MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
April 24, 2018
CITY HALL
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California

Commissioners Present: Anne Cribbs, Jeff Greenfield, Jeff LaMere, Ryan McCauley (arrived at 8:29 p.m.), Don McDougall, David Moss, and Keith Reckdahl

Commissioners Absent:

Others Present:

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

I. ROLL CALL

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS

Chair McDougall: Are there any changes, additions, comments on the agenda? Kristen.

Kristen O'Kane: The only comment I wanted to make is under Number 7, the tentative agenda for May 29th. That should be May 22nd.

III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Chair McDougall: The next thing is Oral Communications. Oral Communications are topics that are not on the agenda this evening. I have two cards, one talking about airplane noise, one talking about the tennis courts. If Mark Shull is here.

Male: (inaudible)

Chair McDougall: I think we would conceded that airplane noise is something we have little or no influence over in the Parks Department. Thank you. Robin Cook, would you like to speak now? Are tennis courts on the—yes, Item Number 5. We'll do this later then. Thank you.
IV. DEPARTMENT REPORT

Chair McDougall: The next thing, Department Report.

Ms. O'Kane: Chair McDougall, if I could comment. Since we do have people here to talk about the pickleball and tennis courts, do we want to keep the agenda as is?

Chair McDougall: I would be quite happy to adjust the agenda and move the pickleball discussion up. I’m sure Adam wouldn't mind either. We should have the comments first and then the discussion?

Ms. O'Kane: I don't think we should move it right away only because there could be some people that are still coming. Maybe we could move it before the temporary lighting at Cubberley.

Chair McDougall: Make 5, 4 and just change the two of them. Thank you for that suggestion. Department Report.

Mr. Anderson: Good evening. Daren Anderson with Open Space, Parks, and Golf. I've got a few brief updates for you. We mentioned at the last Commission meeting that we're working on the Cubberley bleachers. That repair has moved on. That was done almost entirely with in-house staff. We saved quite a bit of money over replacing the entire bleachers; we swapped out all the hardware and all the wood, painted it ourselves, and replaced the fencing on it. That's the next step. It'll be completed and open to the public on May 4th is our game plan for that. The Peers Park dog park, we're excited about that one. We started construction last week, and it's moving forward. We anticipate about 4 more weeks, and we should have the first new dog park in Palo Alto in about 25 years.

Commissioner Cribbs: Could I ask a question about that now?

Chair McDougall: Yes, please.

Commissioner Cribbs: Thank you. Daren, what's the crew like that's working on that? How many people do we use and utilize?

Mr. Anderson: This one's a contract running—it's a contractor named Loza Construction that's doing the project. It varies per day on how many people they've got out. When they're setting posts—I think I saw a three-person crew the other day.

Commissioner Cribbs: They're on a timeline to be finished?

Mr. Anderson: Yeah, in about 4 weeks we anticipate.

Commissioner Cribbs: Thank you.
Mr. Anderson: Some of that is not necessarily them doing construction. Some of the delay is waiting for the materials to come in. The amenities is usually one of the portions of our wait time. We ordered it as soon as the money was available and the plan was approved, but sometimes there's a little wait associated with that. By that, I mean drinking fountains and that kind of stuff.

Commissioner Cribbs: Would we open before the amenities are here?

Mr. Anderson: No, we'll wait until everything's installed.

Commissioner Cribbs: It's going to be all done-done?

Mr. Anderson: Yeah. A little update …

Chair McDougall: If I can continue on that just for one second. I assume there's some sort of communications plan to let dog owners and everybody know about that.

Mr. Anderson: Yes.

Chair McDougall: I don't think we need to understand that now.

Mr. Anderson: Through our, gosh, almost a decade now, of reaching out to dog owners, I've got a pretty good distribution list along with Howard Hoffman, who's been a great partner. He's the president of the Palo Alto Dog Owners Association. We rely on him quite a bit for spreading the word.

Commissioner Cribbs: I think we should have a celebration …

Mr. Anderson: I love that idea.

Commissioner Cribbs: … with dog biscuits.

Mr. Anderson: That's a great idea. Another project, this one is not a CSD-led project, but it definitely affects us. This is the Highway 101 bike and pedestrian bridge project. Sixty-five percent design was recently completed. They're just starting efforts on the 90 percent-level design. They're working with Caltrans. They anticipate by the end of the year they'll have bid documents, so it can go out to bid. They were hesitant to give me an estimate on when they could start construction because there's a lot of variables. Hopefully they'll come back with that information shortly. The Baylands Boardwalk project …

Commissioner Moss: Question about the bridge. I noticed that the other bridge that's going up right now, the one north of Embarcadero or north of the other …

Commissioner Cribbs: It's the East Palo Alto bridge coming into the shopping center.
Commissioner Moss: Yeah, the East Palo Alto bridge is also going up. That one's going up real fast.

Mr. Anderson: I'm envious of how quickly they got that going. I can't speak to why ours is a longer process unfortunately. I'm sorry. We'll do everything we can to make it happen quickly. On that same note of why projects take a little longer is the next topic, the Baylands Boardwalk that we've been working on for quite some time. It's out for bid right now, which is good. However, we're still waiting on two permits. We got the 404 permit, which is a big and important one, but we need one from the Regional Water Board. That's a little challenging sometimes. They're currently shooting to get that permit. Best case scenario, we'd go to Council in June, if we got the permit in time, to get approval for the contract, and then start work September 1, 2018 if everything lines up right. We'll be pursuing that endeavor. It's again contingent on permit acquisition. The closed trails at Foothills Park, I've been keeping you apprised of this one. We made some headway. The last challenge we had faced was the rerouted trail sections. Again, this is for Los Trancos and Costanoan Trails up at Foothills Park. The rerouted section was too close to some woodrat middens, and so I went up and took measurements and sent photos to my trail consultant and said, "Do you think we could accommodate this, scooting over 35, 40 feet in different areas?" He said, "Yes, I'm confident we could do that." We've got a new alignment, and we have got an appointment to go with Planning and start our application process on Monday. Their guidance so far was realistically they think some time in August we can go to Council for approval. We have to go to the Planning and Transportation Commission and the Council, but August is the timeframe. I think that will line up with our contractor being there and hopefully get to work on rerouting those trails. I'll know more after that meeting with Planning. At the next Commission meeting I'll be glad to give you another update. My last update concerns the Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan. My last time here with Commission I gave a little presentation on that and gave a status update. One of the key and very positive bits of feedback we got from the Commission was do some more outreach to people that aren't in the stakeholder group, which was very helpful. We created a special outreach, two-page thing that my Rangers out in the field come up to people and say, "Do you think we could accommodate this, scooting over 35, 40 feet in different areas?" In a small amount of time, 5-10, 15 minutes, they can get some pithy information back that's useful for the plan. They did that at the Great Race event recently at the Baylands. They're doing that impromptu with different visitors stopping by. They have one more month of outreach that they're going to try to do. That will involve reaching out—I think they've already gotten some windsurfers, but we haven't really gotten that youth group that we talked about. That's next. We're primarily targeting—that'll be through the Environmental Volunteers, our own naturalist staff that work at the Lucy Evans Nature Center, and then through Save the Bay where they bring out school groups and pull them aside and say, "We're really excited about this plan. Can we ask you about these three or four things?" and try to get some of that good feedback to tie into the plan.
Commissioner Cribbs: Could I ask a question please? What about the youth that aren't the natural users, who might not interface with the Rangers and other people? Can we get somehow into the schools for kids, who didn't ever think they'd go to the Baylands, but if it turned out to be cool they might go, and get some of their ideas?

Mr. Anderson: That's good feedback. I think to some degree, maybe not entirely, that happens through the outreach we do with Save the Bay. They'll have a group—oftentimes those are not your regular park visitors. They are part of a class that has to come out and do—oftentimes when I would lead those programs, there were some first-time-in-open-space experiences. To some degree, I hope we get some of that. I'll ask the Rangers if they've got additional ideas.

Commissioner Cribbs: That would be really good if we could, maybe even through the high school science teachers at Paly and Gunn. They might be able to pass that out. If you get nothing, then you get nothing. If you get something, it could be really valuable.

Mr. Anderson: I'll give that a shot. Thank you. Lastly, on that same plan the consultant has been working on piecing together some more chapters. These are goals and objectives, future planned projects, climate change and sea level rise opportunities, analysis, and best management practices. I anticipate June I'll come to you with drafts of all those chapters, the meat and the substance of the plan, for your review and your feedback. That's everything I have.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Just quick to add, tagging onto what Anne just said. There are environmental science classes at the high schools, so that would be a good target group.

Chair McDougall: You did say you had Environmental Volunteers helping collect or hand out …

Mr. Anderson: That's correct. Their new director has just been added as a stakeholder to the group.

Commissioner Moss: The Los Trancos Trail, if it goes through Council in August and gets approved, when you can start that? Can you work through the winter?

Mr. Anderson: That's a good question. I probably need to defer to my trail contractor and see how long he thinks it would take. I'm hopeful that, since he'll be here during that time period, right after Council approves it he can get going and hopefully finish it before winter. I'll find out more.

Commissioner Moss: Is there any more update on the 7.7 acres? The last time we talked we were very, very close to getting that open. They have to put a fence around the nursery. What's the status?
Mr. Anderson: I think I'm going to have to come back to you next month with more information on that one. Kristen's helping me work through some logistics and consult with the City Attorney's Office and see what the next steps are.

Ms. O'Kane: Just a little bit more information. We had planned to go to Council as an action for Council to discuss the Buckeye Creek hydrology study as well as the 7.7 acres. There was some question from the City Attorney whether we should bring it as an informational report in the packet to Council or whether it needs to be an action. We're working with the City Attorney to determine what the appropriate way to inform Council is.

Chair McDougall: Are we done?

Ms. O'Kane: I have one announcement or item under Department Report. Saturday, May 5th, is our 96th annual May Fete Parade. You've probably received a couple of emails asking if you would like to participate as a VIP. I would really appreciate a couple of you attending. It's always nice to see familiar faces walking the parade route and supporting the parade. If you would like to attend as a VIP, you would get to walk with a group at the beginning of the parade. You get a t-shirt. You get some other goodies and, of course, the prestige of walking in the parade. Either let me know or let Stephanie Douglas know if you plan to be there. Also, just for you, Commissioner LaMere, as Palo Alto Recreation Foundation liaison, they're likely going to reach out to you to see if you will hold a banner in the parade on behalf of parks.

Commissioner LaMere: What time is the parade?

Ms. O'Kane: It starts at 10:00 a.m. No pressure, just letting you know.

Commissioner Cribbs: Could I just say that this is an incredibly wonderful Palo Alto institution? It is a great parade. Everybody who hasn't had the experience or wants to have another experience should plan to go because it really is one of the things that makes Palo Alto what Palo Alto is. It's got a long tradition and a long history and a lot of sentiment and all of that. Thanks for all the staff is doing on it because it's not an easy job to put on a parade.

Ms. O'Kane: I also wanted to mention that every year we have a different theme. This year the theme is Children of the World to celebrate the diversity of Palo Alto, and our parade marshal is Neighbors Abroad. They're the organization that helps with our Sister Cities. We were hoping to have someone from one of our Sister Cities here in town, but they happen to be leaving the day before the parade. They won't be there, but I hope you can make it.
APPROVED

Commissioner Reckdahl: Historically Parks and Rec has had the most people marching, more than other Commissions. If you can make it, please make it. It's a good time. It's worth your time. It's an enjoyable thing.

Commissioner LaMere: Last year, I did walk in it with Keith and brought my son. We had a great time. A couple of years ago, I walked with my son and nephew, and we pulled a wagon in the unaffiliated section. I don't know if the Recreation Foundation widely expresses that or if that's known, but it was actually a really neat experience that you can participate in the parade without being affiliated with a certain school or a certain other group. It was pretty neat to be able to do that as well.

Chair McDougall: I hope everybody attends. It sounds great. Are there any other comments or should we move onto the next agenda item?

V. BUSINESS

1. Approval of Draft Minutes from the March 27, 2018 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting.

Approval of the draft March 27, 2018 Minutes was moved by Commissioner Moss and seconded by Vice Chair Greenfield. Passed 5-0 Cribbs abstaining, McCauley absent

2. Presentation by Friends of the Palo Alto Parks (FOPAP)

Chair McDougall: We're lucky enough to have Roger Smith, the cofounder of Friends of Palo Alto Parks, to speak with us about Friends of the Palo Alto Parks, help us understand what their ambitions are and some of their background. Welcome, Roger. We are very, very pleased to have you here.

Roger Smith: Thank you very much. I'm delighted to be here. I'd like to start by thanking each of you for serving. It's really neat that we do that in our City. We started the Friends of the Palo Alto Parks in 2005. Our goals are fairly simple here. It's to provide funding to enrich, enhance, and beautify Palo Alto parks. Number 2 is to foster greater public awareness and appreciation and ownership of our parks. Three is to raise funds to assist in purchasing additional parkland and open space. One of the premises when we started the organization is that the City would never have all the money they would like to have to do what we would like to do in our parks. We're a small group. We have eight Board Members. The other seven are our president, Susan Beall, Richard Hackmann, Ed Selden, Jeny Smith, Linda Selden, and Le Levy, who's a former Mayor. I think many of you might know him. We have an advisory board of Jagdish Basi, Allan Brown of Vance Brown and Sons, John and Kristine Erving, Barbara Gross, David MacKenzie, Jeff Traum, and Olenka Villareal. We do several things. Again, we're not a big group. One of the things we've been working on is Color Our Parks where we work on the flower beds at Rinconada and
also have done work over at Lucie Stern Community Center. We worked to help get funding for the Arastradero Preserve for the demonstration things there. We've worked hard to get benches in many of our parks. We also help out Bol Park garden center. We work closely with the Kiwanis Club to help Daren's group to work on the parks. Recently have done Bowden Park and Hoover Park. We were involved with Bike Palo Alto that stopped at a couple of our parks. We have a little tree display at Briones Park. We have volunteered to help out with the new golf course on the native plants. Partnering with the City on our major parks, we not only raise funds but one of the things that we bring to the table is we lease the property from the City, and that gives us the opportunity to bring in our own contractors and get in-kind donations. Because of that, we can do things faster and many times less expensive than the City could. We've been involved in three major projects, Heritage Park, Lytton Plaza, and the Magical Bridge. A little bit of history of each of these. Each of these projects had a champion and a small working group. Jagdish Basi and Jeff Traum, who were on our Board at that time, had the idea for the playground at Heritage Park and worked with Mayor Yoriko to get that moving along. Then, we were fortunate to have some neighbors, John and Kristine Erving who live right on the park, to step up to head up the building of that park. Interesting enough, as we all know, there are different parts of the community. Kristine Erving has been president of maybe five or six different organizations. She had never been to a City Council meeting, so she came to talk about Heritage Park. We had several contractors give us advice on the park. Those of you that have been there, there's a beautiful dolphin, and Tig Tarlton donated that in honor of his daughter who died. It's like the one in Ireland. What was interesting there is the funding came primarily from the neighborhood, and Summerhill Homes, who built at that area, donated a fair amount of money. The shepherds of that park are the Ervings. They live there, and they watch it and take ownership of it. The next major project that we did was Lytton Plaza. The idea came from Le Levy, who's big into fountains. He was joined by Roxie Rapp to get this thing cooking, and then Le joined our Board. Barbara Gross, who at that time ran the Garden Court Hotel, became the head of the working group. We formed a founders group who committed at least $10,000 to the project. There's a really nice plaque right there on the wall showing the founders group. I was by there today. It's sad that eight of these folks are no longer with us. That's Warren Thoits, John Santana, Dale Denson, Jack Rominger, John Childress, Sam Webster, and Leonard Ely. The reason I bring this up is, if you knew these people, they were really pillars of our community. You could always tap them on the shoulder, and they'd take out their checkbook. One of our goals and of the City in general is we have to replace them with other people who may not have worked here in town, but a lot of folks live here. We had some very large donations from Le Levy, Roxie Rapp, and Chop Keenan. The major project that they were best known for is the Magical Bridge. The inspiration for that came from Olenka Villareal, who had a disabled daughter. She was having to drive a long ways to find playgrounds for her. She joined our Board and literally worked tirelessly for many years to complete this wonderful project. We were able to get a lead gift from Dick Perry, the Perry Foundation, of $1 million. Dick Perry sits behind me in football games at Stanford. He says this to me
many times, "The Magical Bridge Playground is the best thing to happen in Palo Alto."
This is a guy who gave $25 million to the school to build a gym. Olenka and her group
have worked very hard. Pat Burt, who was on the Council at that time, became a champion
and helped us work through the City. Olenka's daughter came up with the Magical Bridge.
Those of you that remember, it was a bridge that went over to the three tennis courts. She
said, "That land is a magical bridge." What was neat about that is we made use of land that
was not being used. We raised over $4 million for that project with some very big gifts. If
you have time and have never been there, go sometime because it is so popular. It is really,
really an interesting program. Olenka has gone on and taken the model to build Magical
Bridge parks in several communities. I think one in Redwood City may be coming up.
One of the things we bring to the table is we do have the 501(c), and it's an excellent vehicle
to fund various projects. We now hold the following funds for Bol Park flower project,
Heritage Park, the lawn bowling fund, Lytton Plaza, Magical Bridge, and the Palo Alto
Dog Owners Association. We feel that the 501(c) can be used to help fund various projects
as we go in the future. I would like us all to work together. Any time we're doing a project,
if there's not enough money or they need a little more money, we put our heads together
and see how we might tap the neighbors or whoever the users are. Anne, I like your idea
of once we get a park refurbished, for instance, we have a celebration because it usually
has been closed. That's my report. Happy to answer any questions.

Chair McDougall: Thank you, Roger. I'm sure there are some comments and questions.
I'll start with David.

Commissioner Moss: Thank you very much for that update. My favorite park is that
Magical Bridge. I go by it every day from south Palo Alto. It's fantastic. I can't thank you
enough for helping out with that. Almost every meeting I bring up the AT&T property
next to Boulware Park. I'm hoping that someday, some way we will be able to purchase
that and make it a part of Boulware and somehow work it into that Fry's property next door.
Anything that we can do to push that is my goal.

Mr. Smith: I thought of that also. One of the nice parts about that is if we could close off
that street. That would give us a lot more property there. Maybe we should. I would be
happy to start a little fund for that project just so we have a fund if we start talking to people
who might have an interest in putting some money in that.

Commissioner Cribbs: I'm pretty excited to hear this, Roger. It's pretty amazing what you
all have done since the year 2000. I was looking at the website while I was hearing you
talk. The projects are wonderful and certainly much needed. I especially like what you
said about some of the founders of Lytton Plaza and supporters who aren't with us anymore,
kind of remembering all the people who years ago in Palo Alto did so much to think about
the future of the City with parks. I think it's going to be really important for you to continue
identifying new donors and new people. If there's any way we can help you with that, that's
really critical. Thank you so much for everything that you've done. We really appreciate it.

Mr. Smith: Anne, thank you very much. It reminds me we had a celebration; I can't remember how many years ago, maybe 10 or so, at Foothill Park. I think it was one of the anniversaries. One of the Lee brothers got up and explained about what happened there. The story that he told—I presume it's true—is Dr. Lee came home and said, "Helen, I'm going to sell the property. She says, "Russell, that's fine. You can sell your half of the property, but not my half." He said, "Helen, what's your half?" She said, "Every other inch."

Commissioner Cribbs: Just to add to that, I'm really hopeful that this group continues to get really good publicity, and people who would like to contribute to Palo Alto are able to find you and that we as a group make it easy for people to contribute.

Mr. Smith: Thank you, Anne. I agree.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I really appreciate the opportunity to learn about the wonderful things your organization has done for the community. It's quite laudable and very impressive. I agree we'll never have enough money to fund all the wonderful ideas we have to enrich our community and our parks and recreation system. We have a new Master Plan, which has just been adopted. It's an aspirational document with great ideas to move forward with in the next 25 years. I certainly hope that we can continue to work together to make some of these ideas into reality. Thank you very much.

Chair McDougall: Jeff, I believe they have all been delivered copies of the Master Plan.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Thanks again. You've done so much for the City. When I go to Heritage Park, it's such a beautiful park and makes that neighborhood so much more livable, so much more attractive. If that was just filled with houses, then the neighborhood would not be the same. We appreciate that. Jeff mentioned the Master Plan. We have so many things, so many things that the City will not be able to fund. Having a charity that the public can donate to is going to be very important. What can we do to help you raise funds or get publicity?

Mr. Smith: If you don't mind, I'll just mention Heritage Park. One of the things that really warmed my heart is John and Kristine had the idea to get the children from the low-cost housing. They went over and were able to put their handprints on the wall. That's really neat. That's a busy park; I was by there the other day. I'm not certain what we do. I would say we might start with—I don't know all the ends and outs, but it maybe falls into Daren and Public Works. If we're going to redo a park and there may be the basics but it'd be nice to add on, let's say, some things which are not in the budget, we might be able to then work together to go around the neighborhood. One of the things that we haven't accomplished
and that I always wanted to—I had the dream of every park would have some shepherds in it, like the three major ones, people that are either close by or use it or whatever. That might be one. That's pretty nebulous, but that would be a start. Anytime there's money to be had, if there's not enough, we work together.

Commissioner Reckdahl: One of my concerns is that the Friends of Palo Alto Parks is well known by word of mouth. Especially with so many new people coming in, there's a big chunk of the City who doesn't even know that the Friends of Palo Alto Parks exists. What can we do to get people more knowledgeable about the Friends of Palo Alto Parks and more likely to give money to you?

Mr. Smith: To date we've been very project oriented. Clearly, Magical Bridge was a pretty easy sell because you have little kids. Lytton Plaza was more Downtown-oriented. That would be something we'd have to all think about, is there the possibility of having a fund. I think it's worthwhile. I always mispronounce it, but Boulware Park is a classic one. I believe that's in the City somewhere getting the subdivision done. That's a classic one. The other one that really intrigues me is a little park—I can't remember the name of it—at Grant and Ash Street. It's a little pocket park. We need collectively to figure out how we have more pocket parks. Again, I don't know all the details. I think some of the developers have gotten by by putting a bench somewhere. We really need some green space. That might be another area that we could work together. It's easy to say there's so much wealth in town. There's a lot 2 blocks from me on Bryant Street that went on the market for $17 million the other day. The realtor said they thought it was underpriced. It sold in 2 days. I don't know who sold it. That gives you some idea that there's a fair amount of money in town. Through Magical Bridge we were able to tap into some of that money.

Commissioner Reckdahl: It's also hard for us, though, because that same price is what we have to pay if we want to buy parkland. It cuts on both sides. Thanks again. You've done such a good job for the City. We appreciate it.

Commissioner LaMere: Roger, I just want to thank you for your service, your generosity, your initiative, your willingness to give to the City and to the community. Echoing what Anne said about how you mentioned the people who have passed, who had worked with Lytton Plaza. It's incumbent upon us, especially I look at me with a 6-year-old, to find the people of the next generation, so to speak, who can take some of these projects on or who want to invest in this community and who live here now and who really see this as our home. For what you've done and what you've done with the Friends of Palo Alto Park, it's really a great example. Whether it's us continuing to talk about it with our peer group or at the elementary school or whatever, whatever we can do as a Commission to spread the word. It's also finding that generation who is coming up and who has the 6 year olds and the 8 year olds and the kids in elementary school and have made that decision to be part of Palo Alto. It is about service. I just want to thank you for all that you've done because it's
tremendous. We need more people like you, and we need to be able to tap into that and find that. Again, thank you so much.

Mr. Smith: Thank you very much. Also, we have a lot of wealth, but we have a talent pool. If we wanted to be critical, I'm not sure the City collectively has reached out and tapped that. We were able to do that on specific projects, like the contractors. Everybody's got a list of their friends. I go to Council meetings every once in a while, and I can't believe all the stuff that gets dumped on staff. I'm very much editorializing here. I think we have people in the community that might step forward if asked and not be paid as a consultant but just as a working group because there is so much talent. Also, there are guys like me that are getting older and that might have some time.

Chair McDougall: Thank you, Roger. I would like to ask if Kristen or Daren have any questions they'd like to ask or any interaction with Roger.

Mr. Anderson: I would. Mainly just an acknowledgement. I've known Roger for a long time. He calls me frequently almost always to offer help. I just really appreciate that. Not only is he the eyes and the ears—that goes for the whole Friends organization. They'll call me and say, "Just to let you know, there's a swing that looks like it needs some attention. Can you get to it?" Very appreciative of that and those generous offers. Thank you so much.

Mr. Smith: I might mention too that Daren almost always gets back to you within a day on things. The last one I was bothering you about is out at Briones Park. The water fountain was shooting up; you couldn't get a drink. He said, "I'll have our guys look at it on Monday." That's the kind of thing that if we all worked together, if we could get these shepherds going—I'm sure you get a lot of problems. If we had a shepherd in each park, that would really be neat.

Chair McDougall: Number one, I'd just simply like to say thank you to Roger and the whole Friends of Palo Alto Parks. I feel like my job, if I could just do it, would be to create a word cloud out in space from all the comments that were made, some words that were used and some words that are implied. The concept of shepherds and funding and help and partnership. Partnership is really key in all that and the whole idea of next generation and the whole idea of talent and throw in pocket parks. All of that, for me, adds up to passion. As much as anything, thanking you and the organization for the passion that you represent. The challenge for us is to take advantage and leverage that passion with the rest of the community. I will speak for the Commission and say we will find a way to leverage that passion. Thank you for it.

Mr. Smith: Thank you, and delighted to be here.
3. Golf Course Opening and New Operator

Ms. O’Kane: I’ll introduce this item. I asked Lam to join us today. Lam Do is our Superintendent of Parks, Golf, and Open Space. I wasn’t sure about the open space. As you know, we recently had Council approve our new contract with the operator who will be managing the golf course, our new café/restaurant at the golf course, the maintenance. It’s really an exciting time for us with the golf course being completed and kicking off with a brand new operator. We’re really excited about it. I asked Lam to come and share with you some of the details of the new course and the new operator and what you can expect.

Chair McDougall: Welcome, Lam.

Lam Do: Thank you, Chair McDougall and members of the Commission. I’d like to present to you this evening our new Baylands Golf Links and, in conjunction with that, our agreement and partnership with OB Sports, our new golf course operator. I want to start with some background information on the course. That'll lead into the features of the new golf course and also discuss the RFP process and how we came about selecting our golf management company, OB Sports, and the two agreements that we now have with them. We have a course management agreement with them, and we also have a license with them for them to provide food and beverage at the restaurant and on the course. I present to you our new course, the Baylands Golf Links. It is a link-style course with native vegetation areas throughout the course. I’ll speak of what makes this course unique in a second, but let me go back to what we were before. What we were before was the Palo Alto Municipal Golf Course. The Palo Alto golf course was built in 1956, consisting of 160 acres in the Baylands. It remained in operation for 60 years, through 2016. There were some renovations in regards to irrigation systems in between those 60 years, but the course remained primarily the same. It was a flat, up-and-down course located in the Baylands. One impetus of the City’s deciding to renovate the course is the adjacent project of the San Francisquito Creek levee expansion, which was going to expand its footprint into the golf course by 7.4 acres. The City and Council decided to fully renovate the course because of the loss of the 7.4 acres. At the same time, the City also decided to dedicate 10.5 acres for future recreation use. That in itself reduced the Baylands Golf Links course down to about 143 acres. In May of 2016, the City issued—a contract with Wadsworth Golf Construction to begin the process of fully redesigning and renovating the course, all 18 holes. Construction began with demolition of the old course down to removal of the prior irrigation and installing new drainage and a whole new irrigation system in addition to that. From there Wadsworth Golf further developed—after they had the irrigation system under the course, the course was further developed. The course imported over 400 cubic yards of dirt to create contours, which you’ll later see provides us with the link-style course. Much of the dirt came from development at Stanford University, which was an opportunity for the City to take advantage of that because we needed the dirt ourselves. They needed to offload dirt, and we worked out a deal with them to accept their
dirt. From there, we started further developing. You can see in this picture the course is taking shape as a course. You can see tees being developed, greens being shaped and formed. You can see new cart paths having been put in. In addition to that, we opted to replace the old and no longer relevant by location restroom. That restroom was removed, and we installed a new restroom in a location based on the new layout that could be accessible by three different golf holes. This provides multiple opportunities for users to have such a pitstop during their round of play. What we eventually came with is our new Baylands Golf Links course. This is a link-style course specifically designed by Forest Richardson, taking advantage of being adjacent to the Baylands. Link-style courses, for those of you familiar, are typical of what you see in Europe. They take in natural elements and land formations. We’ve created a design similar to that. We’ve added more bunkers. We now have rolling fairways instead of flat, long fairways. We also now have windy conditions, which we had before. Now I’m going to say it's even more windy because we have fewer trees at this point. All these features make it more unique towards a link-style course. Some features on the new course I’d like to discuss with you. What we have is a 40 percent reduction in the prior managed turf. We've converted what was previously managed turf to native vegetation areas to complement the link style. It also helps us in regards to cost of irrigation. Another feature of this course is the selection of paspalum turf grass, which is very tolerant of salinity, which allows us to switch from previously blending both recycled and potable water to now what we think will be mostly and up to 100 percent recycled water in the fairways. The greens will still need to be potable water because it’s a different type of grass. It’s a bent grass; however, most of the golf course is the fairways, and that's what's going to be mostly irrigated with recycled water. We've also selected grasses that are more appropriate for the location as well. In addition to that with the importation of the 400 cubic yards of dirt, we now have contours and elevated views on the course. There are actually a couple of holes where you can see parts of the San Francisco Bay. These elevated views were not available to the course before. In general, the course was raised between a foot and up to 13 feet, I believe, depending on which location you’re at. We also have more features. We also selected a company to manage the golf course, and that's OB Sports. Something about OB Sports is they are a unique golf operator in that they operate all types of golf courses from private courses to daily fee courses to public courses. They operate in a boutique style where they present different themes for the courses they manage. They place the course owner and branding of what the course owner would like before their branding. It's a company that offers a boutique style, which is something the City desired. Next is the RFP process and how we came about selecting OB Sports. We submitted a Request for Proposals for either full course management or a full course lease. This process was intended to change the operating model of the golf course. Previously, our golf course operating model operated with different vendors providing different services. We had Brad Lozares operating the golf shop and providing professional services to manage the golf course play. We had a different restaurant operator, and we had a different golf course management company. The City with this golf course desired the operations of one company for cohesiveness.
We received five course management proposals. We did not receive any full course lease proposals. When we assessed the proposals for cost, management style, and based on interviews and references, we came to the selection of OB Sports as our preferred vendor. From there, we entered negotiations with them. The City actually modified their initial proposal. The initial proposal was a strict fee for service management model in which they asked the City for a management fee. In return, they would manage the golf course where the City would absorb the expenditures and also receive all revenues. The City went back to OB Sports and negotiated a different structure. Now, it will still be fee for service, but on top of that they will be receiving a set operating expense. They have to match that operating expense. This provided the City and the operator with some risk and reward, where they need to operate to the set budget the City has set and still attain the revenues. The City was comfortable in this type of model and presented that. They worked with us to come up with an agreement. In regards to the structure of our agreement with them, we actually ended up with two different agreements. We ended up with a management agreement where they would operate the golf shop on the City's behalf. They would also operate the driving range, operate the golf course as well, and maintain the course. A separate agreement with them is to lease them food and beverage services. This has to do with the structure of how we are funding the construction of the golf course through bond financing and providing the City with flexibility in the future should we want to modify our operating structure or go with another company down the line. By having two different agreements, we get some flexibility in that. That's why we have two separate agreements with them. Also, the City does get one cohesive service because it's one company providing all the services. The benefits of that have to do with the ultimate play experience that one receives coming to the course. We want it to be seamless where one comes and understands from check-in at the golf shop to play or practice in advance or grabbing a snack in advance of getting onto the course that it's one service provider collectively providing one product. If we were to have a tournament, tournament coordination with food and beverage is a challenge. We hope this model coordinates the two. We selected OB Sports for other desires as well. There are some loyalty programs that they want to introduce. The loyalty program that they have has been successful in other courses they manage. This is something we haven't had before. We've had discounts for select play, but we haven't had a loyalty program. We hope this loyalty program will grow as players participate, and we realize the benefits of it. One other change that we've had from prior operations is dynamic pricing. Some of you may be familiar with that model in the airline industry or the hotel industry. Working with OB Sports, we have developed three tiers of pricing for greens fees with residents receiving the lowest rates. A second tier would be Bay Area residents, and third would be visitors from out of town or business play. Within the structure of the three tiers, there's also dynamic pricing, which would fluctuate based on demand and what the tee sheet for the day being reserved looks like. It's similar to an airline or hotel model. It rewards golfers that book their tee times early. With the course now complete, OB Sports has taken over operations with the exception of the restaurant last week upon Council's approval of their agreements. The reason they have not taken
over the restaurant yet is the current operator has some commitments. Their lease will end at the end of this month, at which time OB Sports will take over the restaurant. OB Sports is now busy preparing for our grand opening, which we plan to have Saturday, May 26th, which is Memorial Day weekend. It gives them about a month to prepare the course. They're making some changes as well to the golf shop and the restaurant. These are some remodels to bring in a new change to the course. As most of you are aware, Brad Lozares operated the golf course for the City for 36 years. The restaurant has been leased for as long as I can remember. With OB Sports coming onboard, they are doing some remodeling as well. With the grand opening about a month away, we also plan on having some pre-opening events to invite play, some VIP play. We're also going to invite the public to tour the course. We also want to have some media coverage leading up to the grand opening. Upon grand opening, we would have a festival to kick off and open the course. I do want to acknowledge those that have gotten us here. This has been a long process, 6 years in the making. City staff throughout the City has helped us get to where we are, from Council to the JPA to the Commission, our Planning Commission, the Architectural Review Board, staff from the City Manager's Office, Planning and Community Environment, Community Services staff, Public Works, our Attorney's Office, and also Administrative Services. We're all looking forward to opening the course in a little over a month. If you have questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

Commissioner LaMere: I appreciate all the work that everyone put into this. The golf course, from these pictures, looks beautiful. Excited to see it when it opens. I do have a couple of quick questions. If I understand it, there's an incentive. It's fee for service, but there's also some revenue marks for them to hit and that provide bonuses for the City to recoup the right amount of money. Is that correct?

Mr. Do: That is correct. There is a set expense budget, which they are tasked with managing too. In addition to that, there is a set anticipation or expectation the City will receive all the revenues up to the budgeted amount. Anything beyond the budgeted amount would be a revenue share. The incentive for OB Sports to manage at or under the expense budget yet still bring in more than the anticipated revenue is anything above the anticipated revenue they would receive 20 percent.

Commissioner LaMere: As far as the pricing goes, how does the pricing compare to what the golf course was? I know the golf course has now changed. How does it compare to what it was as well as compared to other area public golf courses?

Mr. Do: A comparison is difficult at this point. The pricing is based on not only the cost to operate the course but also the play experience. We feel the play experience of this new links course, which does not exist in the area, will be much different, much more desirable. Based on those two factors, a comparison would not be an exact comparison. In regards to dollars, the fee range from before—I do have to preface this. Our fee arrangement before
was steeply discounted because we had a modified course for several years. We also lost a lot of customers during that time. We really discounted our course to the point where our greens fees, which were in the $40 range, were down to the high $20s and low $30s. With the reopening, the resident fees would have a range on a weekday of between $40 and $60, on a weekend of between $52 and $80. That's where the dynamic pricing comes into play. I do want to emphasize that a hard dollar comparison probably would not be a direct comparison at this point.

Commissioner LaMere: As far as the rounds projection, how did we reach that conclusion? What number of rounds were being played in the past at the course?

Mr. Do: I'll start with the number of rounds being played at the course. Peak at the course was about 90,000 rounds. Keep in mind that was during the height of the golf boom, the early 2000s. Leading up to when there were discussions that the course would be modified, around 2011-2012-2013, we were in the range of 70,000, 75,000 rounds. I'm not exact on the figures right now. Up until we closed the course in 2016, we were down to 32,000 or 36,000 rounds. In regards to the projections of the new golf course, the City worked with the National Golf Foundation to prepare pro formas in 2012. We asked them to update their projections in 2016 with the anticipation of the new course. We further refined that figure with both a golf consultant from Golf Convergence, Jim Keegan, and we worked with OB Sports to refine the figures. The City has worked with two consulting firms and the operator to determine what we think the golf course will play. The rounds will start off lower than what we think it will sustain. We think it'll take about 2 years, maybe 3 years, to sustain its full operating numbers. Those range between 62,000 to 66,000 rounds.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you. A single operator, I thought that was a very good decision. That will simplify a lot of the operations. I also thought the dynamic pricing was a good route. Who will be setting the rates for the dynamic pricing? Is that a City decision or is that an OB …

Mr. Do: For simplified terms, it's an algorithm that's supported by golf data. They will be using golf statistics to set the dynamic pricing within the range that the City sets. The City has obviously worked out with OB Sports that we will review that to see how it goes. We do have the opportunity to work with their management to adjust the algorithm that determines the pricing.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Before the construction, did we have many open rounds where someone wasn't on the course or was it pretty much sold out?

Mr. Do: Before construction, we had a lot of open slots. Weekends we had a good amount of golf play, but the course struggled during the week, Monday through Thursday. We had rounds open in the morning as well, which typically would be a desirable play time. We struggled in the mornings and mid-day. We were nowhere near capacity.
Commissioner Reckdahl: Dynamic pricing should help that, I would assume.

Mr. Do: We hope it does. It is a shift in the golf industry, but that's a shift we think is going to support this golf course.

Commissioner Reckdahl: You also mentioned the reason for the two contracts had something to do with the bonds. I was confused about that.

Mr. Do: The City is financing construction of the golf course to pay back the General Fund with 30-year bonds. With 30-year bonds, depending on whether one goes with taxable or non-taxable bonds, there are certain restrictions on the contract stipulations that may be made. It has to do with compensation based on gross revenue, net revenue, or flat-rate compensation. There are multiple factors involved. The City has opted for the most flexibility with taxable bonds and two separate agreements. The two agreements in place right now are for 39 months with opportunities to mutually renew for an additional 3 years and then an opportunity for a second mutual renewal for another 3 years. That could be up to 9 years and 3 months if it's mutual on both sides. During that time should it not be mutual with the flexibility of how the City sets up our agreements, we're thinking of the 30-year bond life and how we want to manage the course down the line.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The only thing is the restaurant. In the past, the restaurant really was below par, no pun intended. I'm glad to hear that they're doing some remodeling before they're opening. I don't imagine it's a major remodel.

Mr. Do: It is not a major remodel for several reasons. The full construction budget was focused on the golf course itself, the practice areas, and bumping out the driving range. The golf course construction budget did not include upgrades to the clubhouse facilities, the golf shop and the restaurant. It's not a major upgrade. If we were to pursue a major upgrade of the restaurant, it would further push out when the restaurant would come into operation, which would not match opening the golf course.

Commissioner Reckdahl: There's so much room for improvement, especially with the lunch crowd down there. There are so many offices nearby. In the long run, we really need to improve that restaurant. It's a lost opportunity for revenue and for a community asset. It's a great location; there's not a lot of competition down there. I really would encourage us to do what we can down the road to improve the restaurant.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I know this project has been a major undertaking. You must be very excited and relieved to be getting close to the finish line here. Congratulations on all the hard work (crosstalk).

Mr. Do: On behalf of my colleagues, thank you.
Vice Chair Greenfield: Looks like it's paying off richly. I have a few questions. Regarding the dynamic pricing, is this used at other courses now or is this a new undertaking for us?

Mr. Do: It's a new undertaking for us. It is not used by many golf courses at all. Within this region, I'm not aware of any courses that do dynamic pricing.

Vice Chair Greenfield: How about for the vendor?

Mr. Do: They have one course.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Are the reservations tiered in any manner? Is priority given to residents, for example?

Mr. Do: Yes. The tee time reservations are tiered. The thought behind that is it's tiered to give priority to those that are making travel arrangements coming to the golf course. Those that are paying the highest tier rate would be the ones that have the most advanced tee time reservation for two reasons, they're paying the highest rate and they are making travel arrangements. The thought is residents would be paying the lower rate, and residents have more flexibility in what tee times they play. The most advanced tee time goes to the outside visitor.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Could you provide more details on that? How much earlier can an out-of-town golfer make a reservation than a resident, for example?

Mr. Do: The out-of-town paying the highest tier can make reservations up to 60 days in advance. I don't know offhand what the resident is. I believe the resident was about 2 weeks.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Has the local golf community been consulted in making this decision?

Mr. Do: I don't think we've heard. It's possible, but it has not been expressed to us formally. I think there is an understanding that there's also this aspect of dynamic pricing in there.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Technically, a resident could make a reservation at the out-of-town date and out-of-town rate. Is there further tiering between Bay Area residents and Palo Alto residents?

Mr. Do: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that please?

Vice Chair Greenfield: I'm sorry. There's the nonresident, the Bay Area resident, and the Palo Alto resident. Does the nonresident get the earliest time, then Bay Area, then Palo Alto or is it just two steps?
Mr. Do: No. The tee times are three tiers as well along with the rate structure.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I'd be interested in getting more details on what's planned on that at some point. Are juniors able to make reservations as well at their reduced rate or is it just walk-up availability for juniors? What's the planning there?

Mr. Do: The junior also would be able to make reservations in advance. They're not expected, because they're paying the junior rate, to have no advance.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Their window would be the same as Palo Alto residents?

Mr. Do: That's correct.

Vice Chair Greenfield: There's no distinction on a rate for resident juniors versus nonresident juniors?

Mr. Do: No, there is not.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I have a couple of naive questions as a nongolfer. What is the replay rate?

Mr. Do: Some golfers prefer to play two rounds in a day. It's a monumental task in my opinion, but it's not uncommon. If you wanted to play another 18 holes—some people pay the replay rate, but they may not finish the second round. That's understandable. At all golf courses, there is a replay rate typically.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Finally, are the carts electric?

Mr. Do: Yes, the carts are electric. We're Palo Alto.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I prefaced it as one of the naive questions. Thank you.

Commissioner Cribbs: I have a lot of questions. I'm really happy to hear the presentation. Thank you very much. Just to say like everybody else has, I know how hard and how long we've been working on this. It's really exciting to get it close to the finish line. Where are the golf courses in California that this group operates?

Mr. Do: Locally, they operate the golf club at Moffett. Also, in Southern California they operate another golf course. Overall, it's 55 courses throughout the country.

Commissioner Cribbs: Have we compared the rates for residents, the rates in this presentation, to Mountain View specifically?

Mr. Do: We did do a rate survey, yes. If you give me a few minutes, I can go back and check the rates.
Commissioner Cribbs: That’s okay. I was just switching back and forth, and I just wanted to—we're considerably higher for people who play golf a lot. People who just want to play, we're probably okay. I'm just worried about that. Since you brought up the part about the nonresident and the resident, it feels like it's backwards. It feels like Palo Alto residents, just from my perspective, should have priority.

Mr. Do: The impetus for the opposite is—we do have the possibility that the tee sheet would be completely filled up way in advance with resident play. We are trying to balance both a revenue model and a service model. The golf course has in the past broken even or just slightly in the black or slightly in the red. Balancing revenues and expenses is difficult in operating a golf course. We need to ensure that we hit our revenue targets. Part of hitting the revenue targets is ensuring that we do offer the course to play from outside visitors who indirectly by paying a higher fee contribute towards us being able to achieve our revenue targets. It's a tradeoff. It may be a perspective of residents are not desirable, but what we offer our residents is a fee that is unmatched. Residents are paying the lowest fee here.

Commissioner Cribbs: The pricing is something to watch for. I'm sure that you and the vendor will be doing that because everybody needs to make this work and cover their costs and all of that. I wanted to switch to the golf clubs that we have now at the Baylands, the senior men's club and the men's club and the women's nine-hole. What else is there?

Mr. Do: There's also a women's club. There's a Wednesday club and a Thursday club.

Commissioner Cribbs: How are they feeling about all of this?

Mr. Do: The clubs all have desires to return. During the past 2 years, they've had to play at other courses. They've contacted me asking to be able to come back. We do want to welcome them back. I've worked with OB Sports to bring them back as well. OB Sports informed the golf clubs that once OB Sports has established operations about a month in, maybe 2 months in, we could then integrate the clubs' returning. As OB Sports ramps up with their staffing, they anticipate having a general manager in place any day now. The discussion could then soon begin between OB Sports and the clubs to plan on their return.

Commissioner Cribbs: Will First Tee continue on?

Mr. Do: Yes. The First Tee of Silicon Valley, we've committed to supporting that program. They are actually going to be here this summer offering their programs on Wednesdays. They've also discussed with us other opportunities, and OB Sports is also supportive of the program.

Commissioner Cribbs: There's one other program from East Palo Alto that we've supported in the past. That's Bob Hoover's Junior Golf program that's really graduated a lot of kids,
and they've gone on to scholarships and all of that. I'm hopeful that, if Bob wants to continue, that's in the works as well.

Mr. Do: We have not heard from Bob. If Bob would like to contact us, I'd be more than happy to discuss it with him, with the City, and with OB Sports.

Commissioner Cribbs: Just one more thing along those lines. Brad Lozares—full disclosure—has been a longtime friend of mine, and I have worked with him very closely on golf tournaments in the past, senior tournaments, junior tournaments, and all of that. He has an amazing reputation in the golf world. I'm hopeful that there's something that we all can do to thank him and acknowledge him—this is probably not the right time—for everything he's done for the City and for the golf program, for junior golf, for senior golf, and just generally golf.

Mr. Do: In Brad's 36 years operating the golf shop on behalf of the City, it's estimated that Brad had 5 million golfers during that time. In regards to developing youth in the area, he worked with 18 golf professionals during this time as well, teaching youth. He's made a major contribution to the community. We do want to recognize him, and we're aware of that. That's something that will be forthcoming.

Commissioner Moss: You've answered a couple of my questions already. Thank you. With the water treatment plant, we have a tremendous amount of water going straight into the Bay over near the airport runway. Since the trees and the plants can now handle more saline water, is it possible to take that water and move it over to the golf course so that there's less going directly into the Bay?

Mr. Do: The opportunity to make use of 100 percent recycled water exists almost throughout the course. There are very few areas of the course that right now are on potable water. That's primarily the putting greens. Of the 143 acres, there's about 3 acres of putting greens. Also the practice areas near the golf shop are on potable water. The remainder of the course can take this water. How much water we can take to divert what's going in there, there's only so much we can take. Keep in mind that paspalum does go dormant during the rainy season, so in reality there is no irrigation that we expect to have during the winter months. It would only really be during the spring as it comes out of dormancy, during the summer and into early fall. Come about November it goes back into dormancy.

Commissioner Moss: Your plants are very carefully selected. I know that trees are an issue because it's always been marshland, so it's hard to get trees that fit that kind of area. I know that we have a lot of wind, especially in the afternoons. Do we need trees to block the wind or is that not an issue? Can we get more playing time that's not affected so much by wind in some way with the use of trees or whatever?
Mr. Do: I think I understand your question; I apologize if I misunderstood it. Please let me know. The design of the course did change the look and layout and the amount of trees that are on the course, incorporating the native areas, incorporating the wispy wind as part of the changing way that the course plays. Whether you play the course in the morning or the afternoon, it may play like two different courses. Even though you're hitting the same distance, you're hitting into the wind in the morning. Maybe in the afternoon, the wind is aiding you. It's all part of the design. As for garnering more play, whether there is or is not wind, I think it's a combination of how the links course plays out and how people find it desirable. I don't know that having more trees would make the course more or less desirable. I wouldn't venture there.

Commissioner Moss: I also want to talk about kids. I know one of the reasons that the number of rounds has gone down is because there are fewer golfers. We have had talks in this Commission about the tremendous number of kids' camps. The question is how do we as a City encourage more kids to come out and try to play golf. Do you have any plans with OB to perhaps have camps or work with the camps we already have?

Mr. Do: The Community Services Department does support youth learning, youth development with golf as well. We have had camps that we offered through Brad Lozares. We do plan on continuing that during the immediate launch. However, OB Sports is focused on getting the course open. We do plan on discussing with them—they have youth programs at their other courses, which eventually we can bring more onboard here aside from what the Recreation Department does on its own through its camp programs and/or aside from what we do with First Tee of Silicon Valley.

Commissioner Moss: Can they be publicized in the Enjoy! catalog just like any other camp or class for kids?

Mr. Do: I don't see any reason why we wouldn't. Previously we did the programs we ran with Brad Lozares. I anticipate we would do the same with this new operator.

Commissioner Moss: Forgive me if I didn't hear. How long is the contract with OB and how many years before it will be reviewed? You said there was about a 2-3 year startup. When do you expect the first review with OB?

Mr. Do: The 2-3 year reference was in regards to getting the course fully ramped up and to reach what we think will be its full operational capacity. That is independent of the terms and length of the two agreements we have with OB Sports. Those agreements are actually starting off as 39-month agreements. It's 39 months instead of 36 months because we're starting in April. April, May, and June are the 3 additional months tacked onto 3 fiscal years. After the initial 39 months, by mutual agreement of both parties there is a 3-year extension. After the 3-year extension, there's also by mutual agreement the opportunity for another 3 years.
Commissioner Moss: The design of the course has special plants. You talk about Scottish links. Will this be a rougher rough or something like that because of the plants that are now on the green? What do you mean by Scottish links design?

Mr. Do: Scottish links design has to do with rolling contours, has to do with bunkers protecting the greens. That has to do with the roughs; it's a different type of rough. In most golf courses here you'll see different cuts in the fairways. You'll see a low cut in the fairway, and on the edge of the fairway you'll see a higher cut that could be anywhere from an inch to 2-3 inches higher, creating what's called a rough. This course is almost one cut in the fairways all the way up to the edge of either a cart path or a native area. In essence, the native area becomes the rough. Not all native areas, though, will be in play. Some areas will be out of bounds depending on whether or not the area is a designated wetland or only a vegetation area.

Commissioner Moss: That's all I have. Thank you so much.

Chair McDougall: Lam, thank you. I have one comment and really only one question. I would have answered David's question about the wind differently. My experience on a links course is the wind is considered to be a feature, not a disadvantage. This is a managed service agreement. I don't need to know the numbers of what happens if revenue is missed and what happens if they go over in expenses. That's obviously part of the contract. Are there other key performance indicators that are part of the measurements or …

Mr. Do: Yes, there are.

Chair McDougall: … are the only measurements the revenue and expense?

Mr. Do: There are. Before I answer, I have one other thing I forgot to mention earlier. Commissioner Moss, you asked this. How often is the golf course performance and budget reviewed? Annually, OB Sports and the City will work on the next budget year's operations, revenue targets, and expense budget. It's not that we don't have any opportunity to review it during the 39 months. It's going to be an annual process within the contract. In regards to the performance measures, there are also rounds of play. There's also average green fee, and then there's also customer satisfaction ratings.

Chair McDougall: Thank you for your time. Does anybody have one more question? For the minutes, I'll note Mr. McCauley has joined us. Go ahead.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I just wanted to follow up on the reservations. I know you will be monitoring the budgetary returns of play. I certainly appreciate that that plays an important factor in setting the reservations. I do have some concerns about the lack of priority for Palo Alto residents. I wonder if we may be able to eventually evolve to a system where a certain number of resident reservation slots may be carved into the system. A couple of
follow-up questions. Do the number of nonresident reservations impact the resident rate within the low to high range?

Mr. Do: Sorry, can you repeat that question?

Vice Chair Greenfield: If there's a bunch of nonresident reservations made, and the window opens for residents to make reservations, are the first reservations still going to be at the lowest dollar amount within the range or, by virtue of the fact that there's a number of reservations already taken by nonresidents, do the first resident rates become higher within the range?

Mr. Do: No, the resident rates don't become higher within the range. Each dynamic range is unique to that tier. Perhaps that's a better way to answer.

Vice Chair Greenfield: It's based on how far in advance it is?

Mr. Do: It's a combination of how far in advance and how booked up the tee sheet is. We don't anticipate the visiting player who has the most advanced to fully book up the tee sheet in any manner. The percentage of golf players, we think, will still be mostly a higher percentage of residents and Bay Area residents, not the visiting players. We don't anticipate a difficulty for our residents to book a time based on the desire or preference of, let's say, a weekend morning. We don't think the tee sheet will be full by the time the residents get their opportunity.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Thank you. That would be a good problem to have. A couple more quick questions. Are the high schools planning to use the course for their golf teams?

Mr. Do: We previously have offered the golf course to the high school teams, and we plan on continuing to do that.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Do clubs get reservation priority? The clubs that Anne was mentioning.

Mr. Do: By the virtue of being clubs and us slotting in where their play is, what they would like is ongoing, regular, standard times. By that virtue, they would be quasi prioritized.

Vice Chair Greenfield: What defines a club which is afforded the priority of clubs? Is it the regularity of the reservations?

Mr. Do: Right now, we have existing golf clubs. I'm not aware of any new golf clubs being formed. If that were the case, we would need to discuss with them their club membership, their participation, and what commitment they would make to the golf course. At this time, we're not aware of any new golf club being created. It's more the prior clubs wanting to return, and they've all expressed that they want to return.
Vice Chair Greenfield: Thank you for your clarifications. That's all.

Chair McDougall: To Jeff's point, you're not sure whether you want all those players who can't afford to play Bandon Dunes to show up here to play our links course or whether you want them not to show up.

Commissioner Cribbs: I just wondered if it was possible to show us where on the internet we could find the list of other courses that this vendor is operating. I'd like to see their programs. It's very interesting looking at the model.

Mr. Do: Their website is obsports.com. On that website, there are links to the courses listed by state.

Commissioner Cribbs: I found that, but then I can't find out where in the state that the courses are. Is that information available? I would like to see what programs they offer, especially for kids and for seniors.

Mr. Anderson: We can find that.

Commissioner Cribbs: It's probably around; I'm just not finding it. That would be great. I had one other question. Sorry. In the past, the Superintendent of the Palo Alto golf course obviously did a really good job in the '80s when we had all that play and everything. How does this work? Does the new vendor manage the staff of Palo Alto or will we not have any staff who work on the golf course working on the golf course anymore, any City staff?

Mr. Do: Prior to construction, the City did not have staff onsite maintaining the golf course. It was through a course maintenance contract with Valleycrest, which later became Brightview Golf Maintenance.

Commissioner Cribbs: No City staff worked on the golf course?

Mr. Do: Prior to construction and upon this new course the employees are through OB Sports.

Chair McDougall: If there are no other questions or comments? Lam, thank you very much for being here and bringing us up-to-date on what's exciting. Good luck on May 26th.

Mr. Do: Thank you, Chair. Thank you for this opportunity to present to you. I think everyone's excited as well.

[The Commission heard Item Number 5 prior to Item Number 4.]
4. Temporary Lighting at Cubberley Field: Assessment of Pilot

Mr. Howard: While I'm here, I wanted to give an update on how the lighting trial went on the Cubberley turf field. Some background on this. During the winter months when daylight savings time ends, there's a real high demand for our lit fields as it gets dark much earlier. We currently have three fields that are lit, two at Mayfield and one at El Camino. One soccer field, there's one baseball field there as well. During these times, those fields are in really high demand. They're booked 7 days a week, during the week 4:00-10:00, weekends all day. There's a lot of high demand, and we're constantly looking for additional space. This past year, Palo Alto Soccer Club approached the City with an opportunity. They wanted to try temporary lighting at the Cubberley turf field. This proposal was discussed multiple times here and with the public. On January 23 with feedback from the PRC, the trial was approved to move forward. The proposal provided to us by Palo Alto Soccer Club was to place four to six temporary light stations on the field, solar-powered with generator backup. The lights would be used Monday through Thursday, sunset to 8:30 p.m., hard off at 8:30. All additional activity would go through Cubberley Community Center, not on Nelson. The additional time would only be used for practice for Palo Alto youth. The lights would be secure, and the lights would be placed in a way that would limit disruption to the field and the track as well as to be safe for participants. The trial began February 12 and ended Sunday, March 11. Prior to running the test, we reached out to the Cubberley community. The greatest concerns we heard were to avoid traffic on Nelson, to limit how late the fields were used, and to limit light pollution. The trial and the proposal that was provided the community felt answered those questions. Staff felt comfortable that if we stuck to the proposal we would be able to avoid those concerns. Now that the trial has taken place, some key information about that time. We had roughly 60-80 participants a day, four to six teams. Those were split between the 5:30-7:00 and 7:00-8:30 slots. We ultimately did have to use six light stations after the first night. Four were placed, and it left the center of the field far too dark. They did have to bring in the full six. The lights were solar-powered the entire time. The generators never kicked on. I'm not even sure there were generators on the equipment. They were never used. The schedule of Monday through Thursday, sunset to 8:30, was followed with no reported incidents. The first couple of days as they went through the schedule, they ended a little bit early. Ultimately, they really did fill that time. There was one concern of Nelson. They felt some parents were dropping off, but that was immediately remedied. We received no further complaints on that. The light stations had what we felt was a minimal impact on the track but a little more impact on someone wanting to use the full field. The full field was used for a couple of day games without any incident or concern from the coaches there. Staff did say, "If this was out here for 3 months, maybe that'd be more of an issue." Post-trial public outreach. My contact information was all over the place before the trial, during the trial, after the trial. During the trial, like I said, we did have the one comment about Nelson Drive, which was taken care of really quickly. Staff delivered post-trial surveys to the 18 residents that bordered Cubberley field. We hand delivered those surveys. We
really wanted to make sure we got any feedback that was out there. The surveys were
provided with self-addressed, prepaid envelopes, and they also had the option of taking the
survey online. As of today, we had eight responses. The survey questions and responses
are below. Were you aware of the temporary trial? Eight people said yes. No one said no.
A comment of "it was impossible to miss." Did the lights from the trial have any negative
impact for you or your family? One said yes; seven said no. Comments: "we hated them,
noisy, bright, in the way of usage of the field, soccer is the only one to use the field and
lights degraded all other uses;" "parking and street congestion was well managed;" "great
to have this activity in the evening;" "no problem whatsoever;" "probably had some cars
on Nelson but overall not a problem, and we want the kids to be able to play soccer." The
last question, would you approve a similar lighting plan taking place next winter, January-
March, with the same restrictions? Six said yes; two said no. Comments: "please have
someone continue to monitor, the coaches are telling players' parents to park at Cubberley;"
"while well intentioned, they were the dominant thing we could see out our kitchen
window;" "(inaudible) participants, possibly precedent setting, and this is not essential."
Overall, we thought it was a success, but we do want to hear some of these comments. It's
a small number of people that replied. That's probably a sign that people weren't too upset
with the trial. I felt like we would have heard more had this had a big impact. Next steps,
staff will meet with the Parks and Rec ad hoc committee on fields to debrief and discuss if
there's any further next steps that they would like to take. Any questions or comments?

Chair McDougall: Does anybody have questions or comments? Start with Ryan.

Commissioner McCauley: Adam, could you tell us what's the potential range of next steps?
Is one end of the spectrum installation of permanent lighting, another one to continuing
temporary lighting (inaudible)?

Mr. Howard: At this point, next steps would be considering running the temporary trial in
the future for January through March, a little bit extended, and continue this kind of trial.
We had never really discussed in too much detail the idea of lights in the long term simply
because the funding would be hard to do and we didn't want to muck up the story if it wasn't
going to be a possibility. We didn't talk about the permanent lights at this point, so I guess
it's still in the realm of something the ad hoc might want to discuss.

Chair McDougall: Adam, did the soccer people feel they needed lights in periods other
than these 3 months?

Mr. Howard: No, because normally they can stay on the grass at that point, and they
wouldn't want the additional cost.

Commissioner McCauley: One thing I have in mind is are there ways to make these
lighting units less obstructive. I'm sure that's on your mind too, how do you make these
smaller or more compact so that they don't impact the track or other uses of the soccer field. I don't know that you could do that short of something that's more permanent.

Mr. Howard: Both the "issues" we had were because they're temporary, their overall size. I would assume the neighbor that had that issue was because of its height. If the lights were actually taller, no one would see them looking out their windows. It wasn't the light pollution; it was that they physically were looking at the light structure.

Commissioner LaMere: A couple of quick questions. What other uses of the field, besides soccer, people walking around the track—are there other uses of the field itself for other sports or other activities?

Mr. Howard: Rarely, occasionally ultimate frisbee. Soccer does dominate that field 99 percent of the time.

Commissioner LaMere: As far as parking and regulation of traffic, parking has come up as an issue for Mitchell Park. They mentioned it with pickleball and tennis. Is that purely a parking and transportation issue or is that something that Parks and Rec studies? Who makes decisions and recommendations on parking and traffic flow?

Mr. Howard: Are we talking specifically about Mitchell Park now or just the Nelson Drive?

Commissioner LaMere: Both Mitchell Park and Cubberley.

Mr. Howard: The Cubberley issues was the residents didn't want to see an uptick of traffic coming along the street for soccer throughout the night. Recreation wouldn't have a role in determining if there's enough parking at Mitchell, for instance, or controlling the traffic. Planning Department would have more of an input on is there enough parking and so forth.

Commissioner LaMere: In terms of surveys, would it be beneficial—I see we just surveyed those that bordered the park and did 16 surveys. Would it be worthwhile to survey more people in that community to see if it affected them or to get other feedback based on their proximity to the park?

Mr. Howard: I think we could have. The pre-information that went out went to all the neighborhood association, so it was a much wider net that we cast. Because we didn't hear a lot back, we figured the most impacted group would be the ones along the field.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I really like this trial. It's paid by the participants' money. We didn't pay anything except for your time. If you don't like it, it's not permanent. It was really good, and we should look at doing it next year also. If you had the same units, is there anything you could to minimize the effect to the field? Obviously if they redesigned
Mr. Howard: It would have been very costly. A lot of the charge they received was just the delivery. Every time they came that would have been a charge.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That's nothing that we could have moved ourselves?

Mr. Howard: No. They're pretty big. You'd have to get them onto a truck and move them somewhere.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Looking backwards, was there something you would have done differently?

Mr. Howard: I may have tried to move the end zone lights further and changed the angle at which they were shining down to see if we could have moved them a little further away but still provided the good lighting without it going towards the neighbors. What was really good is outside the track it was dark. There was minimal light pollution. The light was not shining very far, which was great. If we could move them back and change the angles a little bit, I would want to try that.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Thank you for all your effort on this trial, Adam. The trial has gone extremely well. When I was first approached by Palo Alto Soccer Club about the idea, I felt like we were going against the third rail, but it really worked out well. I have spoken with people in the Greenmeadow neighborhood, even someone in the survey area who did not return the survey and is not a soccer family by any means, and they were very supportive of the plan. I've only heard positive comments, which is encouraging. I agree with what you said, that if there were issues we would have heard from more people most likely. If we were to move forward—I know the ad hoc will be addressing this— with a trial next year, is this something the Commission would be able to approve without going to City Council or do envision that we'd need to go to City Council as a next step? You don't have to give me an answer right now. This is obviously something we'll need to work out.

Ms. O'Kane: We didn't go to Council this year. The idea was to give them a heads up that it was happening so, if they happened to be in the neighborhood and saw it or heard something, that they were aware of what was going on. If it was going to be a long-term practice that no longer becomes a trial but we do temporary lighting every year and that's part of our operations, we would probably inform them through an informational report. I don't know if they would have to take action. I'd probably have to look into that a little bit more.
Vice Chair Greenfield: The other area to consider as we potentially move forward is how the permitting process would become open to other youth organizations in addition to Palo Alto Soccer Club.

Mr. Howard: In my opinion, that would be one of the bigger questions that we would need to figure out an answer to.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I don't think it would be a particularly complicated issue. There is increased cost for the additional lighted fields. It may be a problem that sorts itself out relatively easily.

Chair McDougall: Anne.

Commissioner Cribbs: I love the idea that we had this temporary trial. It worked out pretty well; we learned a lot. I'd love to see us do it again next year whether we have to go to Council or not. I'd really love for the ad hoc to get the pricing for permanent lights so that we have that available from some of the experts that are here in Palo Alto so we know what we're looking at. Any time we can increase the amount of field space and time for kids and adults to play is really great. Good job on this. This came to us in December, so we should get a big kudo too for how quickly—was it December, something like that?

Mr. Howard: Something like that.

Commissioner Cribbs: Anyhow, good job you guys.

Commissioner Moss: As unofficial shepherd of Cubberley fields, Daren gets a note from me every week it seems on something or other. I got a lot of comments, and they pretty much match what you've already seen. One thing that I want to add is that we had to add the middle lights in the middle of the field. There is very little room between the track and the field. We were promised that during the practices they would not use the full field. I didn't think we would have a whole lot of use of the full field during the day. Those lights are very close to the edge of the field. When you have these day games, especially the private schools' afterschool soccer games, league games, it's problematic. I would add bumpers all around that structure because it's just too close. There's no place to put them because you can't put them on the track because there's a whole lot of people that run the track, and they're going to get mad. If you move them even further back, you run into the problem especially on the south side where you may not get enough light through the trees. That's something I would suggest. Also if there is any way to get the smaller footprint—especially those middle field lights, I was hoping against hope that we wouldn't need the middle field lights, but that didn't turn out to be the case. The second thing I wanted to mention is that any talk of permanent lights would require a whole new trial because people are going to be mad that there's a lot of noise. You are guaranteeing the noise level well into the night, 365 days a year, and that in itself is a hot button not to mention the light.
would be very cautious about that and go with the temporary lights for a few years before
you think about permanently lighting that whole field. That's really all I had.

Chair McDougall: I can only say congratulations, Adam. It must feel good to have
something that actually came to fruition and got us extra fields and got more people
involved in using City facilities and not have to continue to debate. Thank you very much.

Ms. O'Kane: Chair, could I make a comment?

Chair McDougall: Yes.

Ms. O'Kane: I've heard a couple of Commissioners mention permanent lighting there. I
do want to be clear that that's not something we're considering at this point. I just confirmed
with Daren because I had heard before that when the fields were put in that was discussed,
permanent lighting. It was really opposed by the neighbors and the residents there. That's
not something we're considering now. If it is something we would consider in the future,
we'd have to do significant outreach and get buy-in and support from the community.

Chair McDougall: Thanks for that, Kristen. There was some confusion as we talked about
whether this wasn't permanent but we did the temporary lighting permanently. There were
two different thoughts through here. Are we going to do this every year? My
understanding from the soccer people was they only need it for these 3 months. They
weren't asking for it for the rest of the time. At this point, we should take them at their
initial word, that that's what they wanted it for. Maybe we can consider saying we're going
to do this every year as long as we find the right funding, and that would include them.
Maybe that needs to be a decision that gets made so we're doing it temporarily permanently
but not permanently permanently, if that makes any sense.

Commissioner McCauley: If the better solution is to have permanent infrastructure, even
if it's not used year-round but to have better infrastructure, then we should consider that.

Commissioner Cribbs: I would agree with that, just to see if we can get a price for
permanent lighting and even understand that the permanent lighting is much easier to focus
on the field and doesn't have all that bleed every place. The lighting consultants come out
and direct where it goes so you can go right up to a field and not even know that it's—you
used to be able to find the field by where the lights were. You can't do that anymore
because it's so focused now depending on the height of the light poles.

Chair McDougall: Jeff.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Based on a conversation I had with another staff member recently,
something to consider is the refurb plan for the Cubberley football field. When the turf is
going to be replaced, apparently there's thoughts of replacing the track. At that point, we
can plumb for lighting so we have the infrastructure in place to move forward on something in the event the community and the City decide we want to move forward.

Chair McDougall: With that, I'll thank Adam.

Commissioner McCauley: Actually, if you don't mind, I'll be very quick. I had one other tangential question. It's sparked by something Jeff said. Is temporary lighting an option—putting aside soccer and Cubberley—that you're looking at for tennis courts, for example, or other facilities?

Mr. Howard: I haven't, especially tennis courts. Given the footprint of these particular lights, it'd be really difficult. The rest of this conversation is something we have to consider anytime we talk about lights at any location, the footprint, the neighbors, and the noise levels and all of that. The units I've seen are typically pretty big. To put them around tennis courts would be pretty difficult.

Commissioner Moss: Maybe you could get smaller ones. I don't know.

Commissioner McCauley: Placement outside of the tennis court, for example, might be something you could look into. Just something to keep in the back of your mind as the other conversation progresses.

Chair McDougall: Thank you, Adam.

[The Commission proceeded to Item 6.]

5. Pickleball and Tennis Courts Update

Chair McDougall: We had earlier anticipated changing the next item to be pickleball and tennis courts update rather than the temporary lighting at Cubberley. I'm still planning to do that, but I think I'll check first. Is there anybody here for the lighting conversation? If not, then let's change the order to the pickleball and tennis courts update. If we have speakers, should we have Adam speak first or should we have the speakers?

Commissioner Reckdahl: Usually Adam goes first and then the speakers.

Chair McDougall: Adam, go ahead.

Adam Howard: Good evening, Commissioner. Adam Howard, Senior Recreation Manager for the City of Palo Alto. I'm here to give an update on where we are with the pickleball and tennis court situations. A little bit of background. We do recognize pickleball is one of the fastest-growing sports in the country, which has also become very popular in Palo Alto. We currently don't have any designated courts for pickleball in Palo Alto. However, Mitchell Park tennis courts 5, 6, and 7 are striped for both tennis and
pickleball. Those courts are temporarily converted into pickleball courts by an organized group that comes out and plays certain times throughout the week. Because pickleball courts are smaller, you can put multiple pickleball courts on one tennis court. Tennis is also extremely popular and valued here in Palo Alto for both youth and adults. We have 30 tennis courts on City property, 24 on Palo Alto Unified School District property, and the only lit courts the City owns are Mitchell Park courts and Rinconada courts 1-5. We rent out tennis courts only to USTA teams or the Palo Alto Tennis Club. When we do that, we reserve 50 percent of the courts, always leaving 50 percent open to the general public. Mitchell Park, Rinconada, and Cubberley tennis courts are our highest in demand because of the groupings, because of the quality, and because of bathroom facilities, and because of lights. A little bit of a discussion. With increasing pickleball play, staff and the Rec Commission have wanted to look at providing space for them. Staff created a preliminary proposal to convert Mitchell Park courts 5, 6, and 7 to pickleball courts, add an additional tennis court to the area that would not be lit. We heard a lot of feedback that that was not a very good idea, that the tennis courts were in high demand and really did not want to lose lit tennis courts. We've heard that feedback, so we've gone back to the drawing board to come up with as many different solutions as we could think about. We're in the process of doing that, and then staff will come back to the ad hoc with multiple solution ideas. We'll pick some that we think are most viable, and then we will go out to the community, both tennis and pickleball players, to see if we can come up with an agreement that works for everybody. We really want to find a solution that works for tennis, that works for pickleball. Both communities value each other. This is just a common issue of space that we have. We don't have a lot of open, free space, so there's a shortage of resources that we're trying to find a solution to help both groups. We do hope to put this out to the community a lot. The original draft plan went out there and got "this is happening," which was not the case. That was a staff issue with communications. I apologize that I've stirred the pot. We will make sure everything we do is very much vetted through the community and through the ad hoc to do our best to find the best possible solution. That's where we are. We'll be meeting with the ad hoc next week, the 2nd. We hope to bring the two communities together by the end of next month to see if we can't come up with some solutions.

Chair McDougall: Thank you, Adam. We have one speaker card, Robin Cook. If Robin would like to speak, you'd have up to 3 minutes.

Robin Cook: My name is Robin Cook. I've lived in Palo Alto for 28 years. I'm a homeowner; I have four kids. I currently work at Stanford Hospital in the Department of Hematology, and I play tennis. I'm usually playing 3-4 days a week. I like to play in the evenings now or on weekends. I need the lighted courts. I really appreciate you getting community input. I'm a member of the USTA, the tennis association. I play in league groups and matches. I play in social groups. My kids play. I have four children. I'm also part of Palo Alto Tennis Club, and I've taken City tennis lessons for several years. I still
haven't improved, so I'm still playing. I do have concerns over pickleball taking over our tennis courts. When we go to play after work usually or on weekends, there are people playing before me and people queuing up for our courts after me. They do seem like they're in demand. I know pickleball is a growing sport, but I don't want to replace our tennis courts right now. If you want to get our input or if there's some way you can let me know that our voices are being heard, let me know how to do that. Between Palo Alto Tennis Club or USTA tennis leagues, I've been on several different leagues. I'm on one now. I'm usually on one every season of the year. I like to play tennis, and I like my tennis courts. I also like the alternative for lighting tennis courts. Cubberley tennis courts are recessed, and that may be an alternative. Thank you so much.

Chair McDougall: Robin, thank you very much. We will make sure—I think Adam has made it clear that in the future we will continue to make sure that public input is collected on all of this. In fact, I would compliment Adam on the input we've had already, because I've attended many of those meetings, and we've had a lot of both pickleball and tennis players at those various meetings. Thank you for that. I'm going to give the Commission a chance to ask Adam questions. David.

Commissioner Moss: I appreciate all the effort you've put into trying to come up with compromises. We've heard impassioned pleas from both sides. I just encourage you to keep moving forward on a compromise. It seems lighting other courts is a great way to go. Maybe we can add another court to Cubberley. Maybe we can do a number of things. I just hope we can keep that compromise effort going.

Chair McDougall: Anne.

Commissioner Cribbs: I'm just happy we're moving forward. I'm happy that we're hearing from all the various groups. We've got some resources in Palo Alto, and we will get to some sort of compromise. If, at the end of the day, there needs to be additional lighting, then we'll have to figure out how we work together to make that happen. Good job, Adam. I know it's been a long process.

Chair McDougall: Jeff.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I appreciate the effort that Adam and staff have put in in helping sort out this pickle. Also appreciate all the input from the community. The passion is certainly out there. I look forward to continuing work with the ad hoc and staff to find a solution that's workable for everyone. Thank you.

Chair McDougall: Keith.
Commissioner Reckdahl: Overall our court situation is working, so we have the luxury of doing it right. We don't have to rush. We can get public input and make a good decision. Better right than fast.

Chair McDougall: Jeff. Ryan.

Commissioner McCauley: What are we thinking of in terms of resources that are going to need to be dedicated to different alternatives? Are you talking about construction of multiple courts in different locations? In terms of capital improvements, are we talking hundreds of thousands of dollars, millions of dollars? Can you give us a range?

Mr. Howard: At this point, all of it. I've looked for alternative spaces where additional courts could be built. I've looked at our existing courts and bumping them out to create more. I've looked at lighting other courts. All of which are somewhat expensive. If we're talking some of the options of just bumping out courts, $150,000. If we're talking, for instance, lighting Cubberley courts, we're looking at about $350,000. Everything within that range depending on how grand we want to go. I'm trying to look at as many options as I can and provide pricing so we have as full a picture as we can have when we try to make these decisions.

Commissioner McCauley: With some of these numbers in mind, we're probably talking about single digit millions by the time we look at a couple of different parks. It seems as though this sort of capital improvement may be a ways off. Is that fair? It's not something that's going to be implemented in a year or within 6 months?

Mr. Howard: No. Glad you brought that up. Part of what we'll do is see if we can have a phased approach, a quick and easy fix until we can build something that's 10 years out. Phasing it so people could see what our long-term plan would be.

Commissioner McCauley: That makes a lot of sense. That's a good way to approach it. I'll just make one other note on timing. When this issue first came to our attention, at least to my attention really, the request from the pickleball community was the ability to make reservations for tennis courts. It wasn't actually dedicated tennis courts. It was just to reserve tennis courts just like the Palo Alto Tennis Club or USTA does. I would hope that might be something we could advance the ball on more quickly. Frankly, the capital improvement component is a much longer-term outlook. I would ask the ad hoc to keep that mind and try to push forward the reservation issue and see if there's a compromise that can be reached there and something we can come up with as a solution on that front.

Mr. Howard: I know the word reservation was used, but time is what they were looking for. Currently, the policy is tennis could just book those courts. The 50 or so pickleball players could show up, and they couldn't have any use of the court. They want a way of having time that's assured for them.
Vice Chair Greenfield: I'd like to speak to your question with respect to the ad hoc and where we are with updating a policy that would formally allow pickleball play. We have been talking about that on many occasions. It's really not as simple as it might appear on face value. Right now, we have a policy geared towards tennis play, and we're looking at adding pickleball play. There will be similar policies, but we would have to go to Council for a change in the policy. We'd like to get everything lined up at the time we approach Council. We're looking at potentially dedicated pickleball courts, mixed-use pickleball/tennis courts, and dedicated tennis courts. Each have different distinctions, so there's some nuance to it we're working on.

Commissioner McCauley: I totally appreciate that you want to have as comprehensive a proposal as possible. My concern is that this issue has been festering for a while now. There are parts we can present solutions on, and we should try to move the ball forward as quickly as we can on what we can.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Agreed.

Chair McDougall: David.

Commissioner Moss: It's so expensive, the land in Palo Alto. If we lit every single tennis court, we would double the number of tennis courts essentially because you would have so many more hours that you could play on the existing land rather than buying more land, which we can't do. If there was some way that we could look at lighting all of them over 10 years or 5 years, it probably would be cheaper per court if you could do a mass effort. I don't see land getting any cheaper, and I don't see demand getting any less and I see population increasing. It's probably something we should take the long view. What Commissioner McCauley said about having a short-term solution is really important, but we ought to look at something substantial. We just had earlier today the discussion with Roger Smith. If there's some way that his 501(3)(c) [sic] can be used by the US Tennis Association or the Palo Alto Tennis Club to raise some funds for the first few lit courts, there's probably some money that they might want to donate to speed the effort up. Not that we couldn't do it eventually, but if we want to speed that up—also from the pickleballers. If the pickleballers can raise some funds to light the courts, then they'll get their courts faster. Both of those it would be nice to look at. Thanks.

Chair McDougall: David, thank you, and thank you for raising the issue of where the funds might come from and how do we do that. One of the things Roger did say when he was here was we have an awful lot of smart people and an awful lot of capable people in this City. I totally sympathize with the difficulty of the challenge that Adam has in front of him in terms of courts and dividing and thank him for all of his efforts. I also want to thank both the pickleball community and the tennis community for the kind of effort they make to be here at a meeting like tonight and make sure we understand their interest and make sure we're listening and understanding that there are communities that are part of it. Adam,
thank you. Does anybody have anything they'd like to add? The combination of long game and short game is really an important part of what we're doing. All we have to do first is get out of the rough. Adam, thank you.

6. Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates

Chair McDougall: I'd like to quickly go through and see if there are any ad hoc committee or liaison updates that we might want to have. I don't have a list of committees; I'm going to do it by person. I'll start with Ryan.

Commissioner McCauley: Daren, you had sent an email yesterday, I believe, concerning dog parks in Bowden. I don't want to discourage anyone at all from thinking about possible placement of dog parks in Bowden and that conversation. Daren, correct me if I'm wrong about this. I think your CIP plan has the next dog park or even the funding for dog park improvements 2 years out. It’d be fiscal year 2020.

Mr. Anderson: Yes, that's correct.

Commissioner McCauley: Bowden Park is really very close in proximity to Peers Park, where the dog park is being constructed. In thinking about where amenities are located, Bowden Park has probably dropped far down the list in my mind because it's so close to Peers Park. A number of our existing dog parks need …

Chair McDougall: Ryan, I'm going to suggest maybe we could bring dog parks back again to a different meeting and have a fuller discussion of it.

Commissioner McCauley: I'll be very brief. Our other dog parks need some improvement. Unless we're interested in seeking to have parks dedicate additional CIP funds towards dog parks, I don't know where the money is going to come in the near future.

Chair McDougall: Jeff, do you have anything?

Commissioner LaMere: A quick question about the impact of the survey that came back on the Master Plan. I don't know if we need a conversation about that with the Commission. Would that be the Master Plan ad hoc? That's something to consider, the survey that was just received by the City.

Chair McDougall: Kristen, do you want to comment?

Ms. O'Kane: Commissioner LaMere, you're referring to the polling that was done …

Commissioner LaMere: Yes.
Ms. O'Kane: … with respect to a future ballot measure not just for parks but for other infrastructure needs within the City. That was presented to Finance Committee Tuesday night. I wasn't there, and I'm hesitant to speak to something I'm not an expert at. If you want information soon, you can view the presentation. I watched part of it today, and it's quite interesting. The consultant, this is their business, and they know what they're talking about. How they assess it and evaluate all the outcomes of the polling is quite interesting. I believe there's going to be additional polling done. When we get to a point where we have more information, I may be able to bring someone in who could give a presentation on what that polling means, what the next steps are.

Commissioner LaMere: Just to keep us updated because next steps would need to happen fairly quickly if it's a November ballot measure in terms of things for the parks and what we may need to do.

Ms. O'Kane: It is a very quick timeline and turnaround on getting it onto a November ballot if that's what Council decides to do.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Especially because the Council takes the summer off. That (crosstalk) further.

Chair McDougall: Jeff, I totally agree. We need to encourage our Council Member to attend particularly considering his participation in the whole funding effort and keep us apprised that way. That would be good. In the meantime, I'll make sure I talk to him with Kristen, and we'll see if there's some way to get an informed update for us.

Commissioner McCauley: That would be helpful from my perspective too. As I read that document, it seemed to be the case that parks were not polling well in terms of …

Chair McDougall: Exactly. We need to understand that. Keith.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I have an update regarding community gardens in my liaison role. I attended a couple of meetings this past month which Catherine Bourquin organized with the community gardens, a couple of hours each, one for Johnson, Ventura, and Eleanor gardens and another for Rinconada gardens. This was a first-time event and kind of an experiment that was put together. Each was attended by 25-40 gardeners, soliciting suggestions and discussing maintenance and rule issues. It's moving towards considering rules and policy changes that will be discussed further. I believe it'll end up coming before this body for consideration and approval. Just a quick update there. Thank you.

Chair McDougall: Anne, do you have anything? David.

Commissioner Moss: I went to the State of the City presentation by Liz Kniss on Wednesday. I was surprised to hear that the Jewish Community Center, where it was
housed, is building a quote/unquote public park. I don't know how public it'll be. It's not
the same as a Greenmeadow park where it's really private property. At the same time, I
wanted to find out if we could find out how public it is and what facilities we're going to
have. I'd sure like to be able to tout it when we talk about the number of parks we have. If
we could look at that, that would be great. I was talking to one of the Council Members at
that State of the City. He was saying that the Fry's property plus Boulware Park plus AT&T
should be thought of as one entity. Commissioner Reckdahl is the North Ventura
Neighborhood Association liaison. If there's any way that we can keep pushing for that
whole entity to be considered one entity—the whole tone of the State of the City address
was about affordable housing. That is one of the biggest and most visible locations for
affordable housing, lots of units. It makes total sense to try to tie in with that because that's
where you would need more park space.

Commissioner Reckdahl: My understanding is they are taking over—not looking at Fry's
but the whole surrounding area. It will be comprehensive.

Chair McDougall: You have more, David?

Commissioner Moss: That's it.

Chair McDougall: Thank you. I would comment on a couple of things. Kristen and I did
go to the Friends of Palo Alto Parks. The only thing I would comment there is we witnessed
the same enthusiasm from everybody in the room as we saw from Roger tonight. That was
really positive. We agreed building that partnership is beneficial for everybody. Relative
to the Ventura Park thing, Keith is certainly our representative. My understanding is it's
basically a Comprehensive Plan activity that will go on for some period of time. If we
have individual concerns, there's no reason why we can't go as individuals rather than as
Commission representatives to those meetings. I would encourage that participation.

VI. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

VII. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR MAY 22, 2018 MEETING

Chair McDougall: The next topic would be tentative agenda. I wrote down maybe we
need a dog park update. Maybe we need more input on the results of the polling. Maybe
we could even invite somebody from the JCC to come and tell us about their park plans.
There won't be anything by the next meeting relative to the Ventura activity because I don't
think they start until June. I don't know if anybody has anything else that's a burning issue
and that they would like to add. If not, I'll ask the Vice Chair to meet with me and Kristen
and see if we can't come up with an agenda. Anne, did you have something you wanted to
add as a topic?
Commissioner Cribbs: Is it time yet to hear about the aquatics contracts, where we are with them, or is it premature?

Ms. O'Kane: The RFP hasn't been released yet. It should be very soon. The next couple of months may be an appropriate time.

Chair McDougall: We'll put it on the list.

Ms. O'Kane: If I could interject. In the email that Natalie sent with your packet, there is the future agenda items. I've talked to the Palo Alto Recreation Foundation. Just like we had Roger come today, they're willing to come next month and have the same conversation. That is planned for May. In June, there was a request the last time the Chair, Vice Chair, and I met, which was just a few weeks ago, to have a discussion on what our CIP process is, how do we make those decisions every year, the capital improvement plan process. I put that on for June, and that would also be a discussion of our 5-year CIP because we're going through our new budget process right now.

Commissioner Cribbs: Is that a discussion too about the developers' fees and how they get allocated for community benefit? It's a whole different thing?

Ms. O'Kane: That's different. If that's an interest, we can have that on a future agenda as well. In June—Daren, correct me if I'm wrong—our consultant for the Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan will be coming and presenting on the progress on that plan so far.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Would next month be appropriate for a Foothills Park update? It seemed like you were alluding to that earlier in the meeting.

Mr. Anderson: On the trail status? I think so.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I don't know if that needs to get agendized or not. I'll leave that to your good judgment.

Mr. Anderson: I'll see how it goes with Planning. It might just be something that suits a department update.

Commissioner Moss: There were two possible topics that were mentioned in previous meetings. One is the teens presenting at the end of the year or at the beginning of the year what they accomplished or what they want. I don't know if you wanted to do one at the end of the year, have some representatives come and talk. It would probably have to be May, so maybe it's too late. Maybe it has to be next October.

Ms. O'Kane: I can look into that. They're on the agenda for the May Policy and Services Committee meeting and then possibly a joint study session with Council. We're having a
hard time getting commitment because there's AP testing and finals. All this happens this
time of year, so we want to make sure they're focusing on that. The fall might be a better
time or midyear.

Commissioner Moss: Or you just invite us to one of those other ones so you kill two birds
with one stone.

Ms. O'Kane: That will work too. I will let you know what those dates are.

Commissioner Moss: The other topic was dedicated parkland, how you do that.

Ms. O'Kane: There's a future agenda items list at the bottom of that calendar. Park
dedication is there.

Chair McDougall: We didn't figure until the golf course contract was done we should be
asking the legal staff to come and talk to us. If that's it, we have some good notes. I would
entertain a motion to adjourn.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned on motion by Commissioner Cribbs and second by Commissioner
Reckdahl at 9:30 p.m.