after we figure out what some of the incremental funding opportunities and sources might be. That'll circle back around.
Ms. O'Kane: We also had a separate list called "other." There are other areas of focus that the Commission will pay more attention to this coming year and have involvement. The first was inclusion. The discussion was about cultural inclusion and making things accessible and inclusive for different cultures in Palo Alto. The second was the Ventura Coordinated Area Plan, which is often referred to as the Fry's site. The next was Cubberley. We're about to kick off the Cubberley master planning effort. That's something the Commission will want to pay attention to. We grouped a gymnasium in this category because the discussion focused on Cubberley as the logical location for a new gymnasium. The next was the Stanford General Use Permit as it relates to parkland and recreation needs in Palo Alto. Pocket parks and pop-up parks were also discussed. I've included a photo of a pop-up park that was on University Avenue a couple of years ago. Any discussion on these other areas of focus?

Chair McDougall: Any questions?

Commissioner McCauley: I do have my pet project, my pet issue, which is consideration of access at Foothills Park.

Chair McDougall: We did discuss that. We should make sure we cover that somewhere in this list. That's a worthy discussion.

Ms. O'Kane: We also talked about a potential ballot measure and the initial stage that the City will be going through, which is polling the community to see what might be viable for a ballot measure. We started the conversation by talking about what staff identified as priorities with respect to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Some other projects were discussed, a second phase of the Junior Museum and Zoo, an animal shelter. I didn't include those on this list because they're not directly in the Parks Master Plan. The Commission built on staff's list for a final list, which I have provided to the City Manager's Office and the Public Works Department who are leading this effort to do the polling.

Commissioner Cribbs: I didn't think we were going to poll on Foothill Park. I thought that was going to go in the other areas of focus to be discussed. Maybe I just didn't understand it.

Ms. O'Kane: I questioned that as well. I have the photo of the whiteboard, and it was on there. It may have been one we decided to take off and didn't remove it.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I think the consideration of Foothills Park was more general rather than specific to the Buckeye Creek restoration plan.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I think it was trail improvements, and we were just talking general improvements, would the public be interested in us putting money into Foothills Park, whether it be trails or facilities or whatever.
Vice Chair Greenfield: On the fourth bullet, it might be helpful to rename that additional parkland acquisition fund. It will be more obvious what it is then.

Chair McDougall: It might be worthwhile, for purposes of communicating with other internal organizations, if we had polling priorities and then Parks Master Plan and listed all the ones you have here and then something that said "outside the Master Plan" and added the Junior Museum and the dog thing back in. I'm a little concerned there are other parties interested in those things. We're going to end up having that conversation anyway, so we may as well talk about it now. Does that make sense?

Ms. O'Kane: It does make sense. These were just prepared for the purpose of this meeting today. Those other projects are already being provided by others. Moving on to our ad hoc assignments. I have them here. I think I accurately represented what we discussed. Now would be the time to make any changes if anyone has had second thoughts or if something wasn't properly recorded.

Vice Chair Greenfield: On the park and facilities policy, perhaps you could change that to park and facility use policy.

Chair McDougall: Does anybody else have any questions or comments?

Commissioner Moss: You can add me to the park dedication policy.

Chair McDougall: Are there any other comments or questions?

Commissioner McCauley: I have one very minor comment. Anne, do you think park facilities would be more descriptive than park amenities? Perhaps it doesn't matter one way or the other.

Commissioner Cribbs: It could be.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I would suggest keeping amenities so it isn't confused with the park and facility use policy committee.

Commissioner McCauley: In part, what was driving my thought is one of the items we put under the charge of this committee was to consider maintenance issues, which I think is primarily a facilities issue rather than amenities. Again, I don't feel strongly one way or the other. I thought it might be more descriptive.

Chair McDougall: Could we consider calling it parking amenities and maintenance to embrace them both?

Commissioner Reckdahl: What about development and maintenance of park facilities or park amenities?
Chair McDougall: We did make that a slightly bigger, more interesting challenge. I would ask Commissioner Moss if he would be interested in joining that one as well.

Commissioner Moss: Which one?

Chair McDougall: What do we call it now? The park amenities one, the final one. That's the whole issue of dog parks, bathrooms, ongoing maintenance. If you're not interested, that's fine too.

Commissioner Moss: I'm not interested.

Chair McDougall: If that ad hoc wants to meet and say they've renamed themselves, that would probably be okay.

Ms. O'Kane: What's important is to think about the original intent of the ad hoc, which was including dog parks and restrooms when we're designing new park features. We could add maintenance to it, but maybe that's another ad hoc.

Commissioner McCauley: Anne and I will certainly tell you if we think it should be another ad hoc and too much for us to work through with Daren.

Chair McDougall: Would it be appropriate to suggest the ad hocs meet with staff at their first opportunity and come back with a short definition of the committee's goal?

Ms. O'Kane: Are you suggesting holding meetings up front or when the committee begins work?

Chair McDougall: I'm suggesting whenever the first meeting is. I'm not suggesting separate meetings to discuss goals. It would be appropriate if we came back with some agreement as to what we're going to do in those ad hocs for the year.

Ms. O'Kane: That's would be really helpful to set clear expectations upfront and the goal.

Chair McDougall: Do we want to talk briefly about the liaison?

Ms. O'Kane: These are the liaison assignments. The maintenance piece doesn't have a liaison.

Commissioner Moss: I was the liaison to the Friends of Parks. Does that change?

Chair McDougall: I suggested that change in that they are sufficiently important that we might want to set a precedent of the Chairman being the liaison to the Friends. I would like to take the same approach as last year with both of us going to the meetings. Telling them that the Chairman is the representative would be more powerful.
Commissioner Moss: The only liaison assignment that's not assigned is maintenance to amenities. What's that?

Commissioner McCauley: In our conversation on Friday, we determined it was probably best for the ad hoc committee to take that in the first instance. Something that Anne and I will be doing in one of our future meetings with Daren is look at Daren's comprehensive list or plan on the maintenance front and provide feedback. I think that one's covered.

Commissioner Cribbs: About the maintenance, it really is an opportunity for the staff to say, "We don't have enough money to fund this particular project or to take care of it the way it needs to be taken of." Daren had a good example about the $15,000 a year you had, but you needed more so something didn't get maintained. This an opportunity for us to play a part in helping get more money when appropriate. It actually turned out to be a really cool thing that came out of the retreat. That was something we could really help with.

Commissioner Moss: Does that mean you need a liaison for that or not?

Chair McDougall: As Commissioner McCauley said, that was moved into park amenities, which is why we were saying park amenities and maintenance there. This was one of the things Council Member Scharff helped us with. This is a way for the Commission to see if we can stand behind or in front of Mr. Anderson to get money for what's necessary.

Commissioner Moss: Do you still need someone for park amenities? I was on the funding, but I guess I'm not on the funding anymore.

Commissioner LaMere: David, do you have any interest in the Palo Alto Recreation Foundation liaison? I can drop off that; I have two others besides that.

Commissioner Moss: I guess I'd rather do funding than park amenities. If it's already taken, I'll do park amenities. If you want to make a switch …

Commissioner LaMere: I wouldn't necessarily switch. I would drop off Palo Alto Recreation Foundation if you wanted to do that.

Chair McDougall: The other thing we might consider is—it came to light that there is a Friends of the Foothills. We don't know if it exists or if we have any relationship with it. Maybe Commissioner Moss would like to explore the Friends of the Foothills and report whether it's interesting or useful. Would that be interesting?

Commissioner Moss: I've always thought the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space because of connectivity to other parks—I'm very interested in that. That would be more appealing for me.
Chair McDougall: I would defer to Staff relative to connecting with Midpeninsula Open Space.

Mr. Anderson: We have a good relationship, mutual aid agreements. We have a staff member, a Ranger, that also works for Midpeninsula Regional Open Space. We've got a great connection there already. I don't know that we need one. If you wanted, there might be opportunities including attending their board meetings to learn what they have going on.

Chair McDougall: For one of the Commissioners to be informed on that would be positive. I would support that. We have that one. What did you think about the Foothills Friends? Would you like to at least explore that for us?

Commissioner Moss: Yes, that would be fine.

Chair McDougall: I'd like to echo the comment that that was a constructive session on Friday and thank staff again for their participation and support.

4. Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates

Chair McDougall: We should be able to move on to Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates. These would obviously be older ones if they've changed. Are there any other comments or updates?

Commissioner LaMere: I had a question. We mentioned looking at a date for Palo Alto Recreation Foundation and Friends of the Parks to come in and speak about what they were going to do. Is there any update or thought on what date we may want to do that so I can reach out to the Palo Alto Recreation Foundation.

Chair McDougall: We'll simply add that to the tentative agenda items. That's going to depend on other topics. I think we should do that sooner rather than later.

Ms. O'Kane: The Chair and I can work on the agendas for the next couple of months and see where we might have space to fit that in and let you know.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Is there any news on the ad hoc for funding? Council Member Scharff mentioned that we have to get something to them by their June meeting. That's like 3 months away.

Ms. O'Kane: I provided the list of your priorities to the City Manager's Office. I've let them know that Council Member Scharff recommended a joint meeting.

Commissioner Cribbs: Would we hear from the Manager's Office about when that meeting is? That is a pretty important meeting.
Ms. O'Kane: You would hear from me. I'll follow up with the City Manager's Office this week and find out if that's (crosstalk).

Chair McDougall: It's the Council Finance Committee that Council Member Scharff was talking about a mutual meeting where we would be invited. That would be valuable to get insight into their thinking. Any other comments?

Commissioner Moss: Do you need any more of our help at the staff level to do the funding options, like grant writing and going to Friends of Palo Alto Parks or others?

Ms. O'Kane: Possibly as we move forward. As of today, we don't have something that we've decided to do, such as pursue grant funding for this or pursue donations for that. We should be paying more attention to public-private partnerships, donations, grants, things like that. As something comes up, we would engage the Commission.

Chair McDougall: I've shared that analysis that I showed you with staff so we could look at which of the topics we should raise money for and which of the topics might be totally funded. If we meet with the ad hoc to go through that with staff, then we can maybe come back with a better analysis of here's the whole list, here's how we could go after our liaisons or whatever. It's important to remember that we're liaisons, not salesmen or closers. We had a good conversation on that at the meeting. Is that fair?

Ms. O'Kane: It is. We always welcome you promoting and selling our services and program to the community. I would agree that the closing part is probably more of a staff role.

Chair McDougall: I was trying to differentiate marketing from selling. We should be marketing like crazy but not necessarily out doing deals. Ambassadors is perfect. Thank you.

Ms. O'Kane: I like ambassadors.

Commissioner Cribbs: It's a little bit fuzzy for me because we did hear about the opportunity for a bond issue and the timing of that. They think that's going to be great to get all that confirmed. There are other possibilities that we've been tossing around in the ad hoc and on the Commission. One would be opportunities for the City to reach out to or make the opportunity for various wealthy individuals who would like to help fund something important in Palo Alto. This is not in order of importance. This is the kinds of buckets you could identify. The other are the grants that are available and take a longer time to write. We should probably think—Daren, you said you might have some money for a grant writer. There are the smaller things that could be funded. We talked about the future dog park. A list doesn't have to be perfect; it can be a work in progress. Certainly look to staff for whatever your thoughts are on the direction. I understand we're not going
to be out there selling this, but there have been a lot of good ideas. It's probably time to put them down on a piece of paper and decide whether we're going to move forward with them or not and what other good models we have, like Stanford, to see how they do their fundraising and endowment.

Chair McDougall: I’d suggest the ad hoc do that, and then we work with staff relative to bringing that back here so that everybody can see it. Is there anything else that we need to cover? If not, I would entertain an adjournment.

Commissioner Cribbs: Could I say one more thing please? In the interest of everybody's time, I'm having a lot of trouble trying to figure out when we can have meeting. I can have one between this and this and this. I know that's just life in the big city. It would be great if each of the Commissioners could set aside a time on the calendar for whatever ad hoc meeting would come up. Is it possible to set aside an 8:30 a.m. slot or a 5:00 p.m. slot for a particular ad hoc? If something came up that needed to be addressed, we could add that. Trying to set up a meeting with six or seven emails seems like a big waste of time and, for me, frustration. I apologize for bringing it up right now, but it would be great if we could think about how that might work with consideration for the staff.

Vice Chair Greenfield: You're suggesting a standing meeting date for specific ad hocs on the calendar.

Commissioner Cribbs: Like that, yeah.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Maybe the staff liaison to each of the ad hocs could suggest a date if appropriate for the ad hoc based on their schedule.

Commissioner Cribbs: It might not work, but I'd like to try it.

Vice Chair Greenfield: It sounds like something for each ad hoc to discuss the next time they meet. I would like to discuss the agenda for next month before we adjourn.

Chair McDougall: Let me go back. It's been pointed out that we do need to identify the staff person for each of these ad hocs. Is that not right?

Ms. O'Kane: That's correct. We'll provide that.

Chair McDougall: The ad hoc can work with that staff person. Some of these might work with having a regular meeting. Others are just totally irregular and can be worked out independently.

VI. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair McDougall: Comments and Announcements. Commissioner Moss.
Commissioner Moss: I wanted to make a comment when the tennis players were talking. I feel that by not saying anything, it hardens the two sides. Month after month, they come to us with emotional and impassioned pleas. We really have to come up with a compromise. I rattled off six things that could be used for a compromise. I would like that to be a high priority for the next meeting. It's bad PR for us when you get 15 people out here, and we don't say a thing. Can we get that on the agenda for next—can we get them together outside of this meeting and come up with a compromise? I'll send the six ideas, but we need to address it just like we did with the dog parks and just like we did with the Rinconada pool.

Chair McDougall: We do have an ad hoc on that. Adam's done an extremely good job of having various outreach meetings. There's an outreach meeting planned to involve both parties. I would suggest that we leave that with the ad hoc. I felt it was inappropriate to start a conversation on a topic that wasn't agendized. I didn't think we should engage. It was appropriate to listen, thank them, be aware, but not engage in this particular meeting.

Commissioner Moss: I agree, but what you just said should have been said to them, and it wasn't. Knowing there is an ad hoc meeting and they are meeting with representatives would allay the concerns of the public. I'm surprised that they're still coming to us if something is being worked on behind the scenes.

Chair McDougall: I don't think it's behind the scenes because the same people have shown up at all the ad hoc committee meetings.

Commissioner Moss: Then why are they still here?

Chair McDougall: I can offer an opinion on that, but I don't—they came to the last meeting. I don't know if anybody else wants to comment on this. They know that we're listening, both in the ad hoc and here. Are there any other comments?

VII. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR MARCH 27, 2018 MEETING

Commissioner Reckdahl: I have some topics for the agenda. Commissioner LaMere mentioned the Friends of the Palo Alto Parks and the Palo Alto Recreation Foundation. We had Friends of Palo Alto Parks come in 4 or 5 years ago, and it was very useful. I'd like to see that again. On the parks dedication, have someone from the Legal Department tell us what the ramifications of park dedication, what kind of constraints does it have, and other ramifications.

Commissioner Moss: I want to make sure people realize that they were asked to—we talked to them about Baylands signs. I'm not sure it's appropriate to have them talk to us right now.
Commissioner Reckdahl: This is just a generic discussion of—last time it was focused on this is what our organization does, this is how we work with the City, an overview. I think that would be appropriate.

Chair McDougall: We can at least ask the Friends if they'd like to come and update the Commission on how many members they have and what their focus might be. That could be appropriate. Commissioner Moss, I'd like to work with you on that to make sure we approach them properly, if that's okay. While I'm speaking to Commissioner Moss, thank you for pointing out that maybe I should have reminded them about the ad hoc committees.

Vice Chair Greenfield: My request for the agenda matched Commissioner Reckdahl's. Those were the top two on my list. The park activity guidelines is something we've been looking forward to for 6 months or more. I'd really love to see that come to fruition.

Chair McDougall: Commissioner Cribbs.

Commissioner Cribbs: I'd like to add a request to learn about the rules and regulations of placing art in parks, specific to the dog park across from California Avenue and in general, so that we understand what agreements are out there and how we respond to that.

Chair McDougall: Anybody else? I guess we would want to make sure that we were continuing to have the many things that are being worked on and moving forward as the staff thinks is appropriate to bring them for discussion or action.

Ms. O'Kane: For the March meeting, we'll have a discussion on the Boulware Park improvements. This will follow the community meeting. Daren, did you have anything specific for March?

Commissioner Cribbs: Would that be the time to have a report or observations about the temporary lights at Cubberley?

Mr. Anderson: That sounds reasonable.

Vice Chair Greenfield: One evening Commissioner Moss and I met with Adam and Neil from Palo Alto Soccer Club. They were still tweaking the adjustment, but they looked pretty nice. It seemed to meet expectations as described.

Commissioner Reckdahl: There wasn't bad bleeding into the neighborhood?

Vice Chair Greenfield: It didn't appear bad to me.

Chair McDougall: Nobody's run into one yet. Any other topics.
VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned on motion by Commissioner Reckdahl and second by Commissioner McCauley at 8:53 p.m.