MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
April 23, 2019
CITY HALL
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California

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

Commissioners Absent: Anne Cribbs

Others Present: Council Member Cormack

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

I. ROLL CALL

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS

Chair McDougall: Do we have any Agenda Changes, Requests, Deletions that are not in the agenda as provided? If not, could we move on to Oral Communications then?

III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Chair McDougall: Kristen, please.

Kristen O'Kane: Oral Communications are for members of the public to speak.

Chair McDougall: Do we have anybody who would like to speak on a topic that's not on the agenda tonight? Thank you.

IV. DEPARTMENT REPORT

Chair McDougall: Department Report. Sorry about that, confused you.

Daren Anderson: Hello. Daren Anderson with Community Services Department. I've got a few items for you, a couple of FYIs. There's a project coming up in Palo Alto Unified School District at Hoover Elementary School that involves building some new classrooms
that may involve moving portables onto the grass field. This project would start in June and go until 2023. There are other possible impacts from the project that may affect the adjacent parkland at Mitchell Park. It's the student drop-off and pick-up that would be impacted. They're looking at other alternatives that may involve using the parking lot at Mitchell. With our last experience with the solar project at PAUSD, we wanted to bring this to your attention as soon as I became aware of it and ask if the Commission would like to form an ad hoc committee to meet with staff and ultimately with PAUSD staff as well and see if we can weigh in and help with input on this project. Perhaps I could finish the Department Report and we can come back to that.

Chair McDougall: Thank you.

Mr. Anderson: Another event is unaffiliated but happening at Mitchell Park. The Utilities Department is replacing two transformers, so the power will be out to the park from May 13 through May 15. This will include the restrooms, the tennis court lights, the irrigation, the water feature, and all the park lighting. They're going to do their best to get it completed as soon as possible. We'll make sure that we inform all the adjacent groups, the library, the schools, the community center, and everyone in and around the park. We'll have it signed really well. Just an FYI that's coming.

Commissioner Moss: Does that mean the library and the community center will be closed?

Mr. Anderson: No, I'm sorry. The light control will only be going on in the park itself. It's just the power inside Mitchell Park. This other FYI is unsubstantiated. A fisherman reported a gar up at Foothills Park at Boronda Lake. A gar is an invasive fish, usually the result of an aquarium release, which is kind of interesting. They can grow from 1 foot to 9 feet long. This isn't the first time we've had this happen. Ten years ago, we had a similar report, and we did the same thing we did this time. We contacted California Fish & Wildlife Service. They send out a biologist. We electroshocked parts of the lake looking for this fish. Electroshock is essentially putting in a battery-powered electrifier. It shocks a little portion of the lake. Fish are stunned momentarily and rise up to the top. You can see if you've got any invasive ones, in particular this gar that we're looking at. In this instance, the Fish & Wildlife biologist came out again and did a survey and didn't find it again. Just wanted to let you know if you hear about it, we're on top of it. We're communicating with people that are fishing at the lake on a regular basis to educate them about what the gar looks like and if you catch them, please do not re-release it. We'd like to capture that, freeze it, and call Fish & Wildlife Service. Just an FYI, there are five of the seven gar species that are native to the United States, but none of which are in California.

Ms. O'Kane: I have some things to share as well. I'm Kristen O'Kane, Community Services. Mine are about two special events that are coming up. The first is Palo Alto Day. As you probably know, hopefully, this year is Palo Alto's 125th birthday. There's an
event occurring on King Plaza this Sunday at 2:00 to celebrate Palo Alto Day. It's a
community event put on by different members of the community, not just the City, to
celebrate and to open a time capsule that was buried here in City Hall 25 years ago. There
were three time capsules buried 25 years ago, one to be opened in 2019, one in another 25
years, and maybe another 50 years after that. We're going to open that. We're going to
have just a fun celebration. There will be some singing groups. I encourage you all to
attend. The actual program starts at 2:00, but there's some music that starts at 12:45. Again,
King Plaza this Sunday. The second one, I wanted to remind everyone of the May Fete
Parade that is happening the following weekend on Saturday. I do have a request. We are
looking for some judges to judge the floats at the May Fete Parade. If anyone is interested,
we would greatly appreciate it. It requires that you get there a little bit earlier, 9:15, but
you do get to vote on all the floats and make some kids feel very special that day. If anyone
is interested, please let me know. Again, if you haven't let Stephanie Douglas know if
you'd like to walk in the parade, please do so, so we can make sure we have the right
number of people accounted for. Two fun community events coming up. I hope to see
you there. Thank you.

Chair McDougall: Daren, would you like to go back to the question about the ad hoc.
Which school did you say that was? I'm sorry.

Mr. Anderson: This is Hoover Elementary. I think it might be helpful to form an ad hoc
if the Commission feels that would benefit the process. I'd be glad to work with the ad hoc
and connect them with PAUSD staff and see if we can discuss this project in more detail.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I'd be happy to be involved with that. I live down the street on
Waverley Street. I know part of the transportation plan they're talking about is potentially
opening up Waverley Street as a one-way road for drop-off. I know Hoover School is
trying to do some outreach, so this is a good time to plug the message a little bit for the
people who are listening. As part of the construction, the loop through the school area will
be closed. It'll be dead-ended on the side adjacent to the home on the other side. Traffic
will either have to turn around and then go through Waverley Street or go back out the way
they came. It's a problem any way you look at it. I'd be happy to be involved with that.

Chair McDougall: Is there anybody else who would like to join that? I hate to think you'd
do it alone, so I'll volunteer to participate with you.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Love to spend more time with you, Don.

Chair McDougall: People are going to start talking. That's good. I think we should make
sure or certainly express the appreciation that the School Board reached out. That should
not go unnoticed.
Vice Chair Greenfield: I just had one question regarding the utilities issue at Mitchell Park. Will that affect the tennis and pickleball courts?

Mr. Anderson: Yes, the lighting on all the courts.

Vice Chair Greenfield: No lights on May 13 through 15.

Mr. Anderson: That's correct.

Chair McDougall: Any other questions for Daren or Kristen? In that case, I'd like to move on to approval of the minutes.

V. BUSINESS

1. Approval of Draft Minutes from the March 26, 2019 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting.

Approval of the draft March 26, 2019 Minutes was moved by Commissioner Reckdahl and seconded by Commissioner Moss. Passed 6-0, Cribbs absent

2. Recommendation to City Council to Adopt a Park Improvement Ordinance at Mitchell Park for Constructing Two Pickleball Courts, Converting Tennis Court 5 into Four Pickleball Courts, and Restriping Courts 6 and 7 for Dual Use.

Chair McDougall: The next item is recommendation to City Council to adopt a Park Improvement Ordinance at Mitchell Park. I'd like to invite Adam Howard to participate with Daren to make that presentation. For the audience, I have three cards here. The process will be that we'll hear the presentation. If I have cards, you'll be invited to speak, and then the Commission will speak, and then there will be a motion. Thank you all for being here. Remember the thoughtful and peaceful approach that we've witnessed from all of you before. Adam.

Adam Howard: Thank you. Good evening. Adam Howard, Senior Community Services Manager. Thank you for having me here. Yes, we are here to receive a recommendation to send forward a Park Improvement Ordinance for the Mitchell Park courts. A brief background as we've discussed this before. We've seen an increase in Palo Alto in pickleball play. Our first step to help with that solution was to update the Court Policy to allow pickleball play to happen in Palo Alto. August 28, we brought a recommendation for changes to the Court Use Policy to the Commission. You sent it forward to the City Council, who approved it on October 15. Again, we realized that was the first step and what we needed to do was provide some designated space for the pickleball users. February 19, staff held a public meeting to discuss redesigned plans at Mitchell Park. On February 26, we came back and reported that to you. What you'll see is the same plan...
designs from that previous meeting with a little bit more detail and in the form of a PIO. The paperwork in front of you is some changes that took place since the PIO was sent. They're really just changes to the note section of the diagram. The wording is the same, but in the note section some things didn't correlate with the picture that you see. We wanted to make sure that those corrections came forward to you. For tonight, the Park Improvement Ordinance focuses on these six things: the removal of four trees and replanting additional trees according to the City Arborist's replanting recommendations; install two new pickleball courts and new perimeter fencing that is currently outside the passive grass area and adjacent to the existing tennis courts; install a new concrete walkway along the exterior of the new pickleball courts; convert one existing tennis court, Court 5, into four dedicated pickleball courts; stripe the two existing tennis courts, Courts 6 and 7, into multiuse courts; and install one drinking fountain adjacent to the courts for everybody's use. This is an overhead image of Mitchell Park Courts 5, 6, and 7. You have seen this before. We'll go into a little detail of each of those steps I just talked about. First is the removal of four trees. The red large circles are the current locations of those trees. Just a picture of those trees, three palm trees and I don't remember the name of the larger tree. You can see where they are adjacent to the tennis courts currently. Those would be removed. The recommendation would be to replant. At this point, we're looking at replanting seven trees in Mitchell Park. Most of that will go in the new landscaping area, but some of them might go other places in the park. This is the overhead of where the new pickleball courts and perimeter fencing will remain. We're basically bumping out the current perimeter fence to this new red line. That's where the two new pickleball courts will go. We would install a new walkway along the exterior of the fence. That's what the yellow image represents. That way we have a concrete walkway around the new existing perimeter fence. This shows the conversion of Court 5 into four designated pickleball courts. We would then dual stripe Courts 6 and 7 to provide both tennis and pickleball use with the previously mentioned designated times for each sport. The red circle is where the water fountain will be located. There is also a water fountain in the Magical Bridge Playground, so this will be the second water fountain in the area. As an overview and recap, this proposed plan gives eight designated pickleball courts, which does include the two recently redesigned paddleball courts; four designated tennis courts, which are all lit; and two multiuse courts, which make two tennis courts or seven pickleball courts, all with lights. If the recommendation goes forward tonight, next steps are to bring the Park Improvement Ordinance to City Council in May and, while doing that, finishing the Planning Department permits. The hope would be to get Council to approve the contract in July with construction starting in August and completion in October. Questions or comments?

Chair McDougall: I'd like to go to the public speakers. If anybody is planning on speaking, I'd appreciate it if you'd submit cards now. We've had the situation before where people have wanted to speak afterwards, and I'm afraid we can't allow that. I'll wait one minute.
While we're waiting, to go in the order the cards were submitted, I'll start with Harvey Alcabes. I hope I have that right. Next is Kay Carey, if they can be ready.

Harvey Alcabes: Hello. My name's Harvey Alcabes. I'm a longtime Palo Alto resident, have been a tennis player for a while. In the last year, I started playing pickleball. I've found that it's something that a lot of people really enjoy. With the tennis courts, there's generally been—pickleball is very, very fast growing. Even from last summer until now, there is a lot more players. In one court, we can have 16 people playing in what would be one tennis court, where up to four people could play. I just want to recommend that the Council approve this request.

Chair McDougall: Thank you. Kay Carey followed by Ann Lemmenes [phonetic].

Kay Carey: Good evening. I'm Kay Carey, a longtime Palo Alto resident, past president of Palo Alto Tennis Club. I've recently tried pickleball. It's certainly fun. This has been a very thoughtful plan that has been put forward by the Rec Department and is a useful compromise so that we can have both tennis players and pickleball players getting court usage. I hope, though, that the Commission is going to be monitoring the usage of the courts because ultimately it would make a lot of sense to think about Cubberley as a pickleball center. For example, I believe $80,000 is being spent for the two new pickleball courts. It would be interesting if instead $100,000 was spent to light two Cubberley courts, which could be mixed use, that is eight pickleball courts or two tennis courts. Just a suggestion because the parking problems at Mitchell are severe. Cubberley makes sense as a pickleball center. It doesn't have a nice little viewing area, which would be a wonderful thing to put in. I just wanted to make the suggestion that, as you are continuing to monitor it, you might be thinking in terms of where do you want your pickleball center to be. I think it would be difficult to have it at Mitchell Park. I certainly commend this plan as a good transition plan. Thank you.

Chair McDougall: Thank you. Ann Lemmenes followed by Lee Caswell.

Ann Lemmenes: Hi. My name is Ann Lemmenes, and I'm a Palo Alto resident and property owner. I want to thank you, first of all, for all your hours, days, weeks, months, and years of work on this project. I think the proposal is really a good one. It doesn't overly benefit pickleball nor unduly harm the tennis community. Thank you very much.

Chair McDougall: Thank you. Lee Caswell followed by Monica Williams.

Lee Caswell: Hi. My name is Lee Caswell. I'm a longtime tennis player and an even longer time Palo Alto resident. I do recommend moving forward. It's a very thoughtful proposal, a balance of pickleball and tennis. What I wanted to talk about just for a minute, though, was the nature of this game and how, from a community standpoint, it really does by compressing the skillset allow people to interact in a way that is indicative of how we
want Palo Alto to behave. We're bringing people from different ages. I've played with
everyone who's a pickleball player here at different times. Although I was a competitive
tennis player, I'm able to play with a group of people that is a big range of folks, different
sexes, different ages. It's really been my pleasure to be part of that. I am the spouse of a
School Board Member, so I do happen to just run into people from all different schools and
kids who are participating in sport where it's not easy to enter tennis the same way as it is
to get into pickleball. I'm really enthusiastic about having dedicated courts. It's a pretty
big drag on the pickleball players to bring all these courts in every week. The setup and
downtime with this are quite an effort, and I think this is going to go a long way towards
improving the enjoyment of the game, number one, and also a little bit on safety too. Thank
you so much.

Chair McDougall: Thank you. Monica Williams follows by Susan McConnell.

Monica Williams: Good evening, Chair McDougall and Commissioners. I'm Monica
Williams, President of the Palo Alto Pickleball Club. I want to thank you for this proposal.
Four years ago, an article in the *Mercury News* called me a 73-year-old pickleball goddess.
That was four years ago. I'm absolutely delighted that you have brought this to fruition.
We're looking forward to having this facility at Mitchell Park. We'll be able to teach a lot
more youth. This gives us the possibility of people just coming in and playing rather than
having to put up a net. That's why with our youth we want to have them be able to come
onto the courts and practice. There's nowhere else to do that without putting up courts.
Having the dedicated courts is really fantastic. Thank you so much. I want to also say that,
for those people who are not speaking tonight, we want to respect your time, so we don't
want to take too much of your time. To have those people who are supporting pickleball
to stand up please. Thank you. That looks like 100 percent. Thank you, and the proposal
is fantastic. Thank you very much.

Chair McDougall: Thank you. Susan McConnell.

Susan McConnell: Hi. My name is Susan McConnell, and I'm a member of the Palo Alto
Pickleball Club and a resident of Palo Alto for 46 years. For 18 years, I captained many
Palo Alto USTA teams until my knees gave out. This past Monday morning when I arrived
at Mitchell Park to play pickleball, there were 44 people playing on three tennis courts with
people waiting to go on the courts. I looked when I came in, and there were, I believe, only
two tennis players on your newly resurfaced courts. We have a very vibrant pickleball
community at Mitchell Park. In fact, there's a vibrant pickleball community throughout
the United States. We support the plan proposed by the Palo Alto Parks and Rec
Department to change one tennis court, Number 5, into four dedicated pickleball courts.
Dual lines will be put on Courts No. 6 and 7. This is a fair compromise. Tennis players
will have 21 lit courts instead of 22. Thank you. I sure hope this goes through.
Chair McDougall: Thank you. I'd like to now convert to talking with the Parks and Rec Commission. I think I'll start, David, with you.

Commissioner Moss: Thank you. I've been starting to play pickleball, and I've noticed this camaraderie, and I think it's fantastic that you have this focus in one geographic area. I noticed that there are two pickleball courts that used to be paddleball courts, and almost nobody uses them. Having that focus is really great. I'm very happy that you're creating this center in Mitchell Park and not, for instance, putting two or three courts at Cubberley and two or three courts somewhere else. I don't think they'll be used like they're used at Mitchell Park. It's just fantastic. I also heard for the first time a seating area for watching. I've never heard that before in the year and a half. I don't know if that's possible, to put a two-layer bleacher or something like that somewhere.

Mr. Howard: This has been part of the conversation. We looked at a full set of bleachers, but we couldn't put down a pad due to the proximity to the creek. In the landscaped area, we do hope to include some picnic-style benches so people can sit and enjoy the shade and the game.

Commissioner Moss: Can you tell me what is between the two new courts and the existing Court 5 in the way of fencing? Is there a half fence, no fence? What's between the two when you're done?

Mr. Howard: Between the courts, we'll have dividing fences basically that are used in pickleball. The cement walkway that's there now will be removed so all the surface will be the same. They'll just have little dividers that divide each of the courts. It'll be a very low—I don't know if I'd call it a fence. It's 3 feet high.

Commissioner Moss: There's one that already exists between Courts 5 and 6. There's a little half fence that—is that going to be similar between …

Mr. Howard: It would probably be even lower than that. That fence will be extended a little bit so that tennis and pickleball could be at the same time without interference.

Commissioner Moss: I'm really happy to see, every time I go by there, the ability of the pickleballers and the tennis players to share Courts 6 and 7. I encourage us to keep working on that. That's working out great. Thank you.

Chair McDougall: I'll go to the other end. Commissioner McCauley.

Commissioner McCauley: Adam and Daren, this has been a long time coming. Congratulations, well done.

Chair McDougall: Commissioner LaMere.
Commissioner LaMere: Appreciate all your hard work on this. It's a great plan. A couple of things that came to mind in terms of long-range thinking. I was really excited to see you able to bump-out and use existing land and expand things at the park. To continue to look at our different parks and how land can be used in efficient ways is exciting. I know we've talked about it a lot, but to continue to study where can we put lights up and where does it not impact the residents and what parks can we really put lights up whether it's for tennis courts, soccer fields. Our population is growing. It's going to get more and more impacted. To continue to find different ways to utilize our space. Congratulations on this. I know you guys have worked very, very hard. You've engaged the public. Excited to see this plan come to fruition.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I'll say me too. Thank you very much. I also appreciate the October completion date. That's very good. I know you've worked very hard to squeeze that through. I appreciate that. Refresh my memory. What are the dedicated hours right now in Mitchell Park for pickleball?

Mr. Howard: Currently?

Commissioner Reckdahl: Currently.

Mr. Howard: I'm not going to remember the—it's Mondays and Wednesdays for one group. Tuesdays and Thursdays are the next. Maybe they remember which one is which off the top of their heads. The remaining evenings is first-come-first-serve.

Commissioner Reckdahl: We do have some evening slots right now?

Mr. Howard: Right now, it's 4:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. Monday and Wednesday are one sport, and 4:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. Tuesday/Thursday is the other sport. I can't remember which night is which.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Do we get a lot of pickleball in the evening?

Mr. Howard: Yeah, especially now that the weather's improving.

Commissioner Reckdahl: These new courts, we're not going to put lights up. Do we get extra light bouncing off the courts? Are they playable in the evenings, these new courts?

Mr. Howard: We're not sure. There is going to be some light, but we don't know if it'll be enough light. We're not positive about that. We can't redirect, so we're not positive.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The current lights are fixed?

Mr. Howard: Yeah.
Commissioner Reckdahl: If we wanted to add lights to these courts down the road, is this minor? I think it's like $100,000 to do a court.

Mr. Howard: Daren might remind me if I'm wrong. I think they gave us a quote of $70,000 if we wanted to light the addition.

Mr. Anderson: I might add that there's also the permitting process, which is more complicated when it comes to lighting things. Of course, the adjacent courts are lit, so that will help. It's not a totally unlit area. Adding additional lights in parks is sometimes a challenge. As Commissioner LaMere pointed out, as we try to maximize space, we'll certainly be looking at options to light a number of areas.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The fact that we already have lights there, I assume that would simplify it.

Mr. Anderson: I would think so.

Commissioner Reckdahl: This $70,000 quote was including the fact that they could tie into the existing lights?

Mr. Howard: Right, because they had been to the courts before, so they knew that.

Mr. Anderson: I just wanted to qualify that that $70,000 wasn't fully vetted. It was an envelope estimate.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Just a rom estimate. I appreciate that. Finally, I like the benches at the trees. The fact that they're movable will be a feature because in the morning the sun is going to be coming from the right side. If you want shade, you'll want the benches on the left. In the afternoon, it may be reversed. The fact that they're not fixed is a good thing. How wide is that strip of grass right now? Is it 10 feet?

Mr. Howard: Currently or in the design?

Commissioner Reckdahl: When they build it.

Mr. Howard: It was roughly 10 feet.

Commissioner Reckdahl: If you put the trees in the middle, you could move the picnic table back and forth, something like that. Thank you very much. I look forward to this being heavily used. When I walk through the park, pickleball is very heavily used more so than tennis. This is the right decision.

Chair McDougall: Commissioner Greenfield.
Vice Chair Greenfield: I'd like to thank staff and the community for the collaborative effort in getting to where we are today. It's been a long process. A lot of people have been along for the ride for a long time. I'm happy to see the light at the end of the tunnel. I have nitpicked plenty of details within the ad hoc. I'm happy with things as they are. Congratulations.

Chair McDougall: I can only echo the appreciation for the work, Adam, and the stamina that has gone into this. We should also commend pickleball particularly and the tennis people for both their persistence and stamina in this because it's been a necessarily long process. You've done an incredible job of making sure everybody's voice was heard. I have no other comments or questions, just to say thank you to you and everybody that worked with you and helped you. With that said, if there are no other comments—I turn and look at Allison. We have developed the practice of inviting Council Member Cormack to speak at our meetings on our topics. The next thing that happens with this item is it goes before Council. She has suggested it would be inappropriate to participate today because she'll be participating on this in the future. Thank you for your understanding. The next thing would be a motion. The motion would be—would somebody like to give us the specifics of the motion? Is that a slide we could look at?

MOTION

Commissioner McCauley: I would move to recommend that the City Council adopt the Park Improvement Ordinance that's before us.

Chair McDougall: Is this the definition here? This would be the appropriate wording. Ryan, would you like to …

Commissioner McCauley: I move that the Commission recommend to the City Council that it adopt the Park Improvement Ordinance at Mitchell Park for constructing two pickleball courts, converting Court 5 into four pickleball courts, and restriping Courts 6 and 7 for dual use.

Chair McDougall: It is useful to add anything about "and the appropriate amenities" or does that come with it?

Mr. Anderson: You can leave it as is. The PIO includes that, and it gives us a little flexibility.

Chair McDougall: Do I have a second?

Vice Chair Greenfield: I'll second.
Chair McDougall: Anybody in favor? All in favor please. Anybody opposed? With that, it's passed unanimously [Cribbs absent]. Thank you again to the attendees. Thank you again to the staff and the Commission.

3. Preparation for Council Study Session

Chair McDougall: The next item on the agenda is preparation for the Council study session. Kristen, do you want to start off and provide some context?

Ms. O'Kane: We have, as you know, a joint study session. It's currently scheduled for May 6. I was just trying to pull up the time. It's a little later than we usually do because there's a special order and another study session that same day. We had also, just a side note, planned for the Cubberley joint study session between Council and the School District. That's been moved probably 'til later in the summer. That one is not on May 6. Typically the process for these study sessions is the Chair and the Vice Chair and staff will meet with the Mayor and Vice Mayor. In this instance, we met with the Mayor and Council Member Cormack, which was actually a really good fit for the study session. The Vice Mayor will not be there on May 6, so he deferred to Council Member Cormack. What we did at that meeting is just talk through what Chair McDougall will likely present at the meeting on behalf of the Commission, which would be accomplishments from the previous year and then priorities for the coming year or the current year. I'll turn it over to you, Chair McDougall, but it would be good for the Commission to know generally what the presentation will be and if there's any particular focus you'd like to take the study session and a little bit of choreography maybe would help as well. I'll turn it over to you, and I'm here to answer any questions that you might have along the way.

Chair McDougall: Thank you. We met with Mayor Filseth and Council Member Cormack. I want to thank her for being there and her participation in that meeting. It was very useful. I'd like this not to be my presentation but our presentation. What we have in front of you is—I said earlier today that it was a summary version, but then I changed that to say it was a redacted version because that seems to be the term of use these days—what we presented that day. I put it this way so we're not sitting here saying, "Remember the bridge. Remember that." Hopefully, most of the things that we would remember are here. I would suggest that the presentation or discussion be more or less in this direction. What we really need to do is see if we can come to agreement of what we'd like to achieve. Would we like to achieve the fact that they should be confident that the Parks and Rec Commission is doing a good job or should we try and achieve the fact that they should be looking at something in particular? Should we achieve some warnings about what we think is coming in the future? There's any number of things that we can do. Through this conversation, I'd like to invite Commissioner Greenfield to interrupt me at any time because he was instrumental in doing this. The agenda we had for that meeting was we just put up the priorities and thoughts and what the citizen input was. We talked about highlights and
activities and celebrations. I put in the guiding principles outcome that we had from our
meeting. I didn't think priorities covered what we were trying to do. It says CSD-PRC
projects. None of these are our projects. They're very much CSD projects, and they're in
fact Public Works projects that CSD is substantially leading. To that end, we wanted to
make sure it was understood what our role was relative to the overall organization. I did
talk about funding sources and some of the data that I've used before. I don't think that's
meaningful in a general Council conversation. What I learned from this meeting is if you
want to talk in big numbers, you can. That doesn't last for more than about 30 nanoseconds
before it's in small numbers. The small numbers are, number one, not our business and,
number two, they're way too movable to bring in front of Council in this fashion. The thing
that I bolded there was the challenges and projects of interest. I'll count on Commissioner
Greenfield to help me talk about that. Under the introduction, it's useful to continue to
reinforce that Parks and Rec is really responsible for what I would consider to be—I've
used this term before—scarce and valuable resources. I put up the Council Priorities
because climate and sustainability are part of that. I put up the Mayor's values—he didn't
argue with them—from his presentation, which included sustainability in nature and
sustainability in fiscal responsibility, and a Health City Healthy Community, and being a
good neighbor. I did talk about the Citizen Survey and the great marks that the parks and
open space received in the Citizen Survey. The recreation highlights, I'm not going to go
through them. You can read them. The parks highlights, the open space, the infrastructure,
and the concept of partnership development, the fact that we had had several different
organizations come and speak to us and we look to engage with those organizations. The
highlighting has more to do with—in fact, in some version of it there was color in there,
which were the ones the Mayor called out in his speech, not necessarily the really
important—there are things that were more important than others. The priorities. These
are divided into sections. Priorities are part of both the CIP and Master Plan projects.
They're listed there. There are specific park projects. There's specific CSD projects, the
Cubberley Master Plan and recreation opportunity analysis. You might throw BCCP up
there earlier. Those are just activities that are going on. As you talk about priorities, for
this Commission and for the City climate change is incredibly high. Certainly from my
position, funding needs and opportunities and strategies are important. In terms of
challenges, we said there was projects of current public interest. We think the Baylands
BCCP, including the ITT building, including the 10 acres, will solicit and involve
community conversation. The Ventura plan will clearly include that. We would happily
present them with a really nice racket sports package. There's the whole conversation of
park dedication. Projects of potential public interest, the Foothills creek hydrology and
restoration. Funding strategies, we talked a lot about that with Council Member Cormack
and the Mayor. The other in terms of challenges is clearly climate change. That's a very
quick overview. I would invite comment, first, from Commissioner Greenfield about that
meeting and how we should proceed with the Council.
Vice Chair Greenfield: One thing we're certainly mindful of is we're talking about a 60-minute meeting. There are 14 individuals who all like to talk on varying levels. We want to jump to the meat of any meeting as quickly as we can. That's really what the outline of the pre-meeting with the Mayor and Council Member Cormack was. We outlined a number of things, ran through them quickly, highlighted the last item, which was the challenges that we wanted to spend the most time talking about, getting feedback on specific projects, what makes sense. One thing that we did hear, which was useful, regarding the 10.5 acres at the Baylands—there has been previous guidance from previous Councils that that area would be targeted towards recreation development. It would behoove us to address this with the current Council to make sure the guidance is still the same before we move forward with trying to develop that. That is a priority for the Commission right now, to figure out what we're going to do with that land. It's a good time to be talking about it. Before we can make very specific plans in a specific direction, we need some guidance. Be happy to have your comments on that as well.

Council Member Cormack: This is an area where each Council Member has various background and understanding, and we only have one member of Council who has a long history of experience. The recommendation that you all bring forward should probably include pros and cons, some information on both sides in addition to what you recommend. Personally, when I get staff reports, if there are a couple of options and I have a better sense of why there's been a particular recommendation. It's possible that the Commission may not agree. That's fine, recognize that. Just doing a holistic approach, not just some people a while ago said that. Maybe that will be stare decisis, and we'll stick with that. That would be my one suggestion in that area, especially with respect to sea level rise. We've got a bunch of things going on now that's new information.

Chair McDougall: Is that recommendation specific to the 10.5 acres or any of these topics?

Council Member Cormack: It's specific to the 10.5 acres, but it's also general to me.

Vice Chair Greenfield: In the section of projects of current public interest, the BCCP and the 10.5 acres, Ventura and the racket sports all speak for themselves. You may wonder what park dedication is doing on that list. It's something we've talked about but hasn't been a specific project of effort. We were looking for guidance on is this something that is important to the Council to pursue because there's question about how much effort we should put into pursuing it. Actually there were questions about dedicating parks before we came up to it in this portion of the presentation. The general feedback we got is there is interest in looking for park areas that should be dedicated. Right now, I have a liaison role with Kristen, and I'll pursue that. If anybody wants to join me on that effort, they're welcome.

Chair McDougall: I'm going to Council Member Cormack if she has any other points of guidance from that meeting.
Council Member Cormack: The upcoming decisions—if you start with the achievements from last year, that's the important thing to start with. Don't sell yourselves short, and make sure staff gets all the credit that they deserve. The upcoming decisions is definitely where we should spend most of the time. It's always helpful for any of us to get a heads up before something arrives. There are two things on this list that might not jump out to your average Council Member. One is the recreation opportunity analysis. I'm not sure that's something that people would necessarily know about. You might want to spend a little time talking about taking a step back and where that came from at the retreat. The other thing, when we had the budget presented last night, one of the items on the list of how we are going to achieve our fiscal sustainability did include public-private collaborations. While I realize it's early to talk about fundraising, it's probably a good time to mention that it's on your radar, your planning horizon, as you look for appropriate projects and appropriate partners. I encourage you to mention that. Those are the things that jump out to me from this list.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Regarding the Foothills Park Buckeye Creek restoration project and hydrology study, as you know in 2017 we passed a motion recommending the middle option of three in terms of the restoration of just the upper portion of Buckeye Creek in Wildhorse Valley in the $4 million range rather than recommending the full-blown $10 million project which would include that area as well as Las Trampas Valley and the Buckeye Flats 7.7 acres. Some guidance we got is if we were to find outside funding sources for the whole package, we shouldn't worry about the fact that we've only recommended the middle option. In the event we were able to find someone or some group that was interested in pursuing the full package, we can solve that problem later. Find the money, and everything else will fall into place.

Chair McDougall: I'm going to start at the other end. Ryan, do you have anything to add, any suggestions, anything you'd like to achieve?

Commissioner McCauley: This is a very thoughtful approach to the meeting with Council Member Cormack and the Mayor. Well done on that count. Having a brief handout that perhaps lists the 2018 accomplishment might be good. It doesn't need to be lengthy. It can probably be what you have here, maybe with a few words to describe some of the things the Council Members may not be aware of. That way, we can spend maybe five minutes on that and then spend the majority of the time talking about what we foresee coming up in the next year. On that note, there is another item, which several people know about on the Commission, which is access to Foothills Park for students from neighboring communities. I don't know if there was any feedback on that topic. I'd be interested to hear thoughts on that. The ad hoc committee—we can talk about it more when we get to the ad hoc updates—has been moving forward with that concept. We can discuss it in more detail at the ad hoc update phase. I'm curious to know where that one stands and whether we should talk about it with the Council or not if for no other reason than to let them know that we're exploring it. Thoughts on that one?
Chair McDougall: You and I talked briefly about this. The biggest concern from both of the participants was what problem are we solving. I would encourage the ad hoc—however we go about it—to try and answer that question. If we think we can answer that question articulately, then we could bring it up as there's a problem we're trying to solve, and we should solve it this way. If we can't answer that question articulately, then—I don't know what expression to use—we should keep our powder dry. Bringing it up as a possible discussion could sidetrack everything else and could cause—I worry that a negative minority could escalate into something that we'd never achieve what you'd like to achieve.

Commissioner McCauley: I entirely appreciate that sentiment. I hear you. The ad hoc has talked about this may not be the best forum in a session with the Council, which is very compressed and quick, to bring up a topic that probably deserves a more in-depth discussion. In response to the question you posed, which is a totally fair question, it's a question of social justice. There are perhaps competing narratives about how we got to where we are with Foothills Park and the residents exclusiveness requirement. One is that Palo Alto was the community that stepped up to preserve that area and put the money up in the first instance. Other communities weren't willing to pony up at that point in time. Palo Alto somewhat understandably said, "Okay, but this is going to be for Palo Alto residents." There's a counter-narrative, which some of us have probably heard, that Palo Alto is a white-flight suburb of the 1950s and '60s and exclusive resident facilities and parks and things like that were a symptom of those sorts of mentalities, which effectively were to keep the riff raff out of what was an exclusive area. I'm not going to try and resolve what narrative is the right one. That's, at least in some people's view in our community, what is underlying the whole issue. It really is a social justice issue, which we can either clean up ourselves or probably become the headline of local newspaper or perhaps even be on local newspapers that Palo Alto is potentially still promoting that sort of exclusiveness in a facility that in most places would be open to the entire public. There are probably multiple ways to accomplish it. This proposal was intended to be a targeted way. It's a pilot proposal to study whether there would be any impacts from allowing students from neighboring communities that are socioeconomically disadvantaged schools to come to Foothills Park. The park is a resource that is underutilized. Actually it's pretty significantly underutilized. Many of our resources within the park system are overutilized. We have excess capacity. That's really the genesis. I didn't mean to speak for so long, but that's the answer, at least from my perspective, which is it's a social justice issue that we can either rectify ourselves or become perhaps publicized in ways that we don't want to be publicized.

Chair McDougall: I've got understanding and notes of that. I appreciate your passion on that. I'll go to Commissioner LaMere.

Commissioner LaMere: I don't have anything additional to add; although, I do support Ryan in his comments as well as exploring the Foothills Park and the pilot program.
Chair McDougall: Thank you.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm not necessarily opposed to investigating this. I don't think a Council joint study session would be the place to do it. I'd be afraid that it would swamp all our other discussions. We have a lot of very nebulous things. We will have new parkland at Cubberley, Ventura. The 10.5 acres, what are we going to do there? That's very nebulous. The 7.7 acres is very nebulous. How to approach funding, there's not a clear answer to that either. Normally, we do the churn and then we shut up and listen. In this case, we want to listen to the Council and see what they have to give us guidance on these areas. These areas are areas where there isn't an obvious answer, and guidance from the Council will be needed.

Chair McDougall: That's a good point. We want to make sure we don't spend an hour talking, but we spend 15 minutes addressing and identifying issues and making sure that we're listening and getting guidance as opposed to tell them what … Commissioner Moss.

Commissioner Moss: That was going to be one of my questions. You had said in the beginning that this was our presentation, not your presentation. Are you going to divvy this up among the seven of us, three of us, four of us? As you said, you don't want to monopolize the entire 60 minutes with us just talking heads. You want a discussion. I don't know how you want to handle that. Do you want the liaisons and the subcommittees to be prepared to talk about any of these issues in greater depth in 60 minutes? What did you have in mind?

Chair McDougall: There are two answers to that. One is I'm not sure I want anybody to talk in greater depth in any of those. We want to identify topics and issues. We want to be very careful about us talking so much in greater depth that we don't hear. On the other hand, I would like to go through the various ad hocs and have a representative of an ad hoc talk about some of these topics rather than me simply going through the list. We have a slide of accomplishments. We have a slide of priorities. I could take ad hocs and divide that up. I would try my best to create what's called a tick-tock, which Joe Simitian is very famous for creating tick-tocks, so that we really knew minute-by-minute what it was we were trying to do. We can't control the Council speaking, but we can control ourselves speaking. If everybody knows that he has this topic and he has two minutes and it's not free form, we'll use our light here or something. I would prefer to divide it up. I would know what priorities people have by what ad hocs they're on.

Commissioner Moss: I did want to hear if Council Member Cormack had any more comments, but one other question. There are some things here that are more controversial. They're not fully fleshed out, for instance, the AT&T property, things like that. How much detail do we—do we even bring those up or is this the set list?
Chair McDougall: This is not necessarily a set list. We did not put the AT&T property on here because there's already action on that, that probably can't be discussed in a setting like that. Kristen, do you have comments to add on that?

Ms. O'Kane: I do. I just wanted to chime in a little bit. What Commissioner Reckdahl was saying is based on past practice. My experience is the best part of these study sessions is the dialog between the Council and the Commissioners. The way to accomplish that is to give the most time for that dialog. If everyone is participating in the presentation, it's going to take a long time for that presentation. My recommendation is the Chair and Vice Chair give the presentation together. It's not their presentation. They're there representing all of you. Then the conversation, more feedback, and dialog with Council can take place. That would be my recommendation, and that's based on how we've done it previously. I'd welcome your thoughts on that. I would be worried that all of a sudden 30 minutes would pass, and we would not have heard from the City Council.

Chair McDougall: With that approach, I would go out of my way to make sure that everybody participated in answering. Any kind of conversation that got started, I would not want to be the one or necessarily Commissioner Greenfield to—a topic comes up maybe almost random as opposed to—Commissioner Reckdahl, why don't you talk to that. If you're comfortable talking to it, then do it. If you'd rather not be the one to talk to it, bounce it back. We want to get everybody engaged in the conversation. I would be happy at the end if I—unlike these meetings where I don't think I talk the least, I'd be very happy in this meeting if I was the one who talked the least.

Ms. O'Kane: It's good to maybe do bigger picture items instead of focusing on specific project updates at the study session. If a Council Member asks, that would be appropriate. We don't want to get into a discussion about a particular project necessarily as much as big picture priorities. What does the Commission want to move the needle on? What sorts of policy issues are there that the Commission would like to see come forward or changed in some way? That's my recommendation.

Commissioner Moss: I'm assuming in this dialog we may not have answers. It may be that they will ask us questions and give us several months' worth of work to do because of this, rather than us being able to answer all their questions right there in that 60 minutes. Is that right?

Ms. O'Kane: That has happened with other Commissions as well. It's something to consider. Something happened like that with the Human Relations Commission. They did get a project out of their study session, and they were happy to take it on. Staff can help with that. If it seems to be too much or out of the realm of what you're interested in, we can follow up afterwards.
Commissioner Moss: The example that we had here was funding. Mayor Scharff said, "What about funding the entire 20-year Parks Master Plan tomorrow? Can you do it?" We spent a lot of time trying to figure out how we could fund it. We didn't get very far, but we spent a lot of time on it.

Chair McDougall: I thought it was very generous of Commissioner Moss to say that the Council might give us more work. Does anybody else have any comments? If not, I would redraft this a bit, find a way—I'm sorry, Council Member Cormack.

Council Member Cormack: The good news is for the first time we're evenly matched, seven on seven. You won't be completely outnumbered. I want to address head on what Commissioner McCauley brought up. It's actually already in the press. There is some very strong language that some people are using. We should all be prepared in case this becomes an issue that is relevant to the people who live here and to people who don't live here. It's totally up to the Commission. I'm not taking a position on whether you should or should not bring it forward. In my experience, things that can be controversial are best well thought-out in advance. If you decide to bring it up, fine. If you don't, that's fine also. It doesn't mean you can't work on it. I'd encourage you to think long and hard. I would expect the Council, as we always do, will look to our Boards and Commissions to make recommendations and manage initial hearings on that line. I just want to address it head on. It is a topic in the news. This would be the appropriate place for it to be considered.

Commissioner Reckdahl: It's possible that after we shut up and start listening, one of the Council Members may bring it up. If they want to bring it up, I have no problem with that. If they have some insight to guide us, that could be appropriate.

Chair McDougall: The important thing that we've just been reminded of is we need to be well prepared.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I have some more comments on the Foothills Park access issue. I was waiting 'til we finished talking about the bigger picture of how we're going to handle our joint session.

Ms. O'Kane: I just want to make sure—this isn't an agendized item. We don't get into a discussion on it.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I'm just passing comments from the Mayor's session. This is some additional comments.

Ms. O'Kane: Thank you.

Vice Chair Greenfield: We did broach the subject at the meeting, which is probably clear but wasn't explicitly stated. In addition to the question of what problem are we trying to
solve, other questions that were posed for us to consider are is there significant unserved demand, what are options to addressing this issue. If the issue does exist and there is demand, does Foothill Park need to be used as part of the solution or are there other solutions in place or is there demand being met by other open space areas already? The underlying question as well, which maybe we got some answer to just now, is what is the appropriateness or priority of using staff resources for an investigation of this effort. If this is something that Council isn't going to support, then we're not well served to use staff time on this. It's a bit of a chicken and egg issue. We need to figure out how to get guidance on this before we're shut down from pursuing it.

Council Member Cormack: A slightly different recollection. What I remember talking about is prioritization. We all have to choose. What are the things we're working on, and where do we want to spend our time? If this is what the Commission wants to prioritize, then that's appropriate. If there are other things that the Commission wants to prioritize, that's appropriate as well. I didn't personally talk about staff time. It might have been someone else in the meeting. Really more about prioritization. If it's at the top of the list, then you should talk about it with us. If there are other things that are more important, then I encourage you to put those at the top of the list. It's agnostic as to the topic.

Commissioner McCauley: We can perhaps talk about this a little bit more when we get to the ad hoc committee updates. As a general matter, from my limited experience of being at one of these study sessions previously, it makes a lot of sense to be as structured as possible. Your tick-tock idea, Don, is a very good one. Without stepping on any feet because I recognize that we view our Council Members as our bosses in this context, you as the Chairman need to be assertive to actually keep us on schedule. I recognize that the last time we went through this exercise, it's easy with Council Members to go off on lots of different tangents and down many different rabbit holes. I would be assertive. That's my last piece of input.

Vice Chair Greenfield: One other comment I'd like to make not related to any specific item for discussion, but in general, for the meeting between the Parks and Rec Commission and City Council. The last time we met was almost two years ago. We didn't get a meeting scheduled last year. I'd like to recommend we put calendar reminder items to start next February or so looking to schedule the Mayor's meeting, which would be followed by the joint session, so we can make sure to include this next year. It's valuable time. As Commissioner McCauley alluded, we're meeting with our bosses at this meeting. These one-on-ones at least once a year seem like a reasonable practice.

Council Member Cormack: I'll point out that we all serve the public.

Chair McDougall: Unless anybody has more comments, then I'll work with Commissioner Greenfield and do a little more homework, find a way to appropriately distribute it, and commit to you now that my goal would be to make sure it's a discussion that we learn from
and that it's not my conversation. It's everybody participating in the conversation. You're free to kick me in the shins whenever that's inappropriate. With that, I would like to suggest that we move on to the next topic, which is …

Commissioner Reckdahl: I have one question. The fact that we haven't had a meeting in two years, do you want the accomplishments to be listed for the last two years or just for 2018?

Chair McDougall: As soon as Commissioner Greenfield said that, I made a note to think back to the previous year. I don't think I'd want to go through all the accomplishments. If we did a moonshot the previous year, we should add the moonshot in there.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Especially if there are any open issues with any of the projects that we did in the past.

Chair McDougall: If there's any particular accomplishments that anybody's particularly sensitive to, if they could inform Natalie—to keep me out of Brown Act problems—I'll work with Natalie to collect them. Thank you, Natalie. Any other comments on that? Relative to the agenda, I don't know that we're looking for more things to put on the agenda as opposed to things to move on the agenda. Maybe Kristen can give us a little input of what's in front of us.

Ms. O'Kane: The next item is the other ad hoc committee updates. Did you want to …

Chair McDougall: I'm sorry. I skipped that.

4. Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates

Chair McDougall: I would invite Commissioner Greenfield, since it's in front of us and he's done a nice job of championing this, to make comments on what we have in front of us.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I had recommended a little bit more streamlined approach, which isn't exactly what's in front of us. It's more similar to what we used a couple of years ago. Rather than adding the meeting date and attendees, simplify things by putting things in a single column with all the update information. Put things in a format that Natalie can paste right into this document. Each monthly update would be in a single column, and the document would be updated. A new column would be inserted for the new month, and the previous month would get shifted to the right so you could see a history of all the updates for each of the particular ad hocs or liaison roles. We can either have separate tabs in a document for ad hocs and liaison or everything sequentially in one document. It would be nice if there was a location that could be hosted where everyone can access this document. I don't think we should have Brown Act issues if all of this information is then presented
in a meeting because it's then public information. It'd be very useful for the individual ad
hocs to see what's happening month-to-month. A year later, we can at a glance see is it
worth our time to have this ad hoc or would it make more sense to reduce it to a one-person
liaison role or is it something we need at all.

Chair McDougall: I'm going to suggest that we continue to discuss and work on that and
work with Natalie and Kristen. The idea was that we didn't spend a lot of time on this
because we already had the information here. Does anybody have a burning interest in
commenting on anything on here that either they submitted or they see?

Ms. O'Kane: The reason why it's not printed is there were last-minute additions. Our goal
is to—Commissioner Greenfield and Natalie and I will work on it too—is to get it on a
monthly schedule so you're all expecting it, we're expecting a response. We'll be able to
track it as we move along. It is a work in progress, but we're working on it.

Chair McDougall: This is a great improvement from last month's when Commissioner
Greenfield was the only one who submitted something. Now, anytime there was something
submitted or an ad hoc happened, we've got a decent report. I appreciate everybody's
participation in that.

Vice Chair Greenfield: An important part of the process is for Natalie to send the
Commission a reminder three or four days before you need the reports done. We need to
be disciplined in making sure we get a report in. The goal is for each ad hoc to send in a
report of some form even if it's "no update this month," which will be reasonable some
months. It doesn't have to be formal meeting notes from gathering as a meeting. A lot can
be done online together or reviewing an update. For example, the pickleball plan was
reviewed by the Park and Facility Use Policy Ad Hoc this past month, but the ad hoc didn't
actually meet.

Chair McDougall: Are there any incremental additions that people would like to talk about,
liaison meetings or anything else?

Commissioner McCauley: I was going to offer a quick suggestion. Maybe it will be easy.
I hope it will be something that would streamline this. It would be to remove a couple of
these columns, as Jeff was mentioning. You can figure out which columns to keep. That
doesn't matter so much. Definitely you're going to keep the status update column. Perhaps
you just keep in one spreadsheet or one document the prior status update so that you have
last month and this month. That way it's really easy. You can just move it over and create
a new column.

Vice Chair Greenfield: That is exactly the plan. It would be four columns. It would be
the ad hoc group, the members of the ad hoc, the staff liaison of the ad hoc, and the current
month's update. That's all that would be in the packets that would show up on a monthly
Commissioner McCauley: I would like to talk about the Foothills issue just very briefly again, but we can talk about other items first so that they get their due.

Chair McDougall: If we're not careful here, I'm going to create an ad hoc to create ad hoc reports. This morning I got a call from Bob Moss, the Chairman of the Library Commission. The Commission is asking for a joint session with the Parks and Rec Commission and the Library Commission. I've suggested that we have a pretty heavy agenda for the next several months and agreed that we should set up an ad hoc/ad hoc to meet with a couple of their people. They have five Commissioners, so two would be the right number for them. If I could get two volunteers from here to meet with them to plan a joint session, that would be appropriate if anybody is interested in helping with that. If nobody's interested in helping with that—David, thank you. I'll see if I can find somebody else to work with them on that. It's important that we plan this. We need to know what we're trying to achieve and not just have the two groups. Certainly we don't have agenda time in the short term to do that. Is there any other liaison topics that haven't been discussed? David.

Commissioner Moss: I have several questions about the purpose and the use of this, not the specifics.

Chair McDougall: I'm going to suggest that we not spend more time worrying about the reporting format. Maybe people could submit comments and questions about the reporting format to Natalie. Natalie can work with Commissioner Greenfield and Kristen to come up with something that works for them as well as works for us.

Commissioner Moss: That was not my question. My question was what do we do with this information in this meeting. Do I ask questions about the Foothill Park status?

Chair McDougall: The idea is we don't have to have presentations. You should have read this ahead of time. If you've got a question about it, now's the time to ask the question.

Commissioner Moss: Do I ask it in the meeting or do I just …

Chair McDougall: Right now.

Commissioner Moss: … email the attendees?

Chair McDougall: Right now.

Commissioner Moss: For the Foothills Park, I've always thought there ought to be a Los Altos Day or a Menlo Park Day or whatever. I'm wondering if the ad hoc can discuss that
as well. When you talk about the next steps for 7.7 acres, when will that be an agenda item? How close are you to having that be an agenda item?

Commissioner McCauley: I'll look to Daren, but I think the answer is there's a public outreach process that needs to happen in the first instance and some design conceptualization that will go along with the public outreach process. I expect it's going to be late this year at the earliest.

Mr. Anderson: That's exactly it.

Vice Chair Greenfield: Would we need to identify funding before we pursue a public outreach process?

Mr. Anderson: No, I don't think so. We keep funding in mind, of course, throughout the process. As you know with our capital program, we cannot submit a project before it's been planned out, so no placeholders. If the funding is indeed coming from our capital program, no. What we could do is engage with our partners to figure out what's doable within the partnership and existing resources there. We've been talking at the ad hoc to some degree with some of our very preliminary thinking on the 7.7 acres that that would be part of it. In fact, we've already engaged Grassroots Ecology. They've already given me a conceptual plan for what we could do. Now, it's the vetting process, work that through with the ad hoc and, as you say, agendize it with the Commission.

Commissioner McCauley: With respect to the Foothills Park neighbor days or whatever we might call that concept, the committee hasn't discussed it further from when David raised it this past October, I think it was. The two items that we've discussed—the principle one is providing access for students. The other one that we've kicked around a little bit and actually—there's two different committees that both have a stake in this. The other is the Parks Rules and Regulations because allowing people who are not residents of Palo Alto into the park requires an amendment of the Park Rules and Regulations, the Park Municipal Code. We've talked at a very high level about some of the partner organizations like Canopy, Environmental Volunteers, Grassroots Ecology, providing access to some of their volunteers who are doing good work in Palo Alto but otherwise wouldn't be able to access Foothills Park. Those are the two main ones that we've talked about so far. In terms of the neighbor days, I certainly would be open to the idea. It probably needs to be fleshed out how we go about it. I welcome your thoughts on that.

Chair McDougall: Are there any other comments on that?

Commissioner McCauley: I'll try to be very brief, but I'll take 60 seconds to talk about what the ad hoc has come up with thus far on the Foothills access for students from neighboring communities.
Ms. O'Kane: I'm not sure if we can have—we're getting into a discussion item that wasn't agendized.

Commissioner McCauley: I'll be very careful not to make it a discussion but an update of where things stand. The proposal that's on the table at the moment is to allow PAUSD students who are not residents of Palo Alto as well as students from neighboring communities in school districts that under State standards are determined to be socioeconomically disadvantaged. The only school district that would apply to is Ravenswood. To allow them access to the park as a pilot for a one-year period, study the effects, if any, and then make a more permanent recommendation whether to allow those people into the park on a more permanent basis. Daren and his Ranger staff have been excellent in providing feedback on that proposal. We first talked about it in the ad hoc this past October, I believe it was. We've talked about it at a number of meetings since then. That's what the proposal within the ad hoc is at the moment. John Aiken has provided some input and feedback from the recreation side and recreation programs that are happening in the park already. I just wanted everyone to have a sense for what that was. I think it'll be coming before the Commission. I don't know what our agenda will look like in the next couple of months, but probably before too long it'll be before the entire Commission to weigh in on.

Chair McDougall: Thank you. With that, I'm going to ask Kristen to go to the item I talked about before.

VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR MAY 28, 2019 MEETING

Chair McDougall: Now, we can talk about the future agenda.

Ms. O'Kane: May is looking to be a pretty busy month so far. Daren will be here with our Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan consultant to present the draft conservation plan. That's going to be a pretty big item. We also have two park projects. Peter Jensen will be coming back with the Rinconada Park Improvement Ordinance, asking for a recommendation for the Commission to recommend that Council approve it. He was also planning on coming back potentially with a proposed plan for Boulware Park, which is due for park renovation. That will not be a PIO but an introduction to his proposal.

Chair McDougall: In the short term, we're pretty well set with what we're bringing forward.

Ms. O'Kane: That's right.

VII. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair McDougall: Are there any other comments or announcements?
Vice Chair Greenfield: The Rules and Regulations Ad Hoc is looking forward to coming
to the Commission soon with potentially a discussion item of rule changes which would be
followed by an action for approval. This could either be a single agenda item to approve
the action in a single meeting where there'd be an opportunity for review, discussion, and
amendments to that, and a follow-up meeting. We'll probably be on target for having some
discussion in the June agenda.

Mr. Anderson: That's reasonable.

Chair McDougall: I'm going to mention one other thing that came out of the meeting with
the Mayor and Council Member Cormack. At the last meeting, I did mention that we have
had an awful lot of climate change-related presentations, GSI and the trees and so on. It
would be interesting to know if there was an overarching committee or look at that within
the City. Council Member Cormack suggested there was—what was it—a committee
going to look at that and suggested that maybe somebody from the Parks and Rec
Commission would join that. I'm mentioning that now as a reminder to all of us that that
would be really useful if we could do it.

Council Member Cormack: That was embedded in the staff report for our Earth Day study
session. There will be a group coming forward. It was just one sentence. There wasn't
anything more on that. I think that'd be worth considering.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I wanted to bring up Cubberley as a potential agenda item for the
meeting in May. Is this something that would be appropriate for us to schedule?

Ms. O'Kane: We talked about that. I'm worried about May going 'til midnight. Once I
have a Council date for when—the plan for Cubberley is it will likely go to Council, not a
joint study session with the School District, to talk about certain aspects of Cubberley, one
being housing. The School District will have a similar meeting with their Board, and then
we'll do the joint study session later. The timing on when we come to the Parks and Rec
Commission is important. I can see whether Rinconada and Boulware Park could move
from the agenda. I expect that will also be a rather lengthy item. I'm trying to be respectful
of Commissioners' time limits. We'll work with you and Chair McDougall on that.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I agree that we shouldn't be aiming for more than three agenda
items. The question is would Cubberley have a higher priority than one of the park
discussions for that meeting. That's what I'm hearing from you, that may be the case and
we'll talk about it.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The slides that you went over at the last City/School meeting
were very good. You could go over them in 10, 15 minutes just for information only and
no so much getting our opinions but keeping us in the loop. That might be some value
added there. Since they're already prepared, it would be minimal preparation on your part.
Ms. O'Kane: I forgot to mention earlier May 9 is our next Cubberley community meeting. It's our final meeting. I really hope that you all come and help spread the word. It's 7:00 at the Cubberley Pavilion on Thursday, May 9.

Commissioner McCauley: This is the earliest we've finished a meeting in a very long time. I feel necessary to be really short. On the topic of park dedication, Jeff, you were suggesting you might want some help or assistance. I'd be more than happy to help. Should we have that be an ad hoc?

Vice Chair Greenfield: It was an ad hoc last year. At the retreat this year, I was the only one interested, so we decided one person does not make an ad hoc. I became the liaison. We could easily open it up as an ad hoc again.

Chair McDougall: Are you volunteering?

Commissioner McCauley: I am, yes. If others are in agreement, then …

Chair McDougall: Why don't I work with Kristen to formalize that as an ad hoc?

Commissioner Moss: Are we going to have a Boardwalk grand opening? The last one got rained out.

Mr. Anderson: That's with Public Works Engineering right now. They have not rescheduled one. As soon as they do, I'll be sure to let you know.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned on motion by Commissioner McCauley and second by Vice Chair Greenfield at 8:40 p.m.