MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
October 22, 2019
Downtown Library
270 Forest Avenue
Palo Alto, California

Commissioners Present: Anne Cribbs, Jeff Greenfield, Jeff LaMere, Ryan McCauley, Don McDougall, David Moss, and Keith Reckdahl
Commissioners Absent: None
Others Present: Daren Anderson, Catherine Bourquin

I. ROLL CALL

II. AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, and DELETIONS

Chair McDougall: I'll ask if there are any Agenda Changes, Requests, Deletions from the agenda that we have. Thank you to staff for once again great preparation of the agenda. If not, I'll go to Oral Communications.

III. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Chair McDougall: This is members of the public that can speak on topics that are not on the agenda. I have no cards, so I'll assume that I have no Oral Communications. I will offer Commission members at this point an opportunity for Oral Communications on subjects that are not on the agenda. David.

Commissioner Moss: The last meeting, they had a discussion about banners and what to put up in parks. One of my neighbors said, "Make it clear to soccer groups and baseball groups that along"—we're just taking the Cubberley site as an example—"Nelson Drive fences, behind the track, around the tennis courts, on Cubberley buildings are not one of the official sites for banners. They get plastered all over these." We do need to either enforce it or come up with a different way to address the banners. One other neighbor said if we could get it so that they have one banner with a strip on the bottom that tells about an
Chair McDougall: Consistent with public Oral Communications, I'm not going to ask staff to respond to that.

IV. DEPARTMENT REPORT

Chair McDougall: I'll go on to Department Report.

Daren Anderson: Good evening, Commissioners. Daren Andersen, Community Services Department. I wanted to get back to you on the Boulware addition. That's the 3350 Birch Street property the City recently purchased. The next step on that property is community outreach. It's tentatively set for Saturday, November 9, at 10:00 a.m. to noon. Peter Jensen will confirm that, and I'll make sure to email the Commission once that's finalized.

Feedback on the Black & White Ball. The event went really well. We sold 1,002 tickets, made $111,000 in revenue, and utilized over 25 Palo Alto vendors. The Moonlight Run was a great event, went smoothly, There were 2,303 registered participants in that one. A follow-up on the field lighting issues at Stanford-Palo Alto. The repair to the northwest light pole, which had caught on fire, was completed last Thursday. The repair tech explained that the fire was most likely caused by a resistor that overheated. While testing the system, the technician noticed that there were two bulbs out on the north field close to the restroom building. We're working on having those repaired. The Cubberley track and field project was completed. We had the ribbon ceremony last Friday. It was a successful and well-received ribbon cutting. Peter Jensen did a great job on that project. A lot of praise from the community members who attended it. The Cubberley field seasonal lighting, we've been doing this for a couple of years. That's going to start again. This is set for Monday, November 4, through December 13 and then again January 6 through March 6. These lights will go off at 8:30 p.m. It's just to extend the use of the field a little bit during the darker months. The neighbors will receive a postcard notifying them of the seasonal lighting. Adam will hand deliver these after the Commission meeting tonight. During last year's trial, we had one light with some problems. It was continuously running on the generator. We're going to relocate that particular spot so it's in the sun better, so it won't have to turn on the generator. It'll just run on solar as it was designed. We also had some issues with the company who ran the program last year. They've gone out of business. They actually went out of business during the pilot last year, which made it very complicated. We've got a new company. The techs with the company are available from phone and internet, and they can dial into the unit remotely. We're anticipating much better service and far fewer issues. Pickleball, the project was scheduled to be completed by November 15. The good news is the contractor is ahead of schedule right now. I anticipate they will be completed before that. Again, I'll notify you by email. We'll have a ribbon cutting for that event as well. The Hoover dog park fence. You might remember during
our dog park conversations we've talked about some of the challenges with the existing dog parks. The problem with Hoover is the existing fence is only 3 feet tall. It went in before my time, and I have no idea why it was put in at that height. We're correcting it starting tomorrow. It'll be 5 feet. The project will run from tomorrow through Saturday. The dog park will be closed during that project. The El Camino Park synthetic turf infield, something I mentioned at the last Commission meeting. We had an issue with that infield. It's being replaced. It's being done right now. That project will be completed Friday, October 25. That is, the old infield was removed, and a new infield appropriate for the site was installed. An update on the Junior Museum and Zoo project. That's on schedule to open October 3, 2020. Right now, they're working on completing exhibits for the meerkat, raccoon, and turtle and fish. It's going well. An update on the 101 Pedestrian Bike Bridge schedule. That project will go out to bid on October 2 and to Council on November 15 for award of contract. It's moving forward. The construction window is still set for the fall of 2019. They anticipate an 18-month construction window with completion somewhere around March 2021. The 7.7 acres community meeting is set for Saturday, November 16, at 11:00 a.m. at Foothills Park Interpretive Center. This will be the outreach to the community to find out what they'd like to do in using the land. As you recall, we presented the draft restoration plan for how to use it to the Commission. We'll be presenting that to the community and getting their feedback. An update on the Cubberley lease. On October 7, City Council directed staff to negotiate an agreement with PAUSD to continue leasing Cubberley Community Center for a term of five years. The current lease expires in December of this year. City and School District staff developed draft lease terms that were presented to both Council and the Board of Education. The draft terms include specific milestones related to the Cubberley Master Plan as well as a draft lease payment schedule. There's a staff report with more information. If you're interested, I'm glad to email it to you. It's available online. The Cubberley Master Plan. Staff anticipates the draft Cubberley Master Plan will be released to the community in the next few weeks. Regarding sea level rise, I know there's always questions about that. We've got staff from Public Works coming to bring a discussion for the PRC on a horizontal levee project in December or January. The Arastradero Community Gardens—this is our partnership with the church—will open at the end of the month. We anticipate 35 garden plots, and we already have nine or ten people on the waiting list. Catherine has done a wonderful job leading that project and getting the gardens built. We'll be meeting with the gardeners soon and setting up their plots. We're excited about that, our first new community garden in quite some time. Lastly, there's a veterans recognition event planned at King Plaza on November 4 at 3:30. That concludes the Department Report.

Chair McDougall: You said 102 tickets for the Black & White Ball and how much?

Mr. Anderson: 1,002 tickets and $111,000 in revenue.

Chair McDougall: Was the $111,000 net? Do you know?
Mr. Anderson: I don't know.

Chair McDougall: Are there any other questions?

Commissioner Moss: How much money did the Moonlight Run bring in?

Mr. Anderson: I don't have the revenue figures for that. I apologize.

Commissioner Moss: The Cubberley Master Plan, when it comes back and before it goes out to the public, you're going to have the subcommittee look at it?

Mr. Anderson: I'll talk to Kristen about that. She understands that's a deep interest of the Commission. I'll make sure I convey that to her.

Commissioner Moss: The CIP, when is that kicking off?

Mr. Anderson: I've yet to hear from the Office of Management and Budget, who oversees the capital program. We're starting internally right now. My staff has gone through all the existing projects, and we're creating a clean spreadsheet. We're going to go over it internally with staff this week, probably tomorrow morning. I'll set up a meeting to go over it with the Department head, Kristen. I'll meet with the ad hoc next, and then we'll come back to the full Commission. I've got an email coming out to you soon to set up a time for us to meet and talk.

Chair McDougall: Any other questions? Daren, thank you very much.

V. BUSINESS

1. Approval of Draft Minutes from the September 24, 2019 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting.

Approval of the draft September 24, 2019 Minutes was moved by Commissioner Reckdahl and seconded by Commissioner McCauley. Passed 6-0, Moss abstaining

2. Urban Forest Discussion

Chair McDougall: We'll move on to the Urban Forest Discussion with Walter. Walter, welcome. Thank you very much for being here.

Walter Passmore: Thank you, Commissioners. Walter Passmore, Urban Forester. We have a short presentation tonight. This is really more of a discussion. We are proposing to establish an ongoing forum for Urban Forestry to interact with the community. The purpose of the community forum is to implement programs of the Urban Forest Master Plan, to optimize communication, address common issues, share information, and facilitate
collaboration in meeting challenges such as invasive species or carbon credits. Those are some of the programs that relate to the purpose in the Urban Forest Master Plan. Secondly, it's to assess and consider how to expand tree canopy as described in a number of plans including the Urban Forest Master Plan, the Parks Master Plan, the Comprehensive Plan, the Sustainability and Climate Action Plan, the Green Infrastructure Plan. There's a whole slough of City plans that recognize canopy cover as an overarching performance measure for ecosystem function. It relates very well to a number of goals that we have for motivating community health, community recreation, ecosystem management in parks and open space. As such, we feel like it's an appropriate role for the Parks and Recreation Commission to host this ongoing forum. We're proposing to present the Parks and Recreation Commission with an annual State of the Urban Forest Report. I've handed out a Urban Forestry Accomplishments Report as an example of some of the measures that we currently track. This is not a format necessarily for the State of the Urban Forest Report, but I would welcome your feedback on which of those measures you'd like us to report on annually and what you find would also be valuable to add into that report. Again, that's just an example of what we're currently tracking, but we're very open to reporting on whatever the Commission desires. The function would also be to provide a venue for public comment. Currently, there is no formal venue for the public to comment on Urban Forestry issues. The desire is not to establish another board or commission but to pair Urban Forestry issues with the body that is most appropriate. We feel that the Parks and Recreation Commission among our established bodies is the most appropriate to hear Urban Forestry issues and decide how to address those. It would also be to comment on significant issues, projects, policies, or reports that may affect the Urban Forest. We want to talk a little bit about some limitations. I brought this up with the agenda planning Commissioners. The Parks and Recreation Commission will not hear appeals, consider claims, or register complaints against staff. You're not going to be a decision-making body directing Urban Forestry policy or staff, but rather a body to listen to the voice of the community and respond and make recommendations. You will not be directing staff to take any specific action; however, the PRC may request staff to explore, report, consider, or provide recommendations. I want you to feel like your input is very valuable, and you are going to facilitate a healthy conversation with the community at large. In addition, the Parks and Recreation Commission, being a formal body, always has the authority to forward issues to City Council for consideration with opinions that are documented in your minutes. That includes opinions from the public that may communicate with you via Oral Communication. It will be an opportunity to place issues on the formal record and request certain actions. While the Commission would not be directing, it would be an opportunity for the community to interact with staff and for staff to respond in part to those issues that the community brings up. I'm going to spend a little bit of time on this slide, my last slide. Please ask questions. I want this to be an interactive process. An example issue is tree canopy cover. I mentioned that it's an overarching performance measure for ecosystem function. It's outlined in a number of goals that we have in various plans. This year, we are going to create a new canopy cover tool in our enterprise-level GIS system. That will
produce an annual assessment of canopy cover throughout the City, and it will be to a level of definition equal to our imagery. Currently, the City is acquiring 1 meter or finer aerial imagery as part of our GIS system. We will be able to define the extent of canopy on a tree-by-tree basis on a parcel-by-parcel basis or any selected area of the City. We can compare one neighborhood to another. We can compare one park to another. We can compare north to south Palo Alto, which was one of the issues that was originally broached in the Urban Forest Master Plan adopted in 2015. There was a large disparity in canopy between north and south Palo Alto. We'll be able to compare not only the canopy distribution but trends in how the canopy is changing over time and compare that to different baselines. I just laid a couple of baseline datapoints here because we did have a canopy analysis conducted comparing 1982 to 2010. There are some other baselines identified in our Sustainability and Climate Action Plan where we propose to reduce levels of carbon by certain percentages compared to a 1990 baseline. We'll also be assessing the 1990 tree canopy cover so that we can look at the trend over time of how that canopy is hopefully increasing. I do want to talk about some goals that are reflected in a number of plans, one being the equitable distribution of canopy. Another is a tree canopy that is resilient to changes in climate and culture. We are seeing changes in both. A third is productive for a multitude of ecosystem benefits. A fourth is production of habitat values that provide place for plants and animals, including people. Trees being a very large organism, we have to create adequate space. By creating that space, we then create habitat for all of the plants and animals associated with that tree or group of trees to thrive. It's a good measure to assess other ecosystem values that we have interest in. I do want to entertain some questions. I'm going to rely on Chairman McDougal to revisit some of the discussion that we had about how the Parks and Recreation Commission would participate in this ongoing forum.

Chair McDougall: Walter, thank you very much. I'm going to reserve my comments on how we might go forward until we've actually heard from everybody in terms of whether they have questions or not. I'm not totally influencing what we might do next. I'm going to start with David.

Commissioner Moss: I have a couple questions. To increase the density of the canopy in light of the extensive building that's going on and that's being proposed, it seems like it's conflicting. How do you expect to resolve that? Is that just part of the—this seems to be your important slide. I don't see how you can make much improvement. What's going to change?

Mr. Passmore: Looking at the comparison of 1982 to 2010, we noted that the canopy actually increased in excess of 5 percent citywide, which is a huge number of trees. That's a substantial increase from a little over 32 to 37 percent canopy citywide. We attribute that in part to development. We had policies for development that required new trees to be planted in excess of a 1:1 ratio. When we have projects come forward, we were requiring
them to plant more trees than they removed. In 1982, there were more vacant spaces or
green fields development that was going on. Whereas, most of those vacant lots have been
developed since. That opportunity is probably gone for the most part. We can still make
some changes to policy. We can still motivate people to do the right thing and plant more
trees than they're removing. It's not going to be easy, to your point. There are some
substantial challenges if we're going to add more square footage of buildings, but we also
want more square footage for trees and green space and ecosystems.

Commissioner Moss: With our desire to have solar on rooftops and in parking lots and on
top of buildings, we're losing our sunlight if we have too many trees. There's going to be
a conflict there. I know in my own backyard we have so many trees that, for the first time,
we can't grow a garden. Our entire lot is covered by trees. We have to cut back in some
way, shape, or form. I don't know what you're going to do with the community garden, but
you're going to need some sunlight. How do you reconcile that?

Mr. Passmore: I agree. I think there's still a significant amount of opportunity for new
rooftop solar that does not conflict with trees. As we develop more square footage in
buildings, we can propose to build taller and have more opportunities for rooftop solar as
opposed to surface or parking lot-mounted shade canopies, which do have that conflict with
trees. I don't think we're going to prohibit rooftop solar by having more trees. We need to
be strategic about it, though.

Commissioner Reckdahl: You mentioned we'll be getting 1-meter resolution data. Do we
have to manually go through and look at trees or do you have some automated process of
counting trees?

Mr. Passmore: There are existing algorithms that can compare the pixels of data to texture
and using infrared to tease out tree canopy in comparison to other types of land uses
including turf or bushes. There are a lot of existing algorithms. There are also comparative
datasets that we can cross-reference that have already looked at tree canopy. For example,
the U.S. Forest Service just did a statewide urban tree canopy assessment using 3-meter
data. Nonetheless, it's a good reference point so that we can compare Palo Alto data to
what the Forest Service is showing in Palo Alto. That's all free between government
agencies.

Commissioner Reckdahl: How often do you get the new data? Is it once a year?

Mr. Passmore: Annually once we get the new enterprise GIS system, which is supposed
to occur in fiscal year '19.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Would we be able to use that to check out trees during drought
to identify which trees are stressed? That's one of the issues, that street trees do not get
watered regularly. If we have some automated process to say these trees are stressed and they need extra attention, that would be very useful.

Mr. Passmore: Possibly, depending on the imagery quality. Infrared may not be refined enough to assess tree health. Whereas, multispectral imagery would be.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Can we get both infrared and multispectral?

Mr. Passmore: Right now our default is infrared and the color. We're not currently looking at multispectral imagery.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Do we have to pay for this or is this through the Forest Service?

Mr. Passmore: It'll be through our enterprise GIS system for the City of Palo Alto.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The City of Palo Alto already contracts and gets this. The trees will come as a bonus?

Mr. Passmore: Right. The trees will be part of the dataset that will be analyzed.

Commissioner Reckdahl: In south Palo Alto, there's a lot of rolled curbs. We don't have the regular areas. What are strategies that we can do to increase street trees along those rolled curbs?

Mr. Passmore: Our street tree occupancy rate is actually pretty good. About 95 percent of sites have a street tree existing on them right now. Our goal is 98 percent. There's a small opportunity to plant more street trees and to better inform residents, such as those in south Palo Alto with the rolled curb. The big opportunity for increasing tree canopy cover is on private property. It's important to remember the role of government is not just to supply services but also to facilitate advancing community interests and to leverage efforts through public-private partnerships. To that extent, we have initiated some programs such as a south Palo Alto tree planting initiative with Canopy, our nonprofit group. We've also initiated a tree planting program through our utility to enhance the right tree/right place program and not only replace an inappropriate species under the utility line but also provide an extra shade tree in an appropriate location. We're doing a two-for-one offer.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Do we do surveys of street trees and say this street doesn't have as many street trees and we can plant some?

Mr. Passmore: We do. For our public trees, we have a comprehensive inventory of every tree in a developed area, 100 percent of our street trees and all of the trees in our urban parks and high-use areas. We're able to run reports on an annual basis of the number of vacant sites, where those are located, what stature of species could be planted there, and then from that select what tree we would put in that exact location.
Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm very enthusiastic about this. Trees are an important part of Palo Alto. If you go up to City Hall and look out the windows, it's just beautiful. You see trees everywhere. That helps our quality of life. It helps our real estate prices. I think it's a very good thing.

Commissioner Cribbs: I'm very enthusiastic about this too. I think it's a great opportunity for all of us to learn more about trees in Palo Alto and all of that. The south Palo Alto community tree planting, how are you publicizing that?

Mr. Passmore: Through Canopy. Canopy has a listserv of about 4,000 constituents in Palo Alto. They reach out to them via email and an electronic newsletter that comes out on a monthly basis. In addition, they're working with the neighborhood associations and community champions. They've identified one or more champions in each neighborhood that reach out neighbor to neighbor. That word of mouth is pretty effective a lot of the time. They've hosted community meetings. We've seen that program actually gain quite a bit of momentum. The first year, they planted somewhere around 70 trees. They planted about 100 the next year. It looks like they're going to exceed 120 this year, so a little bit more every year. As the word gets out, people are going to get more excited about being a part of that.

Commissioner Cribbs: That's great. The staff within Community Services, what's the practicality and how do you see this working? The reason I'm asking is because I think we're down a couple of people in our headcount in Community Services. While this is a great project, I'd love to know if the staff is going to be asked to take on one more thing.

Mr. Passmore: The Urban Forestry section is positioned in the Public Works Department. Even though we service all of the different departments, we are the technical advisor to the City. We're not positioned in Community Services, and I'm fully staffed right now.

Chair McDougall: In fact, we're counting on being able to borrow some of his people for us.

Commissioner Cribbs: That's a good thing because there always is some interaction if we have this here. We have some projects that have been on our list for a long time, that we just don't seem to be able to get to.

Mr. Passmore: I'll give you an example. Before the Urban Forest Master Plan was adopted in 2015, Community Services was responsible for maintenance of park trees. Since that time, we have transferred that responsibility to Public Works. Now, all of those trees are in inventory, and all of those trees are receiving recurring, cyclical maintenance via the Public Works tree maintenance contractor. That's been a big change in doing proactive maintenance for park trees that Community Services was not capable of doing previously.
Chair McDougall: I think there will be great cooperation.

Commissioner Cribbs: I'm sure there will be. I just wanted to ask the question because I was anxious.

Commissioner McCauley: I'm going to dovetail on Anne's question. For purposes of this Commission, primarily we interact with the Community Services Division. I can't think of any issue on which there isn't a Community Services Department dimension. That would still be true for Urban Forestry and trees. When you go back to the limitation slide, even though there is not by any means mandates that come from this Commission that direct Community Services to do something, there's a much more close working relationship. For example, the Director of Community Services probably highly values the opinion of the Chair of the Parks and Recreation Commission. I'm not sure that the Director of Public Works necessarily cares that much about the Parks and Recreation Commission. In some respects, there's natural ability to hopefully move the ball in a helpful direction coming out of the PRC. Should Urban Forestry be more closely aligned with the Community Services Division? It seems like that's the inclination that I would be inclined to support. I'm curious to know your thoughts. If you can't answer right now, that's okay. I'll leave it there as a thought.

Mr. Passmore: I will offer this. My position was established right before I was hired. I'm the first Urban Forester for the City of Palo Alto. At the time that the position was being thought of, there was a debate about where it should be positioned, under what department. Community Services obviously was one of the departments that had strong consideration for positioning the Urban Forester position. The Planning and Community Environment Department was another, and Public Works was a third. There was also discussion proposed by Canopy that the position should not report to any department. It should report directly to the City Manager. It would be within the Commission's purview to evaluate if the reporting structure makes sense and make recommendations to the City Manager and City Council if you don't think it's as effective as it needs to be. That's a benefit of the Parks and Recreation Commission being involved in Urban Forestry. You can offer your opinion, and you can keep track of these issues that you think are relevant to how Community Services delivers a range of programs to the community. I'll offer that. I'm not sure if I exactly answered your question. That's my best attempt.

Commissioner McCauley: You definitely got at it. What are you expecting the Parks and Recreation Commission to do? Are you thinking it's going to be one State of the Urban Forest Report and that's it or is it going to be a more regular discussion item?

Chair McDougall: Let me respond to that in terms of the meeting we've already had. Before we go too far with all of this, one of the things we think we should do is at least form an ad hoc committee so we can have a small group of people spend some time in conjunction with Walter and Daren and talk about this. Some of these questions about how...
exactly is this going to work and where are the lines, I've spent enough time with Walter that I'm pretty sure we can make it work in a really constructive fashion. Maybe there should be some guardrails somewhere that would be put in. We're thinking, number one, it should be an ad hoc that we start with. In terms of some of the other things, Walter said we need to understand we're not a decision-making body. We're not a decision-making body relative to Daren, so why should it be surprising that we shouldn't be a decision-making body relative to Forestry? On the other hand, Walter's input was but if we want to make recommendations, we're perfectly free to even go so far as to have an action item, make a recommendation, and take it to City Council, let alone have a conversation with Walter about what should be done. The other thing is the question of is it just an annual report because we know an annual report is going to be good news or should there be a quarterly report that covers issues. Should there be the opportunity for the Chairman and the Vice Chair planning a meeting to say, "Trees are falling down. Maybe we better invite Walter to the next meeting." Walter can say, "I've had all of this activity and we've done all these things or we have these questions, I'd like to come to your next meeting." Those are the ways it's worked with Community Services. I don't see any reason for it not working that way here. I don't think there should be a rush to reorganize where Walter's organization fits. There's something different about the tree removal service; almost utility-like service relative to planting trees, taking trees out. I think Walter's right. We don't want to be a body where we have 50 people show up to say, "We want more trees," or "I want the tree in front of my house taken down," or "I want it replaced." Having arm's length is really good for that. I'm confident we can make it work. I am convinced that we should start with an ad hoc that sits down and discusses those items and comes back to the full Commission with "here's how we should do it" or "we shouldn't do it." The objective tonight is to bring it forward. I was enthusiastic. Daren was willing. I'll let Jeff speak for himself. Jeff was enthusiastic that this could be something where this Commission has a vested interest and could be useful.

Commissioner Cribbs: Even with an ad hoc, there's a staff person that gets involved in an ad hoc usually and then there's a report. That's all time spent away from the regular work of Community Services. I love this idea. I hope we can make it work, but I'm just worried about …

Chair McDougall: I think we should create our own ad hoc with Daren to talk about how does this work within the context of …

Commissioner Cribbs: That's the whole issue. It's with Daren. Look at the things that are on his list.

Chair McDougall: I'm talking about two meetings. I'm not talking about setting up an ad hoc that goes on forever. I'm just saying let's appoint …

Commissioner Cribbs: I'm being (crosstalk).
Chair McDougall: Let's appoint a subcommittee or ad hoc, whatever you want to call it, and create some structure. All of us trying to sit here and raise—we can raise questions. I don't know that we can come up with answers. Maybe we have that conversation with Daren, and then we sit down with Walter and say, "Here's our conversation. Do you think we can make it work this way?" I don't think we need all of us to do that. That group including Walter can come back and say, "Here's the way it would work." Does that make sense?

Commissioner McCauley: It does. Like you, Don, I think it could be a great fit. I do have one concern that I'll voice very briefly, and then we can move on. The Commission operates best when it's thinking about policy issues. Perhaps it's less effective when we're thinking about operational issues. I'm not sure how much input you need on policy issues. Perhaps you need more than you're receiving right now. I would be careful to try and keep the Commission out of the operational aspects. That's certainly what you're suggesting already, but I would want to try and put up fairly clear guardrails that what we're talking about is how to help you on a policy basis.

Chair McDougall: The other place where the Commission operates best is when we're assimilating community input, when we're a receptacle for community input and feedback to the appropriate body. We've done that in other cases relative to sea level rise and those kind of things that are not specifically in the Community Services. We've been successful at that without even a formal relationship. We're being offered the opportunity to have a real relationship here.

Commissioner LaMere: I like the idea of providing a voice to the presentation. There's a lot of synergy between health and wellness, which we're trying to get at with a lot of things we do on our Commission, and trees in our City. I'm also sensitive, as Anne stated, to further strain on staff's time. We do know that they're taxed with a lot of different projects. That certainly is a sensitivity. This is of importance. Many of my questions were answered from my fellow Commissioners. One question I have may be an expansion of a statement. I thought you said tree canopy resilient to climate and culture. I was just wondering if you could expand on resilient to culture and what you mean exactly with that statement.

Mr. Passmore: We have a chapter in the Urban Forest Master Plan that talks about the history of Palo Alto. It describes some of the impetus behind planting trees in large quantities and certain species. A lot of those decisions were culturally driven. There was a motivation in the past in Palo Alto to plant a lot of trees and to have this very verdant canopy that we enjoy now. We do see culture changing in Palo Alto based on where people are coming from, what their background is. Some of the desires for tree canopy are changing. It's not happening all at once because culture changes very slowly. It's something we should be aware of. One of the challenges that we have with growing trees around people is that people have very independent opinions about the tree in the...
community versus the tree in their own yard. We've seen, I would say, more in the recent past of people that are new to Palo Alto that don't have the same appreciation of trees as some of the residents that have lived here for 20 or 30 or 40 years. They're more interested in having the biggest house they can have in the safest environment and not so much in the surrounding landscape. I'm speaking in generalities because that's not everyone, but it seems to be more people now than it was 20 years ago. Part of that could be because people are wanting larger homes now than they did in the past, so there's less space for trees. Regardless of the variety of reasons, we do need to recognize those cultural differences as we have shifts in Palo Alto.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I'm very supportive of the concept. I've worked with Canopy a lot, and I certainly value the trees in our community and the work of our Urban Forestry Department. It's awesome that our City has an Urban Forestry Department and an Urban Forester. The proposal fills a significant void in the community. The creation of a new ad hoc is very appropriate. Are we looking towards Walter ultimately being the staff liaison to the ad hoc, which seems appropriate and would thereby alleviate the concerns of an additional burden on the Community Services Department. Daren, do you care to comment on that?

Mr. Anderson: I think that's right. Maybe in the beginning, I'd like to be there to participate, and more on an as-needed basis as we move on from there with Walter certainly taking the lead.

Vice Chair Greenfield: That sounds like the right approach, to have you meet initially to get things going in the right direction and then pass it on. The core roles of the Parks and Rec Commission are policy review and serving as a conduit for community feedback. Those are very appropriate roles for the Commission to fill with respect to the Urban Forestry aspect of our community and our City government. There were some comments about the challenges of increasing tree canopy. Yes, it's challenging, but it is critical to work on for the sustainability of our community and beyond. My experience is that lots of residents are really excited to learn that our City will pay for a tree and have a tree planted in their backyard or on their private property. It is really a grassroots door-to-door process started by somebody in the community. It's a process that takes time, and it's gathering momentum as Walter suggested. It's definitely the right approach. The enterprise GIS system, is it used by other departments besides Urban Forestry?

Mr. Passmore: It will be used across all City departments.

Vice Chair Greenfield: What are some other anticipated uses for the system?

Mr. Passmore: Right now, we have a proprietary GIS system that is branded GeoCity. It's a company that's only used by a few entities. We're going to be converting our entire City GIS system to Esri, which is the most commonly used software worldwide. That will give
us a lot of additional flexibility and tools that we don't currently enjoy. It will allow us to have a lot of prepackaged reporting and analysis capability. It'll allow us to compare data to other entities that are also using Esri, here again the most common GIS system in the world. It's going to be very constructive for the City to make this conversion.

Vice Chair Greenfield: What's a ballpark price for a system like this?

Mr. Passmore: It was in the millions, but I am not the GIS manager, so I could not quote you a price.

Vice Chair Greenfield: That's very exciting to see that coming our way. When we meet as a group to plan the agenda meeting, we had the idea we'd probably see Walter twice a year on average, once for an annual report and once for something else that comes up. Maybe it happens twice a year, maybe it happens a couple of extra times a year, maybe it doesn't. That was our working idea, which seems about right. I'm very supportive of this. I do recommend that we act tonight as a group to create an ad hoc in support of this moving forward. I look forward to increasing our relationship directly with the Urban Forestry Department.

Chair McDougall: Daren, do you have any comments you'd like to make?

Mr. Anderson: As Walter pointed out, our relationship with Public Works and the Urban Forestry Division has been the best in all my time at the City that we've had with Public Works. We've seen enormous benefits both in the maintenance of the trees, as he spoke about. In the previous years, it was on an emergency basis only or our team who aren't arborists doing essentially emergency work. The canopy suffered in the parks. They've seen big increases thanks to this partnership. This is a great step in the right direction. Trees are so important to all of our park users. I hear about it constantly, and I think this is a good venue for it. The ad hoc committee is a great place to start, and I'm looking forward to helping.

Chair McDougall: Just to wrap it up …

Commissioner Moss: As I've been listening to this decision, I'm reminded of the last meeting. There was a discussion of fire management. One meeting when we would get a ton of people here is if there was a fire, especially one in the Foothills that's coming this way. With more trees, there's certainly more chance of a catastrophic fire. They mentioned specifically the border between Foothills Park and Los Trancos Woods and Portola Valley and the need to somehow keep the canopy and the chaparral down. I don't know if this is a question for Walter or Daren. What is the time that we move forward with fire management and with the larger canopy that we're talking about?
Mr. Passmore: That's a discussion for a future meeting. In short, in the first 17 years of my career, fire management was one of my primary responsibilities, pre-suppression, fire planning, management of vegetation. I started with the U.S. Forest Service and worked for a state agency which is the counterpart of Cal Fire in Mississippi. Obviously, there's a lot to managing risk of wildfire. It's not solely how many trees you have, but what type of trees, how those trees are distributed, what kind of fuel load you have, how you prevent sources of ignition. Humans are a primary source of ignition. How do we modify that human behavior so that we have less starts of fires, especially in locations where they can spread quickly. We can talk much more extensively in the future. Daren and I are two of the Co-Chairs for the Foothills Fire Management Plan, a group of departments that think about these issues and try to address fuel loading and other fire management aspects of our public lands as we move forward. We've also made a lot of progress in managing fire concerns in the Foothills, where the risk is the highest. Be glad to have that as a topic of discussion at a future meeting.

Chair McDougall: I'm going to again try and wrap it up. There's been a bunch of discussion. I mentioned the idea that the Commission, any Commission whether it's the Library Commission or Planning Commission or the Parks and Rec Commission, is a place for the community to bring their conversation. I was going to say grievances, but not necessarily grievances, their conversation. As Ryan has pointed out, this body in particular has been particularly effective working with Community Services relative to policy. I'm not sure that that's true always, but this Commission has done that very, very well. The thing that got left out of that, saying that there was those two things, is the third thing. Everybody on this Commission would agree that we have been very strong in terms of advocacy. It hasn't been that we all came together and said, "We're all advocates for a particular thing." Anne said, "I'm an advocate for what's going on with the swimming." Ryan said, "I'm an advocate for what's happening at Foothills." Jeff said, "I'm an advocate for what's happening at soccer." We talk about it together and get our collective voices together as advocates. I think that's been particularly effective. The risk that we should warn Walter of is that we will become advocates. As an advocate, it's on the record, you invited us to say what other presentations would we like other than the annual thing. If this Commission's doing its job relative to a relationship with you, they will ask questions. Please come and tell us about all the oak trees. Please come and tell us about whatever. I would hope that this cooperation we're talking about now would last as opposed to you guys are asking too many questions. I hope that those questions would be good for you and good for the community. You said you would like us to feel that our input is valuable. We know our input's valuable. You should understand that we know that our input is valuable. There are two questions that might be added to the "how do we do this right." Making sure of the logistics, is it an annual report, is it a quarterly report, is it a half yearly report, are there different topics. I suspect that can only grow and get better in terms of the way we communicate. Relative to the question of reporting and structure, over the long term there's a mission creep that needs to be worried about from the Commission and the
structure. As soon as we say, "Let's add Forestry," Forestry's in collaboration with Sustainability, why isn't Sustainability here? David called out that the Foothills Fire Management Plan is part of—it's on your sheet. How soon can you come back with that report because we're really anxious about that one? In fact, we owe that one to our neighboring communities. This is absolutely the right thing. I'd like to ask for volunteers to create an ad hoc. I'd like to define the ad hoc as maybe two or three meetings with Daren to start to make sure we're not doing what Anne's worried about, are we creating problems for Community Services, and then expand that ad hoc to define how the relationship might be, bring that back and then maybe define a new ad hoc that would have the relationship with you, Walter, as the foundation of the relationship with the Commission. Do I have any questions or comments on any of that?

Vice Chair Greenfield: I'm not sure I understand the need to have two ad hocs or two sequential ad hocs. For continuity purposes, it would make sense to have an ad hoc established that works with Daren and Walter to get things off the ground and then that ad hoc continues to work with Walter. Maybe I'm missing something.

Chair McDougall: I'm only concerned that we need a first step to say how we're going to do this. Maybe we should have that discussion amongst us before we take Walter's time. Maybe we should get some ideas about how this might work. Some of the reservations I've heard tonight about what will it do, it might be logical that the ad hoc would continue on. Maybe we can define one, and that one can stop after. The very thing that ad hoc has to do is define and help Walter feel comfortable with the relationship we'll have. You'd like to feel comfortable that we're building a good relationship.

Mr. Passmore: I wouldn't have proposed it if I didn't feel comfortable. This is the right fit. To give you a level of comfort, in my previous position we had an Urban Forestry Board, which was a decision-making body. They were much more directive and involved in our business than anything we're going to create in the City of Palo Alto.

Chair McDougall: If we want to say let's create an ad hoc and the ad hoc can take it forward in whatever structure, that's fine with me. Can I have some volunteers to be on that ad hoc?

Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm interested.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I'm interested.

Chair McDougall: I'll volunteer to start with you guys on that. That would be a good start. We need to move quickly and embrace this. If that's all, thank you very much for a great discussion. Thank you, Walter, for coming and offering this new relationship.
3. Community Garden Guidelines

Chair McDougall: Let's move on to Community Garden.

Mr. Anderson: Chair, I just wanted to check to see if you got any public speaking cards on this item.

Chair McDougall: I have two cards. I'll invite Penny Proctor—I have three cards.

Penny Proctor: I am the volunteer liaison for Eleanor Community Garden. I wanted to thank everyone for the process that made this total rewrite of the rules into these Guidelines. They asked all the gardeners. We had several meetings. All the gardeners were invited. Several more meetings with all the liaisons. It was written and rewritten. I'm delighted with the result. Thank you.

Chair McDougall: Thank you, Penny. Karen Holman.

Karen Holman: Thank you for the service of Penny and Catherine. We're fortunate to have them. This has been an issue of mine for several years now. Actually, I have a garden plot at Pardee, have had for several years. Starting just a few years ago, there was the insertion, if you will, of PVC piping structures. It's just proliferated and proliferated. Unless you go to the garden—for some reason or other, it's really exacerbated at Pardee. I don't see it at other gardens. What you can't tell from these rules and why I have concerns about these rules is that they're really guidance, but they aren't rules. I feel that they're really not very enforceable. What you can't experience unless you go out to the gardens is, if you see a PVC structure referenced here, you don't have the feeling of some of these structures, like the one near me, the garden plot is 20x20, the structure is 20x20. That's why I'm saying you have to see it in real time. Because PVC isn't meant for structure, they tend to go like this, they tend to look like—I'll get to the photos in just a second. In my section of the garden, which is a fairly large section, there are ten PVC structures of varying sizes. In a garden section that is nearer to mine, that's nearer to center, there are eight structures. That's a garden section that's about half the size of my section. The one that's just across the road from that, from which you can look across and see some of the structures on the other side because they're so big and tall and dominant and because they're white. In that garden section, one garden plot alone has six structures, six structures. It's dominant. The rules right now say any trellis or other structure will be allowed if it is functional, orderly, safe, in use, and contributes to the community garden's overall visual continuity. What happens with this environment or any environment is once that visual character starts to change, in this case with the introduction of PVC structures, the visual continuity—what is it—it's changed. If you look at some of these images where there isn't PVC, that's what the garden has always been until the last few years. That provides the visual continuity. When you have the introduction and proliferation of PVC structures, what's the visual continuity? Is it PVC structures? When it comes to the structures, PVC
isn't even mentioned. There's no way to preclude it. You're putting these two young ladies in a very difficult situation. How are they going to argue for visual continuity when PVC is proliferate and you want to promote—other materials aren't even mentioned here, like wood, wire, metal posts, that sort of thing, the kinds of things that either start out as natural colors or age to natural colors because they oxidize or whatever. Those are the natural materials. We used them for all kinds of purposes in the gardens before. There are many products that you can buy that are low and netted and not PVC that you can put over young plantings. It doesn't require PVC. I asked the master gardeners—I understand they don't want to get involved in this—if they have rules about PVC, and they said no. I said, "What would you do if one of your gardeners came forward and asked about using PVC?" They said, "No one would ask." One of the other master gardeners who happens to have a plot also in Eleanor Pardee, said very passionately, "It's a petroleum product. It outgases." They would never allow it. It's just not appropriate for community gardens. If PVC is a good product for garden settings, why do we not see it introduced into our landscaping projects? I've never been to anybody's garden who has a PVC structure. Now, it's being used not just for structures over at the gardens, but it's being used also for staking. If someone sees a PVC structure, they're going to go ahead and build it and ask for forgiveness. It says any trellis or structure not in use for 3 months—thank you for your indulgence here—out of a 12-month period must be removed. What does that mean? If it's a 6-foot structure, does that mean the first 2 feet have to be used for something? The first 3 feet of a 5-foot have to be used for something? What is "in use"? Covered? Used to provide support? What does "in use" mean? There's nothing here that I can find that's enforceable or interpretable. I did spend a lot of years on Planning Commission, City Council. If a rule can't be enforced, it's not a rule. It's not even guidelines. I encourage you to go to the gardens, especially Eleanor Pardee, and see what the impact is. It's quite striking. It's quite stunning. I'm sorry you can't see it from here, but you can see them from way across the way. It really degrades the experience there. It's a respite. It's a restful place to be except for these intrusions. Why don't you see a lot of people here opposing them? Because the gardens are a community. We share produce. We share garden tips. We share plants. We share all kinds of things. It's like any kind of neighbor situation. People don't want to speak against somebody else's structure that they have in their garden. Why am I here being brazen enough to be here? I respect the other gardeners and the use of the gardens. I have great—that we have these community gardens is just phenomenal. Daren and I have talked about this. I'm here because I don't want to see those assets reduced in their quality and their enjoyment and even the health because of the use of PVC, a petroleum product that out-gases and is not made for above-ground use and which is a visual intrusion into the pastoral setting. Thank you very much.

Chair McDougall: Thank you, Karen. Shenae O'Dell [phonetic].

Shenae O'Dell: I wanted to ask about the no fencing because from time to time people bring their dogs and let them just run around in the gardens, which is an issue. I just wanted
to know possibly how could we eliminate or at least have some kind of fencing, maybe chicken wire that we can put around the plots just to ensure that animals aren't running in and out. The garden hours for the Arastradero Garden, Sunday 1:00, we're not able to enter at 1:00. That's an issue for me sometimes because life gets in the way. Sometimes I need to go early in the morning on Sunday. Maybe looking into allowing—maybe not parking at the parking lot but at least letting us walk in to do the gardening on Sundays in the morning times. That's all I have. Thank you.

Chair McDougall: Thank you. Daren, do you have staff comments to make?

Mr. Anderson: Yes. We have a brief presentation. Good evening. I'm Daren Andersen with the Community Services Department. I'd like to introduce my colleague, Catherine Bourquin. She's the Program Coordinator who manages the community garden program. At last month's meeting, you might recall that the Commission recommended the approval of an update to the Park and Open Space Regulations. One of the changes made to the regulations was to remove the community garden regulations that mainly provided administrative details on how the garden program operated. It was also edited to allow the Director of CSD to promulgate guidelines for the use of those community gardens. The ad hoc committee and staff worked together to create these Guidelines, which incorporate the administrative details from the community garden program along with responsibilities of the gardeners. The Guidelines largely consist of existing practices and policies; however, the ad hoc committee and staff identified opportunities to add new policies and procedures aimed at enhancing the garden program. I'll pass it to Catherine now to discuss those new elements of the Guidelines.

Catherine Bourquin: The Guidelines were basically revamped. What's existing right now is the same except for the ones that are in your staff report. These five were developed to help make sure we had the necessary information from the gardeners to know when they were having problems. Oftentimes, plots would appear unattended, and we would have to try and contact the gardener to see if anything was wrong or a notice would be sent for termination. They would later respond not understanding why. That was one of our problems with that section of the Guidelines. There were quite a few non-English speaking gardeners, who we've had a hard time communicating with and had to try to find translators. This delays important information they need to know. New gardeners would not start gardening right away. Before no time, their plots looked unkempt. Introducing an orientation for new gardeners will help with ensuring they are aware of the Guidelines and will help us know how much gardening experience they have, so we can assist them better. Under maintenance, the gardeners' responsibilities. There were six new Guidelines. We realized repeat problems kept coming up, such as leaving items in the walkways, disrupting other gardeners' plots by the misuse of the watering hoses, problems with shading other plots, the use or nonuse of trellises and structures. We decided they needed to be in our Guidelines to provide a clear expectation and to help the garden liaisons enforce these
problems. Under Section IV, we have four new Guidelines. These were generated to ensure the proper maintenance and the expectation to start at the beginning of the season. Since the community garden program is year-round, it was hard to tell if a plot might be abandoned because some would not start until later in the springtime. We also wanted to make sure that produce didn't go to waste, so we developed that Guideline. Also ensuring that communication between the gardener to the coordinator was understood. Under V, organic gardening and use of plots, we added only one new guideline, which only pertained to Rinconada Garden. Over the years, more and more new gardeners added fences around their individual plots. This started a chain reaction of sorts, where it seems to have become the norm. This causes problems on maintenance where weeds are hard to take out because of the location of these fences and some encroaching now on the pathways. The condition of the fences are also a problem. They're rusty, and they haven't been repaired for a while. Going forward, no fences are going to be allowed at Rinconada. The last section is the violation policy, which still exists. We just added a few things that we had issues with, such as gardeners would use somebody else's tools and not replace them, things go missing sometimes. Not very often, but disagreements between the gardeners can escalate. For gardeners who have received multiple notices, every year we put a cap on how many they can receive in 24 calendar months. This is how we developed these new Guidelines.

Mr. Anderson: Chair, I'd also like to thank the ad hoc committee who worked closely with Catherine to create these and all the gardeners who participated as well. We're asking the Commission for feedback. It's not an action item. Depending on the feedback, we can go back and edit these again and come back and communicate more with the gardeners if need be.

Chair McDougall: Catherine, thank you very much and thank you for being here and your friends.

Ms. Bourquin: My garden liaisons. I wouldn't be here without them. They helped me a lot.

Chair McDougall: I'd like to ask any who was on the ad hoc if they would like to comment.

Commissioner McCauley: It was the right thing to pull these Guidelines out of the rules and regulations and to have them be a standalone thing. I'm glad that the Commission endorsed that last month. With respect to these specific Guidelines, Catherine did a great job both gathering input from the gardening community and also trying to find the best way to articulate what the garden community is looking for. With specific respect to the PVC issue or the larger structure issue, the proposal here is a good one. We spent quite a bit of time discussing this within the committee. Essentially, it provides Catherine and the garden liaisons [video malfunction] right approach, and I'm supportive of it.
Mr. Anderson: Earlier, we were having difficulties with the computers, and I didn't get a chance to open the photos. I think we've resolved that now. One of the public was wondering if they could speak to the photos that I failed to get up in time.

Chair McDougall: That's fine.

Ms. Holman: Thank you. This shows the gardens with no PVC. There it is with PVC. Note the size of the structure, note where your eye goes. It goes to the white structure. If you look closely, there are structures here, but they're wood and wire and garden string that hold up all those plants. You don't see it. That's what you see when you come around the bend from the photo that's missing. You come around this really pastoral road—it's beautiful—and you make a few more steps, and that's what you're faced with. In your mind's eye, if you're thinking these are little things, they're not. This is what they look like. In some occasions, they're this large. Again, they don't manage the test of time. They start looking this way and that way in addition to being a big, large, white intrusion that outgases. Thanks. I think staff was going to answer my first question about fees.

Commissioner McCauley: I personally don't (crosstalk) Mayor Holman about the aesthetic. I personally tend to think that the PVC structures are not appealing aesthetically. However, my understanding is the feedback we received in community meetings with the gardeners is they don't think it's an issue that needs to be addressed. Please staff, if I've got that wrong, chime in.

Ms. Bourquin: Like I was saying before, the structures are extreme at Eleanor, but it may be six plots that have them.

Ms. Holman: No.

Ms. Bourquin: More than that?

Ms. Holman: Ten in my section, eight in another, seven in another.

Ms. Bourquin: Big structures?

Ms. Holman: I didn't count the big ones.

Ms. Bourquin: Not PVC alone. Most of them use it just to cover what they're growing, which isn't very intrusive. What she's saying, the reason we put in those Guidelines were so that we can mandate how big they make them and if they're not being utilized. Some of the ones that she's pointed out don't get utilized. You don't see greenery on there. Even though it's wood structures that you don't see, it's because there's greenery on there. The ones that she showed us were basically nothing was growing on them at this point. As far as enforcing, the license is a legal agreement that goes along with the Guidelines, and that's enforceable.
Commissioner LaMere: I appreciate everyone's hard work in revamping the rules. It's great that we've taken a look at both the parks, the gardens just to see what we can update. I do have a question on the thought of Section VI, the fences, Number 7, no fences allowed. Why are we grandfathering in fences that are there and then not allowing fences anywhere else in any other parks and also not allowing them to be built further in Rinconada as opposed to having all fences removed?

Ms. Bourquin: Only because Rinconada is the only garden out of the four that we maintain that has fences. It just started over time.

Commissioner LaMere: But we're not allowing any additional, and we're saying that we don't want them at any other parks. I was wondering why we would still allow them at the park as opposed to having them removed?

Ms. Bourquin: Only because most of the people that have installed them spent a lot of expense on their own installing them. If they do leave, they have to remove them. Eventually I would hope that we get down to not having fences at all.

Commissioner Reckdahl: About the fences, is it the height of the fences? How about allowing 2-foot fences? Would it be acceptable?

Ms. Bourquin: Our problem is that they're starting to encroach in our pathways. They're really hard to maintain. We're constantly having to send notices because they can't reach the weeds. There's so much Bermuda or other invasive weeds that go around there, and they just can't clean it. It starts spreading onto the pathways. That's primarily why.

Commissioner Reckdahl: If the fences were in good condition, then it's not as much of an issue. The fact that they degrade over time is the issue.

Ms. Bourquin: Yes.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The PVC, the thing that strikes me is the fact this is an organic garden. If this was not an organic garden, I wouldn't have as much (inaudible). My sister's an organic gardener, and you're not going to get PVC anywhere near their garden. They're very rigorous about that. The fact that it is an organic garden makes me think you don't want something like this in your neighbor's plot. I don't see any reason not to ban them. There are other options, wood, bamboo, steel. There are plenty of other garden things that are not PVC. We know PVC in the sunlight does break down; it does leach into the soil. Whether that's dangerous or not is an open question. I don't see any reason to have PVC in a garden.

Ms. Bourquin: Bringing up PVC, we'll have to look into the type of cans they use because there are certain plastics that aren't organic. The irrigation hoses, I personally would have
to go and inspect the hoses to make sure they're purchasing lead-free hoses. Not just PVC, we'll have to look further into everything that's a nonorganic material that everybody in the garden is using.

Commissioner Reckdahl: It is a slippery slope. It's also an aesthetic issue. I don't think we need to keep PVC in the garden. I wouldn't go any further and inspect hoses. I don't think that's worth the effort. I guess there are other options. Even if you said, "We're going to grandfather this for a year or two, and you can keep your PVC in there, but two years from now we want everything to be non-PVC," that would be a reasonable approach.

Commissioner Cribbs: I think that's a nice idea about grandfathering and the PVC. I'm wondering why somebody would choose to use PVC as opposed to something else. When you talk to the gardeners who are using PVC, what's the …

Ms. Bourquin: It's for the flexibility that the material gives. You can't do that with the hoops.

Ms. Proctor: It's smooth, so you can put (inaudible) or row cover or shade cloth over it easily. Wood or bamboo—for the coverings, not for a trellis. For a trellis, the wood and wire are superior. For bed coverings to keep the birds and the squirrels and the rats out, the PVC is superior. You can take the coverings on and off easily without it catching on every little sliver of the wood. It's incredibly aggravating to try to put coverings over a wood frame. There are colors of PVC available, dark gray or black, if you wanted to restrict it to no white. The white really shows.

Commissioner Cribbs: That could be an option.

Ms. Bourquin: We did discuss that during the meeting. This is what we came up with.

Commissioner Cribbs: The other question I had is about the dogs running through the gardens. It doesn't seem like that should be allowed.

Ms. Bourquin: They're not allowed. They're not supposed to. Only service dogs allowed. We have big signs that say that on the outside of the garden.

Commissioner Cribbs: What's the enforcement? Is there anything really you can do about it?

Ms. Bourquin: I've told the gardeners that, if somebody's not obeying a rule in the park, in the garden, they need to call communications so we can get park enforcement out there.

Commissioner Moss: I've been listening for the past 20 minutes about the PVC. As a longtime gardener, I've never ever heard of PVC not being in an organic garden. This is the first I've heard of it. Let's just assume that's the case. The most important thing about
PVC is the ability to make a structure where you can connect this piece to this piece to this piece very easily. You can't do that with wood. If you want to make $1 million, find a connector that's wood or something like that that will connect those four in a corner to replace the PVC. I do it all the time against the rats and the squirrels and the birds. It's impossible to garden without some kind of a net in this area. When you have the orientation, if there's something you don't like, you really have to train them with an alternative. You get your best gardeners who are doing it right, and you have a training session for all newbies, and you have these solutions right there. You even sell them on the side. Otherwise, it's not going to work. You're going to have that PVC for a long time or you're going to have squirrels and rats and birds. That's all I'm going to say about PVC. The last speaker was talking about hours. I'm assuming the gardens are open from dawn to dusk seven days a week, 365 days a year.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The church's Sunday morning services. They don't (inaudible).

Commissioner Moss: This is that one garden.

Ms. Bourquin: They're all sunrise to sunset.

Commissioner Moss: There was something in there about not starting your plots until April 1, but of course everybody has a winter garden separate from a summer garden. I'm assuming that there are people out there 365 days a year. Is that correct?

Ms. Bourquin: True, but a lot of people go on vacation, and they just leave their plots. Billing gets out in February, and the next thing you know it's March. April comes along, and they still haven't started their gardens.

Commissioner Moss: The enforcement is have your garden being used. You don't have to worry about what days of the year or …

Ms. Bourquin: They can either cover it or grow something. If they let it go to weeds, then …

Commissioner Moss: Then hire somebody to keep it neat if you have to, if you're going to be on vacation. You have that all in your Guidelines already.

Ms. Bourquin: I do, yes.

Commissioner Moss: It's the enforcement part. I'm wondering with this community if there's somebody who isn't following the rules, does the community come together and stop the one rather than a police person.
Ms. Bourquin: We're very lenient. We give multiple warnings before we give them that violation notice, which is a 30-day notice and goes along with the three times they can get the violation and then their license won't be renewed.

Commissioner Moss: Do you ever just clean up the plots without them asking?

Ms. Bourquin: One of our gardeners loves to do that.

Commissioner Moss: I was thinking it could be done in one minute.

Ms. Bourquin: I contacted other community gardens. Out of four, three did call back, and they do use PVC. They don't prohibit it in their gardens.

Commissioner Moss: I'd like to know the best practices for an alternative and publicize it at the new orientation.

Vice Chair Greenfield: We certainly had a number of discussions with staff about PVC. It's easy to say, given our choice in the matter, we'd all prefer not to see PVC, especially white PVC, in the gardens. It is intrusive. It arguably doesn't belong. It does serve a function for some people but not for others. First, we started looking into what PVC is in use in the garden. We found that all of our irrigation system underground for the plots uses PVC. At a certain fundamental level, there's already PVC in the gardens. We figured out we can make sure that any PVC that's used for potable water purposes needs to be appropriately rated. There are generally two types of PVC, the NSF-rated PVC for potable water and what's known as furniture-grade PVC. The furniture-grade PVC is the bright stuff you see in all the different colors. It typically doesn't have any rating or marking on it. It is typically rated for more sun exposure. There are very reasonable concerns to raise this evening regarding PVC. It's important to have a clear and enforceable policy so that, one, we can clear out unused structures. There are very reasonable concerns raised about defining what use is. We need to make sure that our policy is enforceable. We also had discussions about different colors of PVC. At one point in earlier revisions, there was more detail in the Guidelines in terms of what would be allowed and what wouldn't. That was scaled back to leave it to the discretion of staff. I have concerns about that. We need to make sure what we're doing is a consistent policy, and we need to make sure we have Guidelines in place to ensure that consistency is maintained. I'm not sure we're there by just leaving it to staff. I'm not sure it's clear to the Commission what are the Guidelines that staff would apply to allowing these structures. It would be helpful to get that more clearly delineated by staff. We were concerned about considerations for grandfathering in existing PVC to some degree. We are very interested in not having PVC proliferate further in the gardens, particularly in the new garden that's opening up. We'd like not to have large structures, particularly white, popping up in those. In the same manner that we're looking not to have fences in the gardens, ideally we'd like not to have the same thing happen with the larger PVC structures that aren't in use, particularly the ones that are more of an eyesore.
The policy as structured is a bit of a compromise. It's possible that this could get tightened up further. I'm open to considerations on that. I'm hearing concerns raised by Commissioners in that respect. We did talk about potentially grandfathering in PVC for a set period of time or structures over 2.5 feet would be allowed for a set period of time, and then it wouldn't be allowed after a year or two years. That's certainly something that could be discussed further. My comments are kind of fluid as opposed to decisive, but that reflects how I feel about the matter.

Chair McDougall: How many people are—Penny, what's your title?

Ms. Proctor: I'm a volunteer liaison.

Chair McDougall: Are you guys liaisons as well? There are all these rules, and we're discussing throwing people out of their plots and this and that. Is this something where there's a contention every day or there's a contention once a year? All of these rules and regulations, is this something that is stressful? Is there a bunch of this stuff going on?

Ms. Proctor: There's a certain amount of bad behavior. Guidelines will be very helpful for us to deal with it. One gardener drags the hose over the other gardener's plot and ruins their plants. There wasn't any rule against that. Now there is. Somebody leaves the garbage can in the path all the time. Now, they're not allowed to do that.

Chair McDougall: Does this gardener who drags his hose across the other garden still do it or does he say, "Look at these regulations. They scare me silly. I better not do it" or does he do it?

Ms. Bourquin: He will get a notice.

Ms. Proctor: It isn't against the rules until now. The main hose and garbage can, she's not putting the garbage can in the path anymore. She's gotten mad a couple of times.

Chair McDougall: I think I got the answer I want in your explanation and the head nodding behind you.

Ms. Bourquin: Annie's responsible for the largest community garden, so she has a lot.

Chair McDougall: I applaud the work. This is really well done. I applaud not just this work but the fact that you people do this. I can't imagine why we don't have more recognition of that, why you don't have special badges or whatever. This is an interesting environment. We should get you uniforms or something.

Ms. Proctor: I say I'm the weed police. I send people an email picture of their weeds once a month.
Chair McDougall: We should do everything we possibly can to get rid of white PVC pipes. If that means we say, "You've got one year to paint them," that's a start. You've got some restrictions as to how high they should be. I totally agree with Karen that there's two reasons for doing this. One is to get some vegetables, and the other is to be in nature and to do something that's relaxing. A bunch of white structures in the middle of the garden is not relaxing. I would encourage the ad hoc to go back and look at that again. I have comments on almost every one of the revisions. It says the primary gardener may choose to have a garden helper noted on their registration in case of emergency or this or that. Why shouldn't it be the primary gardener must have a garden helper for the purposes of following up?

Ms. Bourquin: I think the attorney took that out. I think we had that word in there.

Chair McDougall: Considering all these rules are written just in case the garden gets left alone or blah, blah, I don't think we have any way of finding out why the person's not doing it. It says non-English speaking gardener please provide a contact. Why isn't it must provide a contact? There's other wording in here about the primary gardener on the license is ultimately responsible. They're just responsible; they're not ultimately responsible. It's not baseball. How about two strikes and you're out or something? The first thing is plot allocation registration and fees. There are 19 things listed here. I can't be bothered. I knew I was coming to this meeting. I knew I was going to have to discuss it. I had trouble convincing myself to read 19 things. After I convinced myself and did that, I got to the next one. The gardener's responsibility has 16 things. When I read them, some of them are etiquette if you're a gardener. Let's call out etiquette and have five etiquette rules that you could clearly differentiate. "Let me refer you, Mr. Gardener, to our garden etiquette." There is other stuff in here about how to apply and fill out the form. You could have that in a separate category. Your job could be a lot easier if you had eight or ten different sections here that did different things and allowed you to know what you're dealing with as opposed to which one of these 19 am I referring to. The gardens should be wonderful. I'm not surprised that there are etiquette issues, culture issues. Garden participate expectations, what does that mean? Is it garden participation? It's the same typo in several places. It's not just one typo. I would encourage the ad hoc to work with Catherine and see if we can make this a useful document that people can read this and know what sections are being called out. You've got something wonderful, and this needs to reflect it.

Commissioner McCauley: Catherine, could you provide the Commission a sense of what you heard during the community meetings you held about the PVC issue?

Ms. Bourquin: We just asked the question, and everyone said no, they didn't have an issue. That was just one meeting that we had. I brought it up in a survey too, and I didn't get anybody saying they wanted to prohibit it. Mostly people were worried about treated wood. I hear from other people that treated wood nowadays is okay; yet, it hasn't come
Chair McDougall: If you asked the question, "Do you have an objection," you could get a majority of people saying it's okay. If you then asked the question, "What if we asked you to paint it brown or buy brown PVC," would everybody say "it's too expensive" or "I don't like it" or "yes, I want white"?

Commissioner McCauley: There are some technical difficulties to potentially using types of PVC that are not NSF rated. If you go with furniture-grade PVC, for example, it's not potable, it doesn't carry potable water, it's not rated for that. The likelihood of it degrading in a way that's dangerous might be higher. If you paint it, you're going to have a similar issue. You're going to have paint leaching into the soil instead of something else. There is a technical aspect of that. I commend Jeff Greenfield for digging into all of that. While I agree entirely with the sentiment that it is not a good aesthetic, for that reason I would say let's not have any more white PVC. What we're hearing from gardeners is it's actually useful to them and it's what they want. I'm concerned about asking staff to think about banning the PVC when it's something the gardeners appreciate and use. They want to be able to use that substance.

Commissioner Moss: There have to be best practices for organic gardening at industrial levels that should be passed around to every gardener. If you want it to be uniform and to go to the best practices, you have to educate. You can't get rid of PVC unless you have an alternative. I think there are alternatives. I don't know what they are. If you could find out what those best practices are and recommend them to every new whatever, then you could phase it out. Until then …

Commissioner McCauley: I don't know what they are either. Catherine and the committee did research into this and didn't come up with an answer.

Chair McDougall: You're swaying me to listen to the argument. I'd be interested in and ask staff to have a mission statement at the beginning of this document, that says here's what we're doing with community gardens. If community gardens are Number 1, Number 2, Number 3, and Number 4, plain and simply places for people to grow vegetables, and Number 5 to feel good about being outside, I would go with the right thing to do is facilitate growing vegetables and very politely ask Karen to go somewhere else in the park. If you wrote a mission statement, it would not be explicitly grow vegetables. It would be to create community. It would be to create fellowship and environment. If you wrote the mission statement that way, it might be more appropriate to think about whether white PVC is a good thing to have or, if the mission is to grow vegetables, it's maybe a different argument.

Ms. Bourquin: When the community gardeners feel strongly about something, they come right at you, and you get a million emails. Somebody came in and built a fence around
their plot, but it was industrial fencing material that did not belong in a garden setting. I got a million emails because I didn't know this person was doing that. She spent a lot of money on that, and she had to remove it. She did and put up a more natural-looking fence material. I would hear from more than a few people if they had a problem with PVC.

Chair McDougall: If you want to leave the document the way it is, I can't ask you to change it. I can recommend that your job would be easier if it was structured a little better.

Commissioner Moss: I would recommend that the community come up with a guideline, not the Parks and Rec Commission. We put in place the community gardens infrastructure. As far as how you run it and what it looks like, maybe it should be a community effort.

Ms. Bourquin: That's why we had a community meeting, to gather information of what people wanted in the garden.

Commissioner Moss: What do you need from us?

Ms. Bourquin: I wanted your edits and comments.

Commissioner Moss: You're not asking us to approve or disapprove?

Ms. Bourquin: No.

Chair McDougall: This is a discussion item.

Commissioner Cribbs: Can we talk about the fees? There's a part in the new Guidelines about reduction in fees.

Mr. Anderson: That was a helpful comment and a good thing to highlight. CSD has implemented a low-income fee reduction program on a trial basis, so not exclusively for seniors or people with disabilities. It's been in place since earlier this year, not just for gardens but other programs as well. Catherine sent this out to the gardeners earlier in the year with the billing cycle in February. The feedback I've gotten is so far it's going well. They're going to continue that for right now. They hope to make an evaluation on making it permanent by the end of the year. We should have more information on that soon.

Ms. Bourquin: And then we could change the document.

Ms. Holman: What about anybody who is applying new? How would know that they could then afford one by utilizing the low-income fee?

Mr. Anderson: Is it on the website where a new gardener would go to see it?

Ms. Bourquin: Not on the community garden website, but I can add that.
Chair McDougall: I'd like Jeff to wrap it up for us please.

Vice Chair Greenfield: I'd like to summarize the discussion we've had because the feedback is very mixed. It would be helpful to clarify how to move forward on a couple of different levels. In the big picture, originally the community garden rules were part of the rules and regs document, which the Commission made an action to recommend changes to last month. Part of that change was to remove all of the community garden rules from the rules and regulations document. When that goes to City Council for consideration, at that point we need to make sure we have new Community Garden Guidelines in place to (inaudible). I'm hearing mixed messages. Should we be considering phasing out white PVC or not? Should we be considering tightening up the wording so that Section 3.10 regarding the removal of unused items is more enforceable? Do we need more specific clarity regarding the consistency of how the Guidelines would be interpreted by staff for allowing new structures? Should we be considering low-income fee reductions? Are these things the Commission should continue to discuss with staff? I've served as both the community gardens liaison and on the rules and regs ad hoc. Once this is out of the rules and regs document, it may or may not be appropriate for that ad hoc to continue the discussion. I'm just trying to get clarity on where we are moving forward.

Mr. Anderson: Additional conversations with the ad hoc and the gardeners are probably the appropriate next step. That's what I recommend.

Chair McDougall: I trust that Daren will do that. If that concludes it, I would go on to Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates.

4. **Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates**

Chair McDougall: Everybody should have a copy of the update form. I would ask if there are any comments, suggestions, questions on any of these items.

Commissioner McCauley: When Natalie sent this out last week, I didn't recognize that there was an earlier deadline than usual. The Foothills Park ad hoc committee has been working in the past month on a number of aspects for advancing the pilot program, that we talked about at the September meeting, back to the Commission for consideration next month. For park amenities, Anne and I met with Daren this past Thursday and had a very helpful and informative meeting. Anne has already mentioned one of the big takeaways from the meeting. We've got many more projects in terms of capital improvement projects or park amenity issues in the hopper than we have resources. It's not necessarily the dollars but the staff resources. There's a constant discussion about prioritization. That conversation will continue. I wanted to mention to the Commission the issue that park staff could use some additional headcount if possible. That bleeds into CIP, which we're going to be meeting in the not too distant future. Those are the committees that I'm some part of.
Commissioner Cribbs: On the amenities one, we should change your name.

Chair McDougall: Yep. I'm glad that Ryan's able to substitute for me.

Commissioner Cribbs: On the Baylands 10.5, there's nothing there. I should have sent a little note. We're just waiting for community outreach and some environmentalists to be (inaudible).

Chair McDougall: Daren, we were anticipating the 10.5 being on a future calendar item.

Mr. Anderson: I think it is appropriate to have that one-on-one before we go public for the full Commission with the environmentalist groups. They've had a chance to talk to the athletic groups but not the environmentalists yet. That should be coming very soon.

Chair McDougall: Is there anything else anybody would like to bring up? I'm not going to go through the list one-by-one.

Commissioner Moss: The Baylands Conservation Plan, the Ravenswood groundbreaking was very well attended by many dignitaries. They touted it as a way to connect 80 miles of trail. The section just south of it is our responsibility. It's mostly paved except where it's not. How do we get that last section paved? I know there's a particular landowner who's a problem. Can we go around it or past it or do a half-assed job that doesn't require his okay?

Mr. Anderson: This gap in the Bay Trail in our property on the East Palo Alto side of the San Mateo County side of the Baylands Nature Preserve, the property owner is not willing to entertain the option of us completing that trail. It's an unimproved dirt section surrounded by either asphalt or decomposed granite. We approached the previous landowner twice and the new landowner to ask if it would be possible, and they weren't willing to entertain it. We tried to work this from a couple of different angles. We wanted to partner with East Palo Alto, so we've had conversations with their planning staff. It's outside the City boundary and outside the county. There are certain limitations on what Palo Alto can do. With the partnership with East Palo Alto and maybe other vested groups like Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space, it may be possible. I intend to continue the request and see if there are other options.

Commissioner Moss: It's going to become more visible once that new section is done by the end of January. It's going to come up really quickly. I want to urge the City to keep pushing at it. If you have to get San Mateo County and all those other dignitaries to help you, they were very excited. Right now the plan says that we're going to take down every vestige of that ITT property. You've got this influential historical group that says some of that is valuable. When we had the tour, they were suggesting that we leave part of it up or moving some of it. That plan, as it's gone out to the stakeholders, may need to be adjusted.
because it doesn't do (inaudible) groups that have the same interest in the same piece of
land. I just wanted you to know it's not a slam dunk yet.

Chair McDougall: David, I was at the same meeting with you. I think they were in love
with the poles. They understood more about the poles than we've ever understood. They
actually went out in the marsh and measured the distances so they could report in some
way where they were. They were much more discussable and amenable and understanding
that it was going to be removed than you're implying. We need to keep the BCCP document
and the plan the way it is and see if it gets more contentious. At the moment, I don't think
they were going to lay down in front of the truck or the bulldozers. Daren, you may have
talked with Lisa about that.

Mr. Anderson: Lisa has shared some thoughts as well. We're still actively working on the
CEQA analysis for BCCP and running into some delays with Planning. They're short-
staffed. I can't move forward without Planning's support. I had a conversation with our
firm, MIG, who's doing the CEQA analysis specifically about the ITT building. Their
concern in the CEQA analysis, independent of the conversation you just mentioned, is the
Historic Resources Board has one perception about the building and the Parks Commission
another. She was referencing possible issues with the CEQA analysis. We're still working
that out, but I really need Planning to help me walk through that process. Hopefully, I'll
have Planning's aid soon in moving that forward.

VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NOVEMBER 12, 2019 MEETING

Chair McDougall: Let's discuss the tentative agenda. For the next meeting, we would plan
to put the Foothills proposal on the agenda. Is there anything else that is imminent or,
Daren, you think we need to have?

Mr. Anderson: There's one project regarding the Utilities Department. They've got a
proposed project at Peers Park. There's an existing pump station at Peers Park, and they
need to do some improvements adjacent to it. That will require a Park Improvement
Ordinance. I'm assisting the Utilities staff in creating a Park Improvement Ordinance.
They'd like to bring it to the November meeting if possible, but they haven't completed the
document. They might not be ready in time.

Chair McDougall: We can plan for that. We have the aquatics and golf, and we've agreed
to move those to December.

Mr. Anderson: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What is that pump station used for?
Mr. Anderson: I'll send you the staff report as soon as I get it. I'm not quite sure. The change they want to make is about getting power across the tracks. They didn't want to go aboveground; they want to go below.

Commissioner Reckdahl: It's pumping water?

Mr. Anderson: No, electricity is my understanding.

Chair McDougall: Didn't we have a GIS update for …

Mr. Anderson: December.

Vice Chair Greenfield: What about CIP annual update?

Mr. Anderson: I'm not sure if I'll have it ready for the November one. For sure for December.

VII. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair McDougall: Are there any comments or announcements?

Commissioner Cribbs: Is there enough to do anything about Cubberley?

Chair McDougall: Cubberley's in process. Once we get the status from Kristen and the ad hoc, they'll come back. The Council did ask staff to negotiate with the School Board again. I think it's all pending.

Commissioner Moss: What about the AT&T property?

Chair McDougall: That was brought up by Daren earlier. There's a dedication plan sometime in the next several weeks.

Mr. Anderson: A community meeting to talk about the possible uses, November 9. That's tentative. Peter's going to confirm.

Commissioner Moss: They'll talk about the channel, the creek?

Mr. Anderson: No, I don't believe that'll be the focus. It'll be about Boulware itself and the Boulware addition and how we unify them as one park. This is specific to a CIP project as well.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned on motion by Commissioner Cribbs and second by Vice Chair Greenfield at 9:18 p.m.