MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
June 30, 2020
Virtual Meeting
Palo Alto, California

Commissioners Present:  Anne Cribbs, Jeff Greenfield, Jeff LaMere, David Moss, Jackie Olson, and Keith Reckdahl

Commissioners Absent:  None

Others Present:  Council Member Kou

Staff Present:  Daren Anderson, Catherine Bourquin

I.  ROLL CALL

II.  AGENDA CHANGES, REQUESTS, DELETIONS

Chair Greenfield:  Now, we're on to Agenda Changes and Oral Communications. Does anyone have any Agenda changes, requests or deletion before we go on to Oral Communications? Thank you.

III.  ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Greenfield:  Catherine, do we have anyone who would like to speak in Oral Communications?

Daren Anderson:  Chair, I'm not seeing any public speaking requests.  Wait, I'm sorry. There is one public speaker.  Catherine, are you seeing this in the attendees?

Catherine Bourquin:  It's Ryan McCauley.

Chair Greenfield:  Welcome, Ryan.  You have an opportunity to speak during Oral Communications.  Please go ahead.

Ryan McCauley:  Thank you.  I know you must all be wondering, "What in the world is he doing here?"  In light of my resignation from the Commission last week, I wanted to join you briefly tonight to express my gratitude and appreciation for the opportunity to
serve with all of you. As I wrote to you last week, I've been uniformly impressed by the commitment you have shown to our community, and I wanted to say that again tonight. I've also been incredibly impressed throughout my four years of service on the Commission at how each of you in a different way but a very creative way gets to the nut of a problem, the core of a problem, and solves it. The PRC has been working to responsively reform the Foothills Park residents only policy for a long time. I'm proud of the work that the PRC has done to date including our vote last November and most recently the unanimous voice of all members of the PRC standing up to support repeal of the residents only ordinance. The repeal of the residents only ordinance should be the easy part. It hasn't been thus far, but it should be. The harder part is the second piece of the call to action here, which is to formulate a nondiscriminatory policy that prioritizes equal access and resource protection. As you look forward, I encourage you to think about this as an opportunity to hit the reset button on this particular policy. What I mean by that is this is the time not to cobble together a smaller, incremental improvement on top of a bad ordinance, but rather to think hard about the best management practices and formulate a policy that our community will be proud to have on the books. I realize that you might ask, "Why are you jumping ship just at the time when you might be needed in this process?" The answer is multifaceted, but it comes back to, at the end of the day, my own analysis of the legal issues at play here and my personal conclusion that the Foothills ordinance is not just morally wrong but it's also wrong as a matter of law. Having concluded that the ordinance is in deep legal trouble combined with the Council majority's decision last week to postpone any discussion and perhaps mostly informed by Council Members' private feedback that they don't want to touch this issue with a 10-foot pole because they believe it's too politically toxic, I personally have lost confidence in our political leaders' ability or interest to meaningfully tackle this issue. Because of my day job as a prosecutor, while I previously felt comfortable working through the political system toward a policy solution that seemed to be in sight, I don't believe that I can continue serving in the City's system of governance while the Council maintains the status quo. I realize that there are those who will say that the Council majority only put this off temporarily to alleviate a busy schedule, and I appreciate that our Council Members have been putting in long hours and our staff have been putting in even longer ones. We all know that we find time for matters that are important, and this issue is not presently a priority for most Council Members. I very much wish that the Council Members who voted to postpone discussion will prove me wrong by acting immediately in August. However, I think it's very important that this be not a negative narrative but a positive one. To circle back to where I began, I offer you two final thoughts. First, I have great affinity for all of you and for the CSD staff. Thank you for your service and for your friendship to me. Second, I believe that there's much good work remaining to be done by the PRC on this issue and many others. As it concerns Foothills Park, the community needs the PRC's leadership and perspective. I know that Daren and Kristen have a plan for further community engagement, and I welcome that. On this policy issue, our community needs leadership. I think that leadership can only come from the PRC at
Chair Greenfield: Thank you, Ryan. As you well know, it's not appropriate for the Commission members to comment on speakers during Oral Communications. I feel comfortable in taking this opportunity to thank you for your service to our community, for your dedication and passion. Your efforts as part of this body will be missed, and we wish you well. Thank you very much, and best to you, and we'll keep in touch. I don't know if it's appropriate to allow any other Commission members to make a brief comment if they'd like to, without getting into substance.

Vice Chair Cribbs: I wasn't sure if it was appropriate at this point, but I really appreciate Commissioner McCauley's service to the PRC. I learned a lot from him on a lot of issues and certainly had a good time with the dog parks and the bathrooms as well. I thought he brought so much to the Commission. It will be very difficult to replace him. Thanks for letting me have a few words.

Chair Greenfield: Any other Commissioners? Thank you, Ryan.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I enjoyed working with you, Ryan, and good luck. I'm sure we'll see you around.

Mr. McCauley: Indeed. Same to everyone. Have a great evening.

Chair Greenfield: Are there any other speakers for Oral Communications? If not, then please let's move on to the Department Report.

IV. DEPARTMENT REPORT

Mr. Anderson: Thank you, Chair. Daren Anderson with the Community Services Department. The first item on the Department Report was to talk about Ryan McCauley, as you know, has resigned from the Commission. The Clerk's Office is checking to see if they can add the vacant Commission position to their current recruitment, which has an application deadline of July 21st. If not, they'll roll it into their next recruitment, which will be the beginning of August. I'll let you know when I have more information. I too would like to echo the sentiments to Mr. McCauley, acknowledging him and thanking him for his service. It was great working with him, and I really admire his passion and dedication and wish him well. Next update is about the Valley Water community meeting that was held on their tide gate project. This was on June 24th. Valley Water's website has the presentation materials all on site. That's valleywater.org/pafbtidegates. If you Google "Valley Water" and "tide gates," it'll come...
up. The website has a tremendous amount of information. I won't go over too many of
the details other than the core elements of their tentative project. They're going to
complete the planning phase that they're currently in and release a draft CEQA MND for
public comment in the summer of 2020. They plan on releasing the draft CEQA MND
also in the summer of 2020 and completing their 100% design in the spring of 2021 and
hope to start construction in the fall of 2021 and complete the project completely in
January 2025. A little update on the golf course. Generally, the golf course is doing
well. Most days tee times sell out or just a few tee-time slots are unbooked, which tend
to be the late afternoon times, which are the least popular. However, the course I would
not say is at capacity or truly sold out as these tee times are 12 minutes apart for social
distancing purposes. Regularly, tee times would be more like 8-10 minutes apart. I'm
going to go over just a few of the basic rules because I think it's helpful (a) for our
Commission to know and any of the public who may watch. All the tee times must be
prepaid online, so there's no walkup or in-person reservations allowed. There's no early
arrival, and golfers are asked to please leave once they're done playing, practicing, and
dining. No extended socializing, which was previously very common on the golf course.
As I mentioned, the tee times are 12 minutes apart for proper social distancing and to
reduce any bunching of groups and waiting. Golf groups will be allowed up to four
players per tee time arrival. There is no tournament play allowed right now. The golf
course pro shop and café remain closed to guests; however, onsite sales limited to food
to-go and essentials like golf balls, sunscreen, hats, and gloves are available. Now, there
is self-seating in the outdoor patio area of the café. There's no table service, and the food
is still packaged to go, but customers may self-serve. Again, there are no cash
transactions, so it's only credit cards and debit cards that'll be accepted as payment.
Regarding golf carts, only one person may be allowed per golf cart at a time, unless
you're playing with a family member of the same household. The practice facilities are
open. The range is open but with a limited number of hitting stalls, again, to maintain
social distancing. Teaching and instruction are also allowed with one-on-one instruction
with no more than two instructors or two students in a designated teaching area. That's
along Embarcadero Road. The safe parking program that my colleague, Lam Do, briefed
you on at the last Commission meeting is a Planning Department program where they
would like to implement a temporary spot for safe parking next to the fire station at the
Baylands Athletic Center on Geng Road. This area, as Lam mentioned before, is not on
parkland, and it's fenced off from the adjacent Athletic Center. I haven't received any
updates on the next steps or timeframe for that program, but I've got requests into the
project leaders from Planning. I'll let you know as soon as I have more information.
Kristen O'Kane gave me a brief update on Cubberley to share with you. The City
Council approved the lease with PAUSD for Cubberley on June 22nd, and a joint letter
was released to the public of the City and School District and can be found at
cityofpaloalto.org/news/displaynews. Kristen also noted that we're very close to finding
space for all the tenants that had been displaced and are hoping to have that finalized in
the next few days. I wanted to give you a brief update on recreation, arts, and sciences
programs. Onsite, in-person summer camps with stable groups of 12 campers start next week. We have a wide array of programs from the Junior Museum and Zoo, Art Center, Children's Theatre, and our recreation programs, including our popular camp at Foothills Park. Limited spaces are still available for camps all summer long. All the in-person programs will follow strict core safety guidelines including daily wellness checks for participants and staff, the physical distancing measures in place, and strict handwashing procedures, increased custodial cleaning and sanitation. Our camps have been modified to meet the County health orders. One of the most notable changes you may notice is that this year most of our camps are going to be longer than they have been in the past. This change is in response to the County's guidance that children may attend at most one summer camp program every three-week period. The virtual programming is doing well. We're starting virtual ceramics lessons next week, and this includes a pilot program that allows some of our experienced ceramics students the opportunity to rent a potter's wheel to follow along at home. The Public Art Program is overseeing the creation of a Black Lives Matter mural as directed by Council and Public Art Commission. Sixteen artist teams from diverse backgrounds were selected to come together today to create the Black Lives mural on Hamilton Avenue in front of City Hall. On Monday, the letters were stenciled in preparation for the work that began at 7:00 a.m. this morning. Each artist team will paint a different letter with water-based acrylic paints. A brief update on the pool. We have lap swim—this is all information you can find on the website if you want more details. Lap swim is listed, the hours from June 7th to July 31st. I thought some people might be interested. That's Monday through Friday, 6:00 a.m. to 3:45 p.m. and Saturday 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 and 3:00 p.m. to 6:00, and on Sunday 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. I thought it might be interesting also for people to note on July 4th the Rinconada Pool will be open from 6:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., and that's Saturday, July 4th. However, the play pool will be closed for the season. Lap swimming, the lanes are dedicated to lap swimming in the performance pool seven days per week, year round, with a lifeguard on duty at all times. Due to the new safety protocols, they're limiting the operations to one swimmer per lane. The pool's also offering a summer camp called Camp Rinconada for kids ages 7-12. A child's swim level is assessed on the first day of camp, and campers with similar abilities are grouped together. I double checked the website just before we came on. The camp has dates from June 8th to 26th. That's the three-week camp. That section is already full; however, the June 29th to July 17th sections still have availability. There are youth scholarships available from Beyond Barriers Athletic Foundation. You can find more information on that on the website. A little bit of information on the County health order. Our current health order that went into effect on June 5th—I should note that this is going to be updated some time soon, potentially next week, so be prepared for more changes to our order. This can be found on the Santa Clara County COVID-19 learn what to do," and you can find all the latest guidance. The general rules for sports and recreational activities is that you may now engage in outdoor, noncontact sports and recreational activities with members of your own household and no more than

Approved Minutes
one additional household as long as you maintain the 6-foot social distance from everyone from the other household and don't share equipment other than a ball, frisbee or similar item with members of the other household. There is no use of recreational areas or facilities outside your home that have high-touch equipment or surfaces. What that means for us is that our playgrounds, picnic tables, barbecues, drinking fountains and benches remain closed. There's no use of indoor recreational facilities like gyms except in your own home with members of your own household. You must strictly comply with the social distancing requirements in the shelter-in-place order. Tennis, pickleball, basketball and our playing fields are open with social distancing and with up to one other household. All our restrooms are open. Our dog parks are open with limited capacity to the number of people who can occupy it while maintaining that 6-foot social distance. Foothills Toll Camp will open on July 8th, and all the open space parking lots are open. Once we opened the parking lots, as I think many of you heard at the previous Commission meeting and this remains true—visitation in open space is still quite high. I hope to have more data on how that compares to prior years in terms of the number of visitors. I don't have that at hand right now, but I'll be bringing that to you soon. I also wanted to note that our one-way trails that we implemented both at Foothills and Arastradero to assist with social distancing have been successful. On our website you can find maps of those trails and details of where they are. The City's ordinance requiring people to wear a face covering is still in effect, and the State also passed a face covering order on June 18th. We must follow those guidelines for face coverings, but you should note that you do not need to wear a face covering when you're exercising. You do need to have one with you and ready to use. Just a recap of that June 5th order as it pertains to camps. You're allowed to have camps meet. They expanded the use of City fields and provided the opportunity to extend sports field participation. The order allows for one-on-one instruction of noncontact sports and allows children to participate in sports-themed camps. Many of our City sports organizations have already begun to reach out to see how they can provide sports-themed camps and one-on-one instruction using City field space. These groups will provide the City a signed affidavit which outlines how their camps meet the following guidelines, that is the groups of 12 stay together for a minimum of three weeks; adults can only interact with one group of 12 over that three-week period; and kids can only participate in one group over the three-week period. There is limited share of equipment and can only be used with that group of 12, and they've got to have that social distancing and no physical contact. I should note that this order does not allow formal sport practices or games. I want to provide a brief update on the JMZ project. It's coming along well. The building is substantially complete, and they're working on the punch list and have a temporary occupancy permit from the City to occupy the building so that they can quarantine animals. The zoo will be completed by the end of September. A very brief note on the Cameron Park community meeting. You'll be hearing more about this subject from our Landscape Architect, Peter Jensen, who will be presenting on it this evening. There'll be a virtual community meeting this Thursday, July 2nd, at 6:30 p.m. to discuss the Cameron Park improvement project. If
you would like to RSVP, you can email Jeanette Serna, that's jeanette.serna@cityofpaloalto.org. There's also a project website that has all this information on how you can participate. That concludes the Department Report.

Chair Greenfield: Thank you, Daren. Do any Commissioners have questions for Daren?

Commissioner Reckdahl: I have a couple. The Cubberley lease, how long is that lease, the duration of that?

Mr. Anderson: Forgive me, I don't believe I've got that information handy, but I can pull it up soon enough.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I'm just curious. If things change and we want to go back to the status quo, can we break that lease just with an agreement? If both sides agree, we can go back or is there some reason that we'll be stuck with this?

Mr. Anderson: Almost all the City leases have some sort of exclusion or out, and I would imagine this does, but I can't speak definitely to that.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The second thing was the tide gate. I saw in the notes it was 41 weeks we're going to be closing the trail in the Baylands?

Mr. Anderson: No, it's 41 months. It's a four-year project. Without looking at the map, which I highly recommend, if you're interested, you do because it gives the breakdown. In essence, it's a .5-mile section directly where the tide gate is located that would be closed for the entire duration of the project. It's the connection points of what's called Adobe Loop Trail, where there are portions that would be open.

Commissioner Reckdahl: You no longer would be able to go from San Antonio all the way around that loop to Byxbee.

Mr. Anderson: That's correct. You'd have to take an alternative route.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Part of the reason for that is they can only do construction certain times of the year because of wildlife.

Mr. Anderson: Once they dewater and remove the existing tide gate and start constructing, it's unpassable for that section until they rebuild it. Yes, the construction is very, very narrow in terms of the—I think it's four months of the year that they do the work. During the other parts, it bears the good question, can't we just pass through or can't you put in some sort of portable trail or floating trail? They addressed that question in the meeting and said they could not.
Commissioner Reckdahl: I could see that that could be dangerous, putting something like that in. It would be nice if we, at least during the times when we're not constructing, could use it, but I can see that being very difficult.

Mr. Anderson: I should note during the non-construction time, you can come up to the site. If you didn't, that would have closed like an additional 2 ¼ miles of trail on that section of the Adobe Loop Trail. You can come up to it, which extends some of your bike rides. Your point is well taken that it does stop you from making the complete loop on that section.

Commissioner Reckdahl: It's good to see you back, Daren.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you, sir.

Commissioner Moss: One other thing. The detour around it to go all the way from San Antonio to Byxbee Park is to go along East Bayshore. Now that they're doing the Highway 101 overcrossing, they're never going to block that off, are they?

Mr. Anderson: We made sure that we've got a connection point between our project leader, Megha Bansal, and Valley Water. They're going to be connecting, and they can share their communications to minimize any impacts.

Chair Greenfield: Anyone else? On the Valley Water closure, that's very disappointing news. I had met with the engineers at a preliminary meeting a number of months back and voiced a considerable concern about closing the trail, a very popular trail, for such a long period of time. It's very disappointing to hear that there isn't a way to structure the project so that the trail could be open at least some of those periods of time. In the conversations I had with the engineers, I was led to believe it might be a possibility. It's disappointing. Regarding the recruitment process for a new Commissioner, certainly we're hopeful that we can get someone added as soon as possible and piggyback into the current open recruitment cycle. Maybe we can talk further about that. Thank you. I appreciate the report, Daren. Good to have you back.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you very much.

Commissioner Moss: I am so happy that you were able to move people in the Cubberley, on the PAUSD side, find homes for them. I didn't think it was possible, but it sounds like you're very, very close. That's fantastic news. I really appreciate it.

Mr. Anderson: Lots of hard work from our Director, Kristen O'Kane. I'll be sure to pass that on.
Commissioner Moss: The JMZ, they said that they're going to open it to the public in March, and the animals are going to start moving over in October. They need the Cubberley space until probably the end of the year. Is that correct?

Mr. Anderson: I believe so.

Commissioner Moss: At that time, it reverts back to the School District?

Mr. Anderson: I'm not sure what the use will be but, yes, it would go back to some use between PAUSD and the City for other purposes.

Commissioner Moss: The City might be able to use it?

Mr. Anderson: I don't know for sure on that one.

Chair Greenfield: I echo David's phrase and congratulations that we've been able to find homes for all the Cubberley tenants. I know it's a subject that's been very troubling to Kristen. It's great that her perseverance has paid off. Any other comments before we move on in our agenda? We'll get started with our first business item.

V. BUSINESS

1. Approval of Draft Minutes from the June 4, 2020 Special Parks and Recreation Commission meeting

Approval of the draft June 4, 2020 Minutes was moved by Commissioner Reckdahl and seconded by Commissioner Moss. Passed 6-0

2. 2020 Sustainability and Climate Action Plan Update

Chair Greenfield: The update on the 2020 Sustainability and Climate Action Plan, Daren, would you like to introduce our presenter please?

Mr. Anderson: I would like to introduce Christine Luong, who's a Management Analyst for the City Manager's Office in charge of sustainability. Thanks so much for being here, Christine.

Christine Luong: Thank you for the opportunity. Good evening, Commissioners and Council Member Kou. Thank you, Chair Greenfield, for the opportunity to share our work on the 2020 Sustainability and Climate Action Plan. In this presentation, we'll review the 2020 Sustainability and Climate Action Plan potential goals and key actions for water and natural environment. You'll be hearing from Wendy Hediger in a separate presentation on zero waste. In addition, you'll be hearing from Pam Boyle Rodriguez next month on green stormwater infrastructure. We hope tonight for Parks and
Recreation Commission feedback on the goals and key actions before they go to AECOM for analysis. Our current Sustainability and Climate Action Plan, which we sometimes refer to as the S/CAP, is made up of three components. The first being a goal of 80% greenhouse gas reduction by 2030 calculated utilizing our 1990 baseline, the draft S/CAP framework, and the 2018-2020 Sustainability Implementation Plan. Consistent with the Council's adoption of sustainability in the context of climate change as one of the top three priorities for calendar year 2020, staff is developing a 2020 Sustainability and Climate Action Plan to help the City meet our sustainability goals, including our goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions 80% below 1990 levels by 2030. We've solicited community input on the first draft of the goals and key actions and have presented to Council, the Utilities Advisory Commission and the Planning and Transportation Commission, and now we're presenting to you, the Parks and Recreation Commission. While all seven areas are important, in this presentation we're focusing on the water and natural environment areas, which are particularly inter-connected. I'd like to note that the sea level rise contract was approved by Council last week, so we'll be moving forward with our seal level vulnerability assessment and related public outreach. While our overarching sustainability goal is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 80% by 2030 utilizing the 1900 baseline, we've several equally important goals in these following seven areas. These are the team leads for the seven Sustainability and Climate Action Plan areas, and the team leads for water, natural environment and zero waste are here tonight to answer your questions. The main sources of Palo Alto's greenhouse gases are very simple. About a third come from natural gas consumption in buildings and about two-thirds from gasoline and diesel vehicles. This is a very familiar chart that we've shown many times. It shows our 2018 overall greenhouse gas emissions from both Palo Alto municipal operations and community-wide emissions in metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent starting with our 1990 baseline, and then 2005 is a point of comparison. By the end of 2018, Palo Alto reduced our greenhouse gas emissions an estimated 36% from the 1990 baseline despite a population increase of 20% during that same time period. As you can see, the red bar is road transportation, and that represents Palo Alto's largest remaining source of greenhouse gas emissions at about 64% of the remaining total, followed by the solid blue bar, which is natural gas, at about 32% of the remaining emissions. The shaded blue bar represents Palo Alto Green Gas offsets. As a bridging strategy, carbon offsets are being purchased in an amount equal to the greenhouse gas emissions caused by natural gas use within the City. As you can see, natural gas use has not really changed in the past few years. If we include natural gas offsets, greenhouse gas emissions are down about 56.5% from the 1990 baseline, and then road transportation accounts for about 94% of the remaining emissions. We need about 300,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent of additional reductions to meet our 80 by '30 goal. Now, I'd like to turn to Walter Passmore, our Urban Forrester, who has some late-breaking news to share.
Walter Passmore: Thank you. We just wanted to share that this chart does not include quantification of sequestration for our natural environment. We are currently in the process of awarding a contract to construct a tree canopy cover analysis tool so that we will be able to quantify the sequestration benefit of the urban forest throughout Palo Alto across all property lines.

Ms. Luong: Thank you, Walter. As I mentioned previously, we solicited feedback from the community on the first draft of the goals and key actions through a virtual, on-demand 2020 S/CAP community engagement workshop, which included participation by members of the Parks and Recreation Commission—thank you for attending that—our sustainability website, and the April 13th Council study session. The primary goal of our 2020 S/CAP is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions towards our 2030 target; however, sustainability co-benefits can describe other desirable outcomes from our actions beyond greenhouse gas reductions. For example, actions designed to address climate change can also improve local air quality, provide regional benefits that extend beyond Palo Alto or improve public health. We're currently soliciting feedback on eight potential co-benefits that are listed here. Those will be used to help with the impact analysis that is forthcoming. Turning to water. We incorporated the community input to update the 2020 S/CAP potential goals and key actions, which will be the foundation for the eventual 2020 S/CAP. These are the potential goals for water: to exceed the forthcoming Making Conservation a California Way of Life indoor and outdoor water use target by 5%. This is based on new California regulations that will establish two usage targets for urban suppliers, one for residential indoor use and one for the total irrigable land within an agency's service territory. The next goal is to achieve 10% of total water demand met by water reuse, either recycled or stormwater capture; to improve current recycled water by reducing total dissolved solids by 50% by 2024 compared to the 2019 base year; to increase pervious surface, which also includes treatment of how stormwater runs off, within the City 10% by 2030 compared to the 2020 baseline; to manage stormwater by improving water quality to protect the San Francisco Bay and increase beneficial use of captured stormwater. The Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan goals will be updated once additional quantification work is conducted over the next three years to provide accurate, realistic, and publicly vetted metrics. There are six key actions for water. We've numbered them to make it easier to refer to, and they're not numbered based on priority. I'm not going to read them in full. To summarize the key actions, they are to maximize cost-effective water conservation and efficiency, expand the use of effluent from the Regional Water Quality Control Plant; increase implementation of green stormwater infrastructure; design and build a salt removal facility; develop a One Water portfolio. A One Water approach envisions managing all water in an integrated, inclusive and sustainable manner that is more resilient to the impacts of climate change. The One Water approach recognizes that water must be managed in ways that respect and respond to the natural flows of watershed and the natural ecosystem, geology and hydrology of an area. Projects and programs focus on achieving multiple benefits,
including economic, environmental, and social. The final key action is to create streamlined design guidelines and permitting process for onsite potable and non-potable water reuse. These are the potential goals for natural environment. At the June Council meeting, Council directed staff to come up with a metric on biodiversity. Staff intends to work with stakeholders to create a biodiversity index specific to Palo Alto. We welcome the Commission's thoughts on this topic. The goals are to reduce and enhance resilience and biodiversity of our natural environment and to increase tree canopy to 40% Citywide coverage by 2030. There are nine key actions for natural environment. These are numbered, again, to make it easier to refer to and not based on any priority. The summary of the nine key actions is to explore programs and policies to provide carbon sequestration and other environmental benefits; maximize biodiversity and soil health; coordinate implementation of various plans through the City's internal sustainability leadership team; expand the requirements of the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance; implement the Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan—again, staff will be providing a more in-depth GSI presentation to you next month—ensure no net tree canopy loss for all projects; identify opportunities to further reduce and eliminate the use of pesticides; include native plants and pollinator-friendly plant landscaping within all park capital improvement projects; and establish a baseline for carbon storage of tree canopy. For next steps, AECOM is creating a Citywide greenhouse gas emission inventory for 2019, including providing a more accurate methodology for calculating our transportation-related emissions, which will include airport emissions for the first time in accordance with new reporting protocols. AECOM will also calculate a "business as usual" forecast to show what emissions reductions will be achieved if we don't add any new policies or actions. As I mentioned, we've sought input from the Utilities Advisory Commission and Planning and Transportation Commission, and we're looking for your feedback tonight. We'll be returning next month to present on green stormwater infrastructure. I would like to note, the Parks and Recreation Commission is the only group focusing on water, natural environment, sea level rise, and zero waste. We really hope for your comments on those areas with a specific focus on water and natural environment right now and then zero waste in the next presentation. AECOM will work on an impact analysis on the draft key actions to estimate the greenhouse gas reduction of the potential actions, the estimated costs, and the additional sustainability co-benefits. We're currently soliciting feedback from the community on the co-benefits through a virtual public forum. We're also making note of the feedback from the first 2020 S/CAP webinar to improve our community engagement and webinars moving forward. The results of the AECOM impact analysis will help us further refine the goals and key actions needed to get us to our 80 by '30 emissions reduction target. We hope to present a package of options to Council in the fall. I'd like to thank Chair Greenfield for providing very detailed comments on the first draft of the 2020 S/CAP goals and key actions. We've taken those comments into consideration for the updated goals and key actions, and we're hoping for more feedback from the Parks and Recreation Commission. These are our suggested
questions for discussion at this study session. We're available for your questions, and we thank you very much for your time.

Chair Greenfield: Thank you very much, Christine, for the presentation. I know this is just the tip of the iceberg that you're presenting in a very condensed form and represents a very small snapshot into the many hours that you've dedicated to working on the overall sustainability picture and plan for our community. Thank you for all of your efforts in the community workshop and the outreach. Do we have any members of the public who would like to speak? I'm not getting any indication of that.

Commissioner Reckdahl: No one has their hands up on the attendees.

Chair Greenfield: Before we go into any specific questions, do any Commissioners have general questions about the presentation?

Commissioner Moss: This presentation is very near and dear to my heart. There are many, many things that resonate with what the Park Commission has been talking about over the past years. I don't see anything missing. We have the sea level rise project out at the Baylands. We have the urban forest canopy increase. We have the purple pipes and the recycling of water for irrigation for the parks. We are working very hard with the green stormwater people to do with the pervious concrete in our parks and bioswales. We have the Buckeye Creek project, which is a stormwater initiative. It would be nice if we did it by 2030. The natural environment resilience has everything to do with taking care of our open spaces and our parks to make sure that they're not overused. As far as zero waste, I didn't quite realize that our Commission was the only one looking at zero waste. Certainly, we're dealing with grass clippings and tree pruning, but I didn't realize that we run the hazardous waste center or the recycle center. That's news to me. Certainly what we do with our grass clippings and tree pruning. As far as biodiversity, having all that discussion two meetings ago about the pollinator islands and the growing of native plants in those islands and medians in the roads, we should definitely try to come up with a metric, maybe the number of square feet of additional drought-tolerant plants that we come up with. Of course, Daren has spoken many times about pesticide use and about reducing the amount of water used by parks. There's a whole lot of things in there that I'm very happy to see. I really can't find anything missing. That's a good thing.

Chair Greenfield: I guess we're moving onto specific or general comments.

Commissioner Olson: Could we display the key actions? I think that's where we were looking for the most feedback.

Ms. Luong: Would you like to start with water or natural environment?
Commissioner Olson: Water would be great. There was another slide that had values, something like that. The last one was increasing affordability. I think it was earlier on in your presentation. Reduce cost of living through cost savings, how do we imagine that manifesting as a co-benefit?

Ms. Luong: That is a great question. I should have been more clear that these are the eight possible co-benefits. We might not end up with all of these, depending on the feedback we get from the community on what's important to them. Right now, we're envisioning that the cost of living would be related to reducing the cost of living through utility cost savings, for example, or travel cost savings. If we build more houses next to transit, for example, people will save time and money on their commutes and, therefore, have some sort of benefits with their cost of living. Things like that are what we're envisioning by what we mean for reducing cost of living through cost savings.

Commissioner Olson: Can we go back to the key values? There were the water goals one. I don't think I have any questions on this one. I agree with Commissioner Moss. This has been very inclusive and very thorough and very impressive. The only other question I had was on the comment about the canopy and maybe recapturing some of the benefits from the canopy that we have. Could you describe that a little bit more? Are we going to be able to track that over the years or will it be like we know what it is today, but we don't know what it used to be?

Ms. Luong: I'm going to ask Walter Passmore to answer that since he can do a better job than I can.

Mr. Passmore: Thank you. When we construct the tool for canopy cover analysis, that will be part of our GIS system. Every year when we get updated imagery, the tool will automatically analyze that and be able to recalculate the benefits. We'll get an annual update on the carbon benefit and the co-benefits of the urban forest.

Commissioner Olson: Do we have any historical data on that that we could compare to what it used to be or will it be from today forward that we'll have that data?

Mr. Passmore: We have two points in time that have already been analyzed, 1982 and 2010. That analysis is already complete. I think it'll be timely to complete the analysis this year because we'll be able to compare 2010 to 2020 and see how far we've come in the last 10 years.

Commissioner Olson: On the tree canopy increasing to 40%, that means we want 40% more than we have today, correct?

Mr. Passmore: No, 40% of the City would be covered in trees. Currently …
Commissioner Olson: Oh, got it.

Mr. Passmore: ... we're a little bit over 38%. 40% may not seem like a very optimistic goal, but Palo Alto has one of the most vibrant urban forests in the state of California. Even increasing it a nominal amount is a fairly optimistic task.

Commissioner Olson: Does that include private yards and things or only public spaces?

Mr. Passmore: Both because our residents get the benefit of trees wherever they are. It doesn't matter if they're on public or private property.

Commissioner Olson: Interesting. Thank you. That's all my questions. This is a really terrific plan.

Commissioner LaMere: I appreciate the work put into this plan and the detail and also echo the sentiments of the previous Commissioner comments. As we go through this plan and try to reduce our emissions and everything we're doing, are we doing this also in lockstep or as a coalition with neighboring city governments? Certainly we can do everything we can and should do everything we can to reduce our pollutants, but we also will be affected by our neighbors. Do we have conversations with them and try to have similar goals?

Ms. Luong: That's a great question. Yes. There are several regional efforts to coordinate our work and share ideas. We don't coordinate specifically on what is going in each other's climate action plans. However, I do know that, for example, Menlo Park is currently updating their climate action plan. We have a lot of similarities in our plans and similar goals and key actions. We're relatively aligned. There is a Climate Change Task Force that Palo Alto participates in. In the issue-specific areas, there are regional efforts there as well. For example, with sea level rise, there are a lot of regional efforts around sea level rise because the water doesn't care about geographic boundaries. We have to coordinate with our neighbors on that.

Commissioner LaMere: Thank you.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I give this a very good. This is good stuff. Thank you for your time. I have a couple of questions for Walter. On slide 11, this said no net canopy loss. Let's say someone is remodeling their house, and they cut down a big tree. What timeframe do they have to have no loss? Do they have to have it as soon as it's done, plant enough trees to get the same canopy that it had before or, say, plant the trees such that in 3 or 5 years it gets back to the original canopy?
Mr. Passmore: On a project basis, we allow 15 years for that restoration to occur. That can be a combination of planting additional trees onsite and planting offsite or paying in-lieu fees.

Commissioner Reckdahl: You'd buy this on the secondary market?

Mr. Passmore: We do have an internal forestry fund that plants trees. We've been using that money to plant new trees in South Palo Alto specifically where we have less tree canopy.

Commissioner Reckdahl: If I pay the in-lieu cost, you turn around and plant that in the urban part of Palo Alto?

Mr. Passmore: Correct.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That is an apples-to-apples as opposed to planting it in the Foothills somewhere.

Mr. Passmore: No.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That would be a little different. On slide 9, it talks about increase tree canopy to 40%. What is it right now?

Mr. Passmore: About 38.5 our last estimate, but we'll find out a more exact number when our canopy cover analysis tool is complete, hopefully at the end of this calendar year.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What area is considered? Is that just urban Palo Alto or is that all of Palo Alto proper?

Mr. Passmore: Just urban Palo Alto.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Do you know what the canopy is in parks? Have we broken that out?

Mr. Passmore: We have not differentiated parks. Once we construct the canopy cover analysis tool, we will be able to separate specific areas. We could separate all the urban parks and calculate canopy cover on each one.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That'd be interesting. Would we have some bogey that we would have to meet? We'd want to get 40% in our parks or would we want something higher in our parks? Have we talked about that at all?
Mr. Passmore: I don't think we've talked about a canopy cover target for parks specifically, but that might be a great subject for the Parks and Recreation Commission to tackle.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I would imagine that it's easier to plant trees in parks than it would be in a private lot just because you have a house there, and that may be difficult. Whereas, in the parks, you don't have nearly as much competition for the land. I guess you do have the flood field and things. What about preserves, both the open space and Foothills Park, do we have any goals to increase the canopy there?

Mr. Passmore: Only nominally. We want to simulate as closely as possible the historic ecology of those areas. Daren could probably speak to that better than I can. There are only a few areas where we feel that we want to restore tree canopy where it's not currently present.

Mr. Anderson: Just to add onto what Walter just shared. I think a good example would be the re-oaking we did in Pearson-Arastradero Preserve as part of the golf course project, where we tried to save and establish as many oak trees as possible. That's a good example of a fairly large-scale endeavor to re-tree. The other one that jumps out at me as a necessity is for us to be on top of sod losses and making sure we protect as much as possible our heritage oaks throughout the Foothills region.

Commissioner Reckdahl: How many oaks did we plant in Arastradero Preserve?

Mr. Anderson: I believe it was 600 and change that were not necessarily planted but protected, that is a naturally occurring oak that popped up was protected so it would make it to adulthood.

Commissioner Reckdahl: We didn't necessarily plant those.

Mr. Anderson: No. Some were planted through our partnership with Grassroots Ecology, but many were free-growing, and they were protected.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That's all for Walter. I have a question on slide 5. I notice that one of the elements is landfill unrecovered recyclables. That is the greenhouse gases that were used to produce the recyclables or is this …

Ms. Luong: No. Those are the greenhouse gases that are emitted from the recyclables that can't be reused somehow. It's just the off-gassing.

Commissioner Reckdahl: It's off-gassing. What's the next one under that, the life cycle emissions from annual waste placed in landfill?
Ms. Luong: I don't know if Wendy can speak to that better than I can. That also has to do with landfill-related emissions, naturally occurring emissions from the waste.

Commissioner Reckdahl: It's the off-gassing from all the food containers and stuff like that?

Ms. Luong: Exactly.

Wendy Hediger: The life cycle emissions from the annual total waste placed in landfill is the emissions that happen in the landfill from landfill waste. The landfilled, unrecovered recyclables is more of an upstream emissions, so the emissions that, because we didn't recycle those items, like if we throw away an aluminum can or glass and new have to be made, there's a lot more emissions from making it from natural resources than it is if we make it from recycled material. We were trying to capture those upstream emissions.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That's offsite. That's not necessarily occurring in Palo Alto.

Ms. Hediger: Correct. It's just occurring because of the actions that we …

Commissioner Reckdahl: Actions in Palo Alto.

Ms. Hediger: Correct.

Commissioner Reckdahl: If I eat a tomato in Palo Alto, do we book the greenhouse gases that were used to raise that tomato or do we draw the line …

Ms. Hediger: We just looked at the garbage. If you threw that tomato away and didn't eat it, then we were taking those numbers.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I see your point. It's a lost opportunity that we didn't recycle.

Ms. Hediger: When we looked at the unrecovered recyclables, we really were looking at not organics but recyclables, aluminum and glass, plastics. I believe the County has changed for this new year. I think they've taken that out. Christine can talk to that more than I can.

Ms. Luong: Up until this year, Palo Alto Utilities has been calculating most of our greenhouse gas inventories. This year, we decided we need to follow what's called the GPC protocol more closely. AECOM will be doing our 2019 greenhouse gas emissions inventory. We're going to review all of the changes in the GPC protocol and look at how we've done the inventories in the past and make any corrections as needed.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The horizontal line there with the green arrow, is that for everything or is that just for the road travel?
Ms. Luong: No. That horizontal line is where we need to get down to for everything.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What timeframe do we have to get down there?

Ms. Luong: In ten years, by 2030.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That's pretty aggressive. I notice on slide 7 there's some other aggressive numbers. How likely is it that we're going to hit those?

Ms. Luong: That's a great question. It depends on the level of intervention. Right now, we've mostly focused on the low intervention, voluntary, market-driven solutions that can only get you so far. We've also done some interventions in the middle column, like our Energy Reach Code Ordinance, Council ordinances, things like that. One area that we haven't done anything in is the higher intervention, the government-driven solutions. Those will require Citywide voter-approved mandates or financing and utility-scale infrastructure shift. It really depends. Our consultant, AECOM, is going to estimate the greenhouse gas reduction potential costs and co-benefits, and that impact analysis will give us a range of the costs per greenhouse gas reduction for each of the key actions. We'll have various options along this spectrum of tools to get to our 80 by '30 goal. At some point, we're going to have to decide how many high intervention strategies are we going to employ to get us to 80 by '30. The question might be do we need true emissions reductions to get to 80 by '30 or are we going to do a combination of true emissions reductions and continue our offsets program to get to 80 by '30 and then do true emissions reductions by 2040 or something like that. After the impact analysis, once we return to Council, we're going to have to come up with the different scenarios and different packages of options for how aggressively we want to be to get to 80 by '30 or if we want to be not quite as aggressive and give ourselves more time.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That was a good answer. You've put a lot of thought into this. Why do they call it 80 by '30?

Ms. Luong: It's because we need to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions 80% by 2030. The shorthand is 80 by '30.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The salt removal facility at the waste treatment center would be onsite right now at the current location?

Ms. Luong: I believe so. It would be at the Regional Water Quality Control Plant.

Commissioner Reckdahl: We wouldn't have to have any additional land for that it. It would be onsite. The reason for that is to allow more recyclable water to be used?

Ms. Luong: I believe so, yes.
Karin North: It's to improve the water quality for existing recycled water customers since our TDS is rather high. It would be dropping it about half. It would be on the existing recycled plant facility.

Commissioner Reckdahl: That's what I wanted to know. It's because our TDS prevents us from using it some places. Thank you.

Vice Chair Cribbs: Thank you very much. Christine, thank you. This is excellent. I really appreciate all the work that you and all the other people have done. I wanted to thank Commissioner LaMere for asking the question about what are we doing with our neighbors. I'm glad to hear that we have some committees and some work that is going on so we're sharing best practices. It'll be fun to know more about that in the future and keep track of that. I'm glad you asked that question, Jeff. Community engagement is one of the goals, I believe, and one of the actions. Unlike Keith, I don't have the numbers of the slides. Can you talk a little bit about how you've done community engagement and how you will continue to reach out to the community and if you are including the youth of our community in getting feedback from them?

Ms. Luong: Great question. Our community engagement efforts were turned upside down because of the coronavirus. We were supposed to have our first in-person community engagement workshop on March 31st, which obviously couldn't happen because shelter in place started on March 16th. We scrambled, and we did it as a eight-part virtual workshop with the first workshop being a general overview of the 2020 S/CAP update and the remaining seven workshops on each of the specific areas. We had 204 people attend that workshop. We did a really big push to try to reach a broad audience. Half of the people who attended had never attended a sustainability or climate change-related event run by the City of Palo Alto before. That was great.

Vice Chair Cribbs: That's great.

Ms. Luong: It was fantastic. We had a Palo Alto youth group that participated, and they wrote some very, very thoughtful comments. I had originally planned on partnering with the sustainability manager at Palo Alto Unified School District. Unfortunately, her position was eliminated. I'm going to probably have to rethink that and continue working with the Palo Alto youth group that has been engaged. I had done a presentation at Stanford a while back and met with some of the students afterwards, who are all involved in what's called the Sunrise Movement. I've been in communications with them as well.

Vice Chair Cribbs: That's really great to hear on all fronts. There are so many thoughtful high school students in Palo Alto as we've been hearing as they've been talking to the Council about other things and also thoughtful students who are actually making this their life's work over at Stanford. We're really lucky to be in a place with so many resources. It's great that you're doing all that. Thank you very much for talking about
that. I'm feeling like that's maybe one of the places that the Commission could be helpful to try to continue to engage the community and be encouraging about being involved with this very important topic. That would be a recommendation to my fellow Commissioners. On the slide—again I don't know the number—in the list that said equity, I believe it was above the saving money. Would you give an example of address existing inequity, a pretty simple example?

Ms. Luong: That would be things like disproportionate poor air quality, if certain neighborhoods have poorer air quality for whatever reason, if there's an industrial center there, or access to transit. Midtown, for example, has fewer access points to transit than the rest of the City. Flood risk, there are certain homes that are much more at risk for sea level rise and floods. Equity could also be like South Palo Alto doesn't have as many trees. The tree canopy is sparser there. All sorts of things related to equity.

Vice Chair Cribbs: I'm really glad to see that. I congratulate you for adding that to the list. Thank you for doing that.

Chair Greenfield: Thank you for putting all of this together. Thank you for your efforts. The virtual workshop was an awesome effort. As you alluded, it was a significant redirect on how to pull this off. You did a great job with that. Is the workshop still available for viewing or is it still applicable? If it's not applicable, would it be appropriate to update it in the future and make it accessible?

Ms. Luong: We used Go to Webinar to do those workshops. We had a free 3-month COVID package for cities, which just expired last week. The online versions of those workshops are no longer available. I did download all the workshops, so we have them. That said, we are planning on doing new workshops with updated information. We are currently working on our engagement strategy for the next round now that we've updated the first draft of the goals and key actions and we have our second draft. Our current thinking is that we want to put together some more issue-specific webinars focused on the areas that had the most comments from the first round, things like what does it really mean to electrify your home. Another thing that came up a lot was carbon sequestration from the natural environment. We want to have some additional topic-specific webinars, follow that up with more online engagement opportunities, and then culminate. We had originally planned on having an in-person S/CAP summit. The way things are going, it looks like we probably won't be able to have an in-person anything for a long time. We're trying to figure out can we do some sort of virtual town hall to get more people involved and feedback on the final packages of options.

Chair Greenfield: I know it must be very rewarding. In the general feedback from the people who self-select to be engaged on this, their comments are really very—they get it. They get the urgency, the need for effective tracking and appropriate measurement, etc. The co-benefits slide and the spectrum benefits slide, those were great, helpful, and
useful. It seems like the salt removal facility is a fairly high-cost solution. I'm wondering what percentage of planned costs that represents versus percentage of potential reduction.

Ms. North: Do you want to clarify that question exactly how you're trying to—the majority of the cost of the facility is coming from the agreement we signed with Valley Water in December. We project it's about a $20 million facility, and approximately $16 million is going to be coming from Valley Water. Since Mountain View receives the majority of the recycled water, they'll be paying about three-quarters and Palo Alto will be paying about a quarter of the $4 million. It's actually not costing us that much money. The energy costs to produce recycled water is going to be higher because it is reverse osmosis, and there is higher energy demand there. To produce and blend is better than using potable water.

Chair Greenfield: It's easier to feel good about that. On the natural environment side, I've never been shy about being a fan of trees and all the great work that our Urban Forestry Department does. That's great work to hear that the sequestration analysis is coming soon. The Commission has been looking to formalize a relationship with our Urban Forestry Department. We continue to support that. I appreciate Keith's comment about looking to consider the canopy coverage in parks separately. We can certainly be (inaudible) of that. Walter, could you comment on the process if a Palo Alto resident wants to add a tree on his private property, what the City support for that is?

Mr. Passmore: We do have some cooperative programs that we fund through Canopy, our nonprofit. In part, those are funded through the forestry fund that I mentioned the in-lieu fees from development projects that can't plant replacement trees during the project. In part, those come from the General Fund. We're also exploring other potential future funding sources. For example, San Francisco passed a substantial bond measure to increase their tree canopy cover.

Chair Greenfield: If people want to plant a tree, they can contact Canopy and see how maybe they can get City support for that through Canopy?

Mr. Passmore: Correct. There is a level of assistance for some properties to plant new trees.

Chair Greenfield: I appreciate the increase from 38.5% to 40% is not nominal. It does take some effort. What you mentioned also segues well into my next question about the opportunity to get support for implementation of our master plan through additional grant writing. How much staff time goes into pursuing this free money that's out there? This is not the first time this body has raised the question and encouraged even more of this.
Ms. Luong: I remember that comment that you wrote very well. I personally don't spend very much time researching grants or writing grants mostly because I don't have the bandwidth. I know certain departments spend a lot of time. For example, the Office of Transportation has regular meetings to review all potential funding opportunities. I'm not sure what other departments do. It's really on a departmental basis.

Chair Greenfield: I continue to think it's an opportunity. I appreciate the budget process and the pressures on staff right now, but this may even be an area where contracting outside work to pursue grants could be a cost-effective solution. We've got these great urban forestry and parks and open space master plans with all kinds of ideas and programs waiting for implementation but lacking funding. I understand staff resources are an issue as well. If we had more money, we would be in a position to decide how to use it. I just want to also point out that mobility is an issue that's dear to the hearts of the Parks and Rec Commission, and we're very interested in supporting the pathways between parks and other areas in the community as well as schools and inviting recreation throughout the community. I'm not sure you got so much direct answers to your question on the biodiversity metrics that you posed. This is a difficult area. Maybe you could highlight a little bit more what your current approach is working with regional experts and resources like San Francisco Estuary Institute for developing metrics, and maybe you could comment on the prioritization between plant and wildlife. Are those equally prioritized or is there a difference based on metrics available?

Ms. Luong: I will turn this question over to Walter because he's been doing a lot more work directly on it.

Mr. Passmore: We have just started researching the topic. I think we've identified a good foundation to work from, which is the California Biodiversity Initiative. There's been a task force of scientists that came together to identify different measures of biodiversity and come up with a way to look across the entire ecosystem and establish biodiversity health measures. I envision this being more of a scale or grade to ideal and trying to assess where are we now and where do we want to be in the future. We've just started this effort. It's potentially something we could work on for a long, long time and adapt over time as we make progress.

Chair Greenfield: Is this applied differently to suburban areas versus Baylands areas or Foothills open space areas?

Mr. Passmore: Obviously it's going to be nuanced. We're going to need to involve our constituent groups. The Parks and Recreation Commission could be a key participant in fine-tuning the biodiversity index to fit Palo Alto.

Chair Greenfield: I think I can speak for the Commission in saying we're looking for ways that we can support the overall sustainability effort, whether it's using the body as a
conduit for community input and feedback, whether it's outreach to the community for specific programs they can help with. Please let us know how we can help.

Commissioner Moss: Are you using that imagery from 1982 and 2010 to look at areas of monoculture like green grass or concrete to see are we reducing the amount of concrete and green grass at a similar rate that we're increasing the canopy? Can you use those same diagrams for that?

Mr. Passmore: That analysis was specific to trees. We did not analyze any other features. With our new GIS system, we would be able to analyze additional features. Our interest in analyzing the amount of impervious surface or the amount of grass as compared to bushes or trees, those divisions are possible with the new enterprise GIS system.

Commissioner Moss: I'm thinking of specifically the Cal. Ave. parking structure. Can they put vines up the side of the structure instead of concrete and can they put plants and trees in pots on the top layer of the parking structure to reduce the amount of concrete and measure it?

Mr. Passmore: Some of those are being done. One of the improvements that we're making with the GIS is we'll be able to track those landscape improvements on a project-by-project basis. That will be information that you can analyze over time.

Chair Greenfield: Any follow-up questions from other Commissioners?

Commissioner Moss: Why don't we add Buckeye Creek to this? If we're going to spend $20 million to take salt out of the water and another $20 million to take solids out of the water, why don't we do Buckeye Creek, which will reduce significantly the amount of dirt and runoff into the creeks, which eventually run into the Bay? I would think it would be just as important, and it only costs $9 million. We could do it in the next 5-10 years.

Mr. Anderson: I don't know what to say, Commissioner Moss, other than I support that idea. I think we'll just continue those conversations.

Chair Greenfield: It's a funding issue and an assessment issue, where does it contribute and where can we get the funding. Thank you, Christine and Walter and Karin and all of your supporting staff, for this enlightening presentation. We're very supportive and want to continue to work with you and the community. Sustainability as a goal doesn't go away during the COVID-19 times. It continues on, and we need to continue to understand it's a priority and continue actively working to address it. We will continue our sustainability speaker series. Daren, would you like to introduce our next presentation?

Mr. Anderson: Yes, thank you. I'd like to introduce Wendy Hediger. She's an Environmental Specialist with Public Works' Zero Waste. Thank you, Wendy.

Chair Greenfield: Before Wendy jumps in, I apologize. Council Member Kou, did you have anything you wanted to add?

Ms. Hediger: Thank you very much, and good evening. Tonight I will be talking about Zero Waste in Palo Alto, specifically our 2018 Zero Waste Plan, Zero Waste in the Sustainability and Climate Action Plan, and a few of our Zero Waste efforts in parks and open space. I'll hit a few different topics. To start off, in 2005 City Council adopted the goal of zero waste. The goal is to achieve zero waste. However, knowing that achieving zero waste is very difficult, the metric of 90% diversion of waste from landfills by 2021 was adopted. In 2016 as part of the Sustainability and Climate Action Plan, Council adopted a more aggressive goal of 95% diversion by 2030. In addition to these goals, we also need to comply with State mandates. California has a goal of 75% of the waste created needs to be recycled, composted or source reduced with chains not created in the first place by 2020. The State created requirements for mandatory commercial recycling and composting to help attain this goal. Palo Alto also created recycling and composting requirements. In 2016, Council adopted the Recycling and Composting Ordinance requiring everyone in Palo Alto to recycle and compost. There's no enforcement for residents. This ordinance is aimed at the commercial sector, requiring them to have recycle and compost service and to sort their waste properly. It also creates a uniform color-coded system throughout Palo Alto so that, if you're at home, at work, at school, or at play, waste sorting is the same. Zero waste doesn't simply mean recycling and composting all of our waste. We can't recycle our way to zero waste. It's certainly part of the solution, but it's only one tool in the toolbox. Zero waste is a holistic approach to managing materials in a closed-loop system or circular economy where there's no such thing as waste. Discards are either designed out completely or fed back into the production cycle as raw material. Palo Alto's 2018 diversion rate is 82%. That's our most current rate. We usually have the next year's numbers by now, but things are a little delayed this year. It's good to note here that diversion includes all waste prevention, not making waste in the first place, reuse, recycling and composting activities. It lumps all of those things together. The 2018 Zero Waste Plan updates the first such plan for Palo Alto, which was adopted in 2007. The new plan contains new and revised actions designed to meet the aggressive goals adopted by City Council in 2016 as part of the Sustainability and Climate Action Plan, namely, 95% diversion of materials from landfills by 2030 and the 80% reduction of greenhouse gases by the same year. Before we could determine what new actions were necessary to attain our goals, we needed to find out what was still in our garbage. This pie chart shows the total tons of waste being landfilled by Palo Alto in 2016. Approximately 44% of what Palo Alto sent to the
landfill came from construction and demolition projects. Although construction and demolition projects have a high diversion rate, in 2016 it was 72% overall. The 28% they do send to landfill accounts for 44% of the total amount of waste landfilled by Palo Alto. Construction and demolition waste would obviously need to be addressed in the new Zero Waste Plan. We conducted a Waste Characterization Study in 2017 for the non-construction-related waste, the gray side of the previous chart. The chart here shows what was thrown in the garbage by residents and businesses. It does not include what was placed in the recycle or compost carts. Approximately 67% of what is being thrown away in the garbage in Palo Alto can be recycled or composted. The 2017 Waste Characterization Study determined not only what we were throwing out but also who was throwing it out and in what quantity. This level of detail is important when developing a plan. For example, here's a list of the top six materials found in the garbage from both residents and businesses. Edible food scraps top the list. That's food that could have been eaten. It's a slice of pizza, a whole apple, a chunk of cheese, etc., but it was thrown away for some reason. Perhaps it got lost in the back of the fridge and spoiled or someone didn't want to eat leftovers or a cook burnt it and it couldn't be sold. These are what we call edible food waste. It may not be edible when it was thrown away, but it could have been eaten. Food waste prevention efforts would need to be included in the new plan for these items. We want to reduce this waste from happening to save not only food from being wasted but also all the resources that went into creating the food, the water, the energy, etc. We want people to eat the food that they purchase. The second item on the list is inedible food scraps. These are pits, peels, cores, shells, things you wouldn't traditionally eat. These are items that should have been composted. The plan would need to also address improved sorting. The 2017 Waste Characterization Study is available on our website at zerowastepaloalto.org if you'd like to dive into all the details. Using the waste characterization data and information gathered from community engagement efforts, we developed the 2018 Zero Waste Plan. It includes 48 initiatives or actions to be taken to achieve zero waste and the 95% diversion goal. The plan includes refinement of existing programs, the adoption of new policies and programs, working with manufacturers to redesign products, and working with businesses and residents that are purchasing products that will eventually become waste. The plan is divided into short-term, medium-term, and long-term actions. If you would like to read the plan, please go to cityofpaloalto.org/zwplan. Shifting to the Sustainability and Climate Action Plan. Zero waste is an integral component of climate protection. Approximately 42% of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States are associated with the flow of materials through the economy, from the extraction or harvesting of materials and food, production and transport of goods, provision of services, reuse of materials, recycling, composting and to disposal. The flow of these resources contributes to greenhouse gas emissions, which is why reducing waste is an important strategy for both greenhouse gas reductions and overall sustainability. The goals in the Zero Waste chapter of the Sustainability and Climate Action Plan are no surprise. They mirror our Zero Waste goal and how we will achieve it. That's implementing the Zero Waste plan. We pulled out these high priority
actions from the 2018 Zero Waste Plan for inclusion as key actions in the Sustainability and Climate Action Plan. Starting July 1st, tomorrow, demolition will no longer be allowed. Instead, projects that wish to remove a whole structure will need to carefully disassemble the building’s components to maximize reuse and recycling. This current requirement only covers a small percentage of projects. To achieve zero waste, the ordinance will need to be expanded to include more projects. The next key action focuses on single-use disposable foodware. Using reusables conserves natural resources, decreases our carbon footprint, and reduces pollution. Palo Alto already prohibits the use of plastic straws, utensils, stirrer sticks, drink plugs, produce bags, and other disposable plastic items. To achieve zero waste, the ordinance will need to be expanded to single-use disposable cups and containers. Edible food is the biggest single material type disposed in our garbage. This next key action focuses on the commercial sector, requiring them to practice waste prevention by not creating excess edible food in the first place. It also focuses on recovering the excess edible food that they do generate for human consumption. The fourth key action listed is about residential food waste reduction. 26% of the residential garbage, what's thrown in the garbage can, is composed of food that could have been eaten but went bad and was thrown away. This initiative is to have the City learn why Palo Alto residents waste food and then create outreach and programs to help them reduce that amount. The next key action addresses diapers, which comprise 16% of all residential discards or 7% of Citywide discards. It ranked as one of the top six material types in our waste stream. For the last key action listed, some examples of ways to champion waste prevention are provide waste prevention technical assistance for businesses, provide waste reduction grants, promote the adoption of a zero waste lifestyle, and promote access to goods over ownership, for example, a rental or sharing of items in the community. Those are our key actions for zero waste. Changing gears to zero waste parks. I want to share this with you. For the past year and a half, zero waste in parks and open space have been collaborating on several projects to create an environment easier for parkgoers to practice zero waste, to get them in alignment with our recycling and composting ordinance as well. The goals of these projects are to create easily identifiable, color-coded, three-sort waste stations with signs to indicate what goes where and remove unneeded waste receptacles to increase efficiency. Previously Hoover Park had many unlabeled bins that only provided parkgoers the choice to throw away materials into the landfill or recycle containers. What were people to do with their compostable material? Another issue was illegal dumping in carts located at the front of the park. In order to rectify the issue, we reorganized the bins into waste stations and placed them in the locations that generated the most waste. The stations are color coded and include signage to guide the user on how to separate their waste properly. The carts at the front area of the park were removed to deter illegal dumping. This effort was successful, so it was replicated in other parks as well, Ramos Park, Mitchell Park, Bol Park—this park was just completed a couple of weeks ago—and Rinconada Park. At Rinconada, we decided to run a one-year pilot to test more efficient ways to achieve zero waste in parks. The pilot consisted of removing 44 waste receptacles from the park and
creating four large waste stations, which were centrally located, accessible to park users and maintenance staff, and easily serviceable by GreenWaste, our contracted hauler. During the pilot, we evaluated the waste to see what kind of change would occur. Here are some pre-pilot photos. The photos depicted on the top of the slide were from the compost, and the photos from the bottom of the slide were from the recycle. You can see that the material doesn't look different. People were throwing whatever they had in their hand into the nearest bin. It was not well sorted. Here are some photos from the pilot. The two photos from the top are from the compost container, and the bottom two are from the recycling. Now, you can see better sorting. There are food scraps and soiled paper in the compost. There are bottles and cans and recyclable paper in the recycling. Sorting isn't perfect but is definitely improved. Please note here, pizza boxes belong in the compost. That's a mis-sort. The pilot is now over and was deemed successful. There's been a decrease in illegal dumping, litter and contamination. Additionally, parks contractor has been freed up to perform other duties since they no longer need to service the 44 individual waste cans. Parks is currently considering having a similar setup at some of the other parks where it makes sense. Our current project, which is almost finished now, is one we're working on with open space in the Baylands. The Park Rangers removed 43 old concrete landfill containers and replaced them with 15 pet waste receptacles and ten waste stations. All the pet waste receptacles have been installed and are currently in use. Most of the waste stations were recently installed. I believe we have one more that is still on its way. It's my understanding that Cameron Park is the next on the list to be upgraded, and that will happen as part of its CIP project. That concludes my presentation. I want to thank you all for your time and open it up for questions.

Chair Greenfield: Wendy, thank you very much for joining us and bringing us this great information and for all the successful efforts. It's really inspiring. Do any Commissioners have any clarifying questions first? I don't see any hands up. Are there any members of the public who wish to speak? No. Let's go onto Commissioner comments and questions.

Commissioner Reckdahl: You talked about the sorting of waste. The Smart Station down in Sunnyvale, can you talk about the sorting they do down there?

Ms. Hediger: Sure. Our garbage goes down to the Sunnyvale Smart Station where it does go over a sorting line so they can pull out recyclables that get into the garbage. They also pull out some of the organic materials. However, we want to sort out as much as possible on the front end so that Smart can pull out everything else. If you look at our Waste Characterization Study, we sort the residuals that are coming from Smart. There's still quite a bit of recyclables left in what goes to landfill just because it's a lot for them to deal with. The more we can pull out on the front end, the more they can deal with the oops and get as much as possible out.
Commissioner Reckdahl: I imagine if they had to sort out 50%, they wouldn't do a very good job. If they have to sort out 1%, they can …

Ms. Hediger: Correct.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The conveyor belt's going down. They can only go so fast. We have three bins, compost and recycling and landfill. Do all of those go down the conveyor belt at Smart Station or just the …

Ms. Hediger: No. Just our garbage goes to the Smart Station. They sort our garbage. Our recyclables go to the GreenWaste recycling facility in San Jose on Charles Street. It gets separated by commodity type. They sort all the different recyclables. Our compost goes to the ZWED, the Zero Waste Energy Development Company, which is the anaerobic digester in San Jose. They anaerobically digest that, capture the methane, create renewable energy from that. The digestate, what's left over after that, is shipped down to ZBEST in Gilroy where it is then further composted and cured and sold as a landscaping soil amendment.

Commissioner Reckdahl: What happens if someone puts a pizza box in the recycling?

Ms. Hediger: Hopefully, GreenWaste will pull it out, and it won't go in with the paper. The problem with pizza in general is it's a little bit greasy. Grease can contaminate the paper load. As you know, with everything going on in the recycling markets, they want cleaner and cleaner recyclables. GreenWaste is spending a lot more time on the line pulling stuff out that doesn't belong in there. If we could get our recyclables as clean as possible to them, they could really make sure it's right for market and make sure our stuff actually gets recycled.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Does the pizza box get composted or into the landfill?

Ms. Hediger: I don't know. That's a really good question. I'd have to look into that. GreenWaste is really good about trying to do everything they can. Stuff's coming down the line, and they're pulling out stuff that's not supposed to be there and throwing it in bins.

Commissioner Reckdahl: They might just have one bin.

Ms. Hediger: It's probably going to get landfilled. I can double check if you … They're not going to be sorting it like—Smart Station's pulling stuff out for recycling, and they're also trying to get some of the compostable, although it's more food waste and things that fall down and are heavy. The GreenWaste facility is really dealing with recyclables, so we don't want to put things like pizza boxes in there because that slows them down from getting our recyclables sorted into commodity types to get to the market.
Commissioner Reckdahl: In sorting those recyclables, back in the olden days when I first moved to Palo Alto, we had three bins. We had the cans, the paper, and plastics. We sorted them ourselves. People obviously mis-sorted that too. Can you talk about the single bin versus the three bins?

Ms. Hediger: When I started in Palo Alto, we had just added the mixed-paper crate. We had the stacking crates, and they were different colors, the yellow, green, the blue and the dark green. In 2005, we switched over to single stream. We used to do a survey—I don't know if it was every year, but quite often—asking people how they liked the program, how things were going. We got a lot of feedback about wanting to simplify the program. There was a lot of pushback about having the different crates. If you source separate it at home and have your glass separated from aluminum and metals separated from paper, you do have a much cleaner stream. The tradeoff is that it's less convenient. When we moved to single stream, the community was very happy, and our recycling numbers really shot up. Making it more convenient had the detriment of some quality to the stream, but it still wasn't bad. Today, if we recycle right, if we have our stuff recycle ready, it's still very marketable material.

Commissioner Reckdahl: The single bin overall is still a good thing. One of the problems is that you have more by-waste. The glass breaks and gets through and contaminates a bunch of stuff.

Ms. Hediger: The glass breaking is less of a problem than it was in the beginning. When we first went to single stream, they were really worried about glass and the paper. I think they've done a lot and created these new machines to figure it out and get the glass out. Now they break the glass when it goes to sorting. It falls down, and then it goes to a special recycler who can separate the little bits of glass by color type. They have optical sorters that can figure out if it's clear or brown or green. Even some places can tell if it's window glass or not. We don't have that in our area. That's why we want bottle and jar glass only because there's different properties to all the different glass types. The sorting is getting much more sophisticated. Our biggest issue is people that put jars in with food in it or with liquid left in it. It's as simple as pour it out. You don't have to rinse it. You don't have to let it sit upside down overnight to make sure every last drop is out, but you need to pour out your liquid so you don't have water or juice or whatever in there. You need to make sure you scrape it out. I don't think residential is as much of a problem, but restaurants have a lot of goop left in there. Some of the multifamily complexes have issues with that. We've been doing a lot of outreach to encourage people to make sure they don't put food and liquids in the recycling. That's our biggest issue for marketability at this point.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Is that because of ignorance or is that because of indifference?
Ms. Hediger: I do a lot of outreach about it, so I hope it's not because they don't know. With so many things thrown at us today, there's so much information, if it's not something you're really thinking about, the information can fly by you, which is why we spend a lot of time saying the same thing over and over. Every year, I have what I call my maintenance outreach to keep people up to date on the really simple what goes where and these type of things. Some of it might be indifference too. For a while, GreenWaste was taking it and dealing with it at their facility. China was taking it; they didn't mind. They wanted the material bad enough they would deal with it. Finally, they don't need the material that bad anymore. They're trying to clean up their stream. They have an extreme contamination rate. It's like ½% is allowed, which is very difficult for the items they do take. It's making us clean up the stream. I think it's a good thing. By recycling, we are trying to make a raw material for a manufacturer to use. It's not somebody who is taking our garbage somewhere else other than the landfill. If we think of it as a commodity that we're making at home, it's a much better way to think about our recycling system.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Are we having any problems finding buyers for our plastic?

Ms. Hediger: We haven't. GreenWaste has found buyers. Obviously, it's a market system that goes up and down. We've worked a lot with GreenWaste. They've done a lot to clean up the stream. They've added more people on the line and fixed their line to improve it. We've done the outreach to get it cleaner. We've also asked them to prioritize domestic markets so that we have a bit more control and we have a better feeling of where things are going in that there are better environmental controls and social controls. All of our materials are marketed domestically. We're not changing what we accept. We've found a market for all the items on our accepted list. The only two exceptions are mixed paper that's going overseas and film plastic. All the other plastics, glass, metal and cardboard have good domestic markets.

Commissioner Reckdahl: You talked about demolition versus disassembly for house construction. How feasible is that? Does that allow cost or is it just a technique and, once people learn the technique, it'll be no problem?

Ms. Hediger: It starts tomorrow, so it's quite new. We did do a lot of outreach and engagement with the construction community to figure it out. That's why we're starting small. It's a small amount of projects that have a full demolition, like they take a whole structure down. We did a couple of pilots as well to test it and see how it went, so we would have some information. It does take more time, and it does take more money to do deconstruction, which is a very systematic unbuilding of a building, usually in the reverse order that you built it. There'll also be a salvage survey. A salvage group will come in before anything happens and say they'll take this wood or those fixtures or the brick. Those items have to be set aside and taken to the salvage facility. The rest has to be
taken apart component by component so that you have clean wood together, and you have gypsum board together. We can increase the recycling rate to over 90% for most of these items, so we'll get a much better recycling rate. It takes longer, and it's more labor intensive, so there is more cost. If you think about the whole construction project costs and then the demolition costs, it's not like the whole thing will increase, it's just that section.

Commissioner Reckdahl: A very small segment is increasing most of it.

Ms. Hediger: Some lessons learned from it that we'll need to figure out especially as we start talking about expanding the ordinance are that there will have to be a lot of community engagement to figure out what makes sense.

Commissioner Reckdahl: You talked about the disposable cups. Can you talk about the tradeoff between having the bag fee—you can still get a bag, but you have to pay a fee as opposed to some of those things like non-compostable stuff that we're banning. What's the tradeoff of banning versus taxing?

Ms. Hediger: We banned the plastic bag, but we had the fee for the paper bag?

Commissioner Reckdahl: Yeah. Compostable, right now you can't get non-compostable silverware at all in Palo Alto. We've banned some things, but other things we've decided to tax with a bag fee, for example.

Ms. Hediger: It's a good question, and I don't have a great answer for you. When you think about some items are banned because we really don't want them. Styrofoam is really bad. It's a litter issue. It's not very easy to recyclable—it's technically recyclable, but it's really cost prohibitive to recycle. It has all kinds of problems. There are toxins associated with it, so it was better to ban that. Plastic bags were those really thin, to-go bags at the grocery stores. Those are really bad items. We recycle them. They were accepted in our program, but the amount of bags we would get—when we used to have the recycling center, we would have a bin that people could fill up and bring their bags there. That thing would fill up and overflow. It was amazing how much it was being used. Those were only a portion. There was a lot of them being littered. It was just a bad item we didn't want to have. There are tradeoffs because paper bags have their own issues. You don't want to have no option for people at the store when they get their groceries if you did forget your reusable bag. I've worked for the City for 20 years, and I remember when I first came I did outreach about bring your own bag to the grocery store. Only so many people were bringing their reusable bag. We got to a certain amount. We were doing checks at the grocery stores to see how many people were bringing their own bag. Outreach would increase it by a little bit but not the majority. Adding the fee helped change the behavior so people would bring their reusable bag. It was an incentive to bring your own bag if you didn't want to pay the fee for the paper bag. If you forgot
your bag or you need a paper bag for your compostable collection that you want to put in your green cart, then you could pay the fee. The fee allows you to have that item but make different behavioral choices. Whereas, the ban takes it away. I think it just depends on how bad the item is if we want to ban it and whether there is a good option. Our current move towards compostable utensils and straws and stuff, compostables are good. Recycling is good. What I hope to tell you when I explain what zero waste is, recycling and composting aren't going to get us there. There's a lot of emissions from compostable items. You have to grow corn, the potato, whatever that utensil (inaudible), and there's emissions from that, and the transportation of those. These single-use items, whether they're compostable, recyclable or garbage are things we want to move away from. Banning the plastic utensils and straws was because they were bad and we were having serious problems with them. With compostables, at least people will know it's easier for them. If everything's compostable, they just put it in the compost bin. We can compost it down. Also, it's a bridge to get us to reusables. We haven't really figured out what does that mean, how would you have reusable to-go containers and utensils, and what's the system for that. We've piloted go boxes in Palo Alto for a few years, and we're talking with some other places. Things have kind of come to a halt with COVID, but we're trying to figure that out. Before we move to that phase, we need to test some things, but that's our trajectory, going towards reuse. It's a lot better.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Thank you. I appreciate your work.

Commissioner LaMere: I appreciate the presentation and what Commissioner Reckdahl clarified.

Commissioner Olson: Wendy, thank you so much. This has been really intriguing, interesting. I appreciate all of the information and all of our very ambitious goals. I hope we can meet all of those. Rinconada Park and moving everything to the very large, industrial-looking bins, has that resulted at all in more trash scattered throughout the park for folks who maybe aren't able to locate a trash bin or have you not had any problems with that?

Ms. Hediger: No, we haven't. In fact, illegal dumping and litter reduced during the pilot. We did have some people out on a few weekends handing out—we made little packets that were "what goes where" guides. It had a sorting guide on one side, and it also contained three different bags, a clear bag for garbage, a blue-tinted bag for recyclables, and a green-tinted compostable bag for compost and explained the program to the parkgoers. They liked it; it was very helpful. I think we had it available in some places for people to pick up too if they had reserved a picnic area.

Commissioner Olson: On the waste percentages, I was very surprised at what came in high. We hear frequently, at least I do, through different feeds about the fashion industry generating so much waste, but that didn't even make the list. Is that misinformation or is
it that maybe in Palo Alto we give clothes away as opposed to throwing them in the waste?

Ms. Hediger: We do have textiles on there, and I'm not sure what that number is. I know it was something we looked at also wanting to address in the Zero Waste Plan. Our first thrust at that is adding it to the cleanup day, to now you have the textiles that are collected with the cleanup day collections and make that easier for people. I think a lot of textiles go to the Good Will or Salvation Army or Hope. We donate them. Where does it go from there? If they don't get resold, if people aren't buying that, if they're ripped or torn, they can be made into rags. Some of the stuff gets sent to other countries to use, we don't really see where it goes. Palo Alto counts that as something that was reused. It was donated. Once it goes to Good Will or the Salvation Army, they separate out what they think they can sell and what our market just won't handle, but some other market would find it acceptable. Like China came up to here with the dirty recyclables from us, we're hitting those limits in other countries with clothing. I went on vacation a couple of years ago to Uganda, and they said they had just shut down accepting that kind of stuff from outside countries because they were just getting loads of stuff they couldn't deal with. Some of the loads of reusable stuff there—how many popcorn machines can they absorb from us? It's interesting to think about donation is really great, but how many people really use what you're donating? We do need to think about clothing as—maybe look at Thread Up or something where we can sell it to someone or start purchasing reused. I don't think those things about the fashion industry are off. I think it's definitely something we need to worry about, think about.

Commissioner Olson: On the demolition, you said it's just a small segment, and it's only total demolitions. Does it apply starting tomorrow with residential housing or is it more commercial projects?

Ms. Hediger: It's both. It's residential or commercial, but it's only projects—any project that applies starting tomorrow. Anybody who's already started the process isn't going to apply. If they apply for their permit starting tomorrow and they want to take down a whole structure, then they will fall under this ordinance whether it's residential or commercial.

Commissioner Olson: You mentioned it was a small percentage. Is it less than 5% of projects?

Ms. Hediger: I don't have that number. It's just a few, handful a year.

Commissioner Olson: Thank you again for the thoughtful presentation, Wendy.

Commissioner Moss: This has been an amazing presentation. I had no idea. I'm pretty savvy, but there's a lot of stuff here that I didn't know. I don't have any specific questions
that need more clarification. I'm just amazed that 7% of our garbage is diapers. That is just absolutely amazing to me.

Vice Chair Cribbs: David, I'm laughing about the diapers because I remember the olden days with diapers when you used to wash them. I think I have all my questions answered from fellow Commissioners who were very thoughtful. Wendy, I thought it was a great presentation. Lots to think about and lots to have things done about. I wanted to mention that I love the Rinconada Park pilot project with the great big bins. I was so happy to hear you say that they were working out well and that you had even provided residents and park permit holders with various kinds of bags that they were happy to participate in picking up stuff. My hope is that some day we'll be able to extend a culture of taking care of our parks to everybody who comes to the parks and let people pick up their own stuff and put it into those multicolored bins that you showed. Thank you very much for all your work on that. It was great.

Chair Greenfield: I want to echo all the other Commissioners' general thanks for this great presentation and enlightening us to ways to better preserve our environment. Most all of us get the message and want to do our part, but there's always so much more to learn. The clarifications on the food containers and how much waste you get there is helpful. We always have questions about which plastic bags can be recycled. Is any kind of plastic allowed or are there some plastics that aren't? What's the best way to get questions like this, more subtle questions that aren't covered on the signage that's put on the bins?

Ms. Hediger: Just give us a call or email us. We're always happy to answer questions because there are these subtleties. We always run this balance of giving enough information and giving too much information. Some people just want the basics, and other people want to know exactly where this little thing goes. We have a detailed list that's available on zerowastepaloalto.org/wgwtools. There's a short list, a detailed list. There are videos that may be very helpful for you. If that information doesn't answer your question, I love to answer questions. Give me a call, send us an email. It's zerowaste@cityofpaloalto.org. If you have a particular item, if you want to take a picture of it and email it to us and say, "What do I do with this," we get a lot of that.

Chair Greenfield: You will hear from me because I'll save a bag of stuff. It's like, "I don't know about this stuff." That's great to hear and get that clarified.

Ms. Hediger: We do have Zero Waste block leaders, residents that are really interested. They've been trained to be experts in Zero Waste. They may be able to answer your question too. If we're not available, if it's on the weekend and you really want to know or you want to get rid of it, you could look up on our website and find the Zero Waste block leader and contact them. They've volunteered to answer these types of questions. If it's a
fine detail, they may not know themselves, but they know how to get a hold of me to answer questions.

Chair Greenfield: Could you talk a little bit about what you're doing with the School District in developing young ambassadors for the program?

Ms. Hediger: I work with the School District. We have a Zero Waste Champion program. It's a stipend position. We would like to have one at every school; we don't quite have a Champion at every school. They're the expert at the school to answer zero waste questions and try to facilitate and foster zero waste efforts. They do outreach and education. They'll do it differently because every school site is different but try to educate not only the students on what goes where and get them involved in projects. The most important thing, which was really exciting, was the School District switched over to reusable lunchware at the beginning of last school year for the elementary schools. They got the kids onboard. While it was an increase in labor to get the dishes picked up, washed, and back out, it actually turned into a cost savings. With COVID, that's all come to a halt. They did projects like that. They were very important in helping that happen. That creates the atmosphere of "this is how we do things in Palo Alto." They also worked with administrative staff. The Zero Waste Champion needs to be a District employee at that school location so they're able to work with the admin, they're able to work with custodial stuff, they're able to work with the other teachers and the students. We've been doing a lot of work with that program in the last few years.

Chair Greenfield: I know it's very successful. I see the fruits of it at my home with my kids. They're well educated in the process and helping us all learn. How does our 82% diversion rate compare with other neighboring communities and on a regional basis as well?

Ms. Hediger: I haven't looked at that in a while I've been so caught up with the Zero Waste Plan and our Waste Characterization Study. We're definitely at the forefront in terms of California. California itself is at 60% in diversion. We're one of the leading cities. That said, we have a ways to go if we want to reach our 95%, which is going to be very difficult. That's definitely a stretch goal. You can see how it's plateaued. It was interesting when Christine talked about her spectrum of tools to achieve sustainability or the climate protection. It's the same thing for Zero Waste. I think we're further along that spectrum. Since I can remember, we've done all kinds of voluntary stuff and tried to give incentives and encourage people to do certain things. We're now moving more into ordinances like the construction demolition ordinance, the recycling and composting ordinance, the ban on foodware. We need to move and create a higher level of change so that we can attain our goals.

Chair Greenfield: Are single-use water bottles used for any Palo Alto events still?
Ms. Hediger: They're not supposed to be. Right now, we don't have any events, so I don't have to think about it. They can be used at events that are not sponsored by the City. The Chili cookoff doesn't use single-use water bottles. The Art Festival is allowed to sell the single-use water bottles. A lot of events have worked with us to not have single-use water bottles and have the different hydration stations set up. It's a work in progress of getting it all. That's part of our disposable foodware ordinance that we'll hopefully be doing community engagement on at some point. We thought we would be doing it in April, but COVID came up. That'll be one of the other phases. We have a multiphase plan, and one is to maybe extend the ban on single-use water bottles across the board.

Chair Greenfield: I appreciate that that is a challenge. It can be a bit of a scourge hitting our parks. After a busy weekend, trash cans or recycling bins hopefully overflowing with a bunch of plastic, single-use water bottles. Could you clarify the different options for Palo Alto residents to drive to different locations to drop off different types of recyclable or hazardous material? I know some stuff goes to the Sunnyvale Smart Station. We have the hazardous waste station located near the Water Quality Control Plant. That just reopened June 20th. You can take your hazardous waste there for drop off. It's every Saturday 9 to 11 and then the first Friday of the month from 3 to 5. There are some places that will take fluorescent bulbs or batteries, some of the hardware stores. We have on our website the "recycle where" search tool. If you put in what you have, it'll show you where you can take your material. Some places take batteries and bulbs. I think PAMF takes medications. Some of the Walgreens, I believe, take medications. Depending on what item you're looking for, there are different places to take it. We've tried to get that all into the "recycle where" search tool so you can figure that out. If you want to take your recyclables to a recycling center, we don't have one in Palo Alto anymore, but there is the Smart Station recycling center that you could go to. There's also a recycling center in Mountain View. I would double check on that, though, because they were having some issues because of COVID. They might have closed, but I don't know where they are in reopening. A lot of the buy-back redemption centers closed throughout the state. We're having some problems having enough of those. Smart Station does have a buy back, and that is open. I believe they're doing it by appointment at this time to maintain the social distancing. That's on their website. Did that answer your question?

Chair Greenfield: That's great. I did use the "recycle where" search tool before and ended up going to the Smart Station to recycle something. It works; it's very good.

Ms. Hediger: I'm glad you like it.
Chair Greenfield: Thank you very much. Do any Commissioners have any final comments? Council Member Kou? Thank you very much, Wendy. Appreciate your presentation and all of your efforts for our community. Next is the review of the draft design of the Cameron Park improvement project.

4. Review of Draft Design of the Cameron Park Improvement Project

Chair Greenfield: Peter Jensen, you're up.

Peter Jensen: Commissioners, good evening. Good to be with you again under different circumstances than normal, of course. We continue as the landscape continues to age and need maintenance, even during the age of COVID. Our next project that we're going to talk about is Cameron Park. It's the next one up on our renovation. Cameron Park is located in College Terrace. It's one of the four parks in that neighborhood. It's the one with the larger turf space. We're going to talk about what was proposed, what was discussed at the community meeting and community meeting feedback, what we're planning on proposing now and, of course, taking some feedback and input from the Commission. I'm going to go through the presentation. If you'd like to ask questions as we go along, please feel free to do so. Our presentation is not too long. It should be fairly straightforward. I would like to point out that the image on the screen, the planting around the sign is quite fantastic. That's a Beschomeria, which is a very rare plant from Mexico, that puts off a beautiful flower. You don't see it that size very often. I just wanted to point that out, that it is a cool feature to the park. We're talking about Capital Improvement Project PE14002. There's a funding amount for $200,000 for it. Not a big budget for a park but good enough to do what we have to do to maintain the park and make the playground nicer than it is. That money is earmarked for this year, so we will be planning on doing the design and outreach process and then moving into the construction drawings and then doing the actual construction this year. Hopefully, we'll be moving towards construction. We'll see if we can get there in the fall or winter of this year. The major aspect of the park renovation is the playground. The playground has reached its life expectancy, which is somewhere between 15 and 20 years. That's usually when they get replaced. That does take up the majority of the budget. We'll talk about what we're going to propose out there because we are going to propose a couple of different things for the playground. Right now it is a tot lot playground, which means it's for ages 2-5. It is a sand playground. Those are things we are going to address as we go along. There are some accessibility issues in the park. There is not an accessible pathway to get you through the park and over to the playground from this part of the street. The pathway dead ends under these trees and doesn't get you over there. We're going to talk about some accessibility improvements, a connection to the path and then replacing some site furnishings as far as the picnic tables, benches, trash receptacles, and drinking fountain. Most of our work is going to be concentrated towards this end of the park. We want to maintain that turf area as far as open, outdoor space. Here are some
existing images of the park. You can see the existing tot lot playground. Here is the sole picnic table that's at the dead end of the pathway. This is an image of mostly the turf area that takes up the majority of the park. This plan shows the proposed renovations that were taken to the community. We held the first community meeting online for this project. It kicked off a normal process. What we proposed was changing out the playground equipment, which is number one. Number two was connecting the pathway through the park to get you over to the playground. Number three was reusing one of the tables in this location and providing more than one picnic table and clustering that closer to the playground. There's also some very nice shade trees in that location where we can put the picnic tables. There are some old benches around the playground that we want to replace. The drinking fountain hasn't worked in quite a while; we want to fix that. There are some old trash receptacles onsite, and we're looking at using one of the new divided receptacles. We are going to propose planting some trees along this line to provide more shade to the playground. When we start to reconfigure the turf area, we have to deal with the irrigation and reconfigure that to make sure it works with the new layout. We did have two bid alternates for the community to consider. A1 was adding concrete walkways here. Currently, if you're walking down this sidewalk, you dead end into the park on the grass. There is no accessible walkway on either side that connects to the other side of the street. We did propose that and a 42-inch fence around the playground. I believe that's more in response to what's happening with COVID. When the playground needs to be closed, it is possible to close it with a gate and not tie caution tape around it as we're doing now. This is the plan that was presented to the community for their feedback. We did hold two separate meetings. They were on the same day but different times to allow more people to participate. I can't say the turnout was high. I believe we had 14-18 community members overall involved. We did try really hard to get people involved. We sent out postcards to all the College Terrace neighborhood, every household. We also did a mass email to their College Terrace group. Here are some images of what the proposed playground will look like. The other major change, other than the playground becoming a little bit larger, is mixing the age groups. Besides it having age 2-5 equipment with the playhouse and the strapped seat and the spring toy, we're going to bring in some regular swings. The climbing structure is also built for older kids and the slide. This equipment has an umbrella over the top to provide shade, which was really liked by the community members that participated in the meeting. Along with the community meeting, we did an online survey. We dispersed that for a period of three weeks right after the meeting. We got better turnout on that, 44 participants. Some of the questions all 44 people didn't answer, but we got a lot more feedback about the amenities and what the community wanted to see in the park. I can't say the community was a big fan of the fencing around the playground. They didn't see a need for it since the playground is off the main street and tucked in the corner. They did request us to conduct an online survey to get more community input. There were some comments about repairing the site drainage, which was an issue. A neighbor's water leak was making an area of the turf not usable and wet. That has been resolved, so I think we have helped the
turf area to be more usable. There was a need to add more shade to the playground, to
plant more trees in the park. There was a need to provide other uses. A community
garden, horseshoes, bocce court came up. We'll show you some opportunities where that
can happen. Due to the restricted budget, we're going to have to develop those things in
the future. If the community would like to either fund or work on them, that is a
possibility. They liked the idea of providing play equipment for older children. They
liked more swings. There were some responses about keeping some sand. The proposed
plan replaces the rubberized surfacing with rubberized surfacing that allows all the
equipment and the playground to be fully accessible. Sand is difficult in that it is not an
accessible surface and does a lot of damage to the rubberized surface. This time, we've
left it out. Fixing the drinking fountain is something everyone wanted. Apparently it's
been broken for a while. That's the feedback from the community meetings. Our
community survey went through seven questions. The first question was about allowing
people to provide input about what they felt the park should have. That is enclosed in an
attachment in the package if you want to read individual responses for the renovation of
the playground, shade, drainage, and the pathways. When the survey was released, we
were in the beginning of COVID, so there's a lot of folks that didn't feel we should be
spending any money on the park. We've kind of resolved that issue. There were some
yes or no questions. Are you in favor of adding the concrete walkway? I was surprised
by the community survey feedback. It was close. There seemed to be a lot of support for
it in the community meeting. You can see 19 yes and 21 no. There was support for
eliminating sand with 22 yes and 14 no. There was not any support for fencing around
the playground with 12 yes and 27 no. There was thin support for adding a barbecue to
the picnic area. There is support for adding other amenities to the park to provide other
things to do, 24 to 11 no for that. The seventh question was about prioritization. If we
had limited funding to spend, which we do, what things should we focus on? The shade
structure and community garden came out as the highest for new amenities, and then it
went down from there. That was the results from the online survey. From that feedback,
we revised our plan. We've maintained the playground like it is. It still has rubberized
surfacing; it does not have sand. It does have an added shade structure over the swing.
We've maintained the accessible pathway even though the majority by one doesn't feel it
should be there. For accessibility purposes and access to the playground, we should have
it. The way the pathway system is laid out now, it's a no-brainer and an easy thing to do.
We've kept the picnic area in the plan with two tables under the tree. Number four is the
barbecue at the picnic area. Site amenities include a new drinking fountain and the trash
receptacles next to the drinking fountain. I have some images of these things we can look
at. Planting another tree closer to the playground. There are three very nice red oaks
planted next to the playground. They're probably about 15-20 years old. This tree grows
extremely fast. I think we're going to add one to the grove and let them grow together.
Within 10 or 15 years, they will shade the entire playground. That's how big and broad
and fast they grow. It's not a street tree, but it works quite well in a park. The bid
alternatives that we're showing here. A is showing a bocce ball court that could be added
to the park. The smaller rectangle inside that is a horseshoe pit. Those two things could be added at that location. B is converting that turf area and some of the ad hoc planting area into a community garden. Each one of those rectangles represents a 6x10 garden plot. That piece of turf, when it's divided away from the main part of the turf, becomes a prime candidate for reducing or eliminating turf for maintenance. Over time, if the community is really active and wants to work on the community garden, they could work with City staff to create a garden. It wouldn't be difficult to get some hose bibs out there off the existing irrigation system. Most of the work is labor, removal of the turf and building the plots. I see that actively taking place at all of our community gardens where there's a spot that hasn't been used. We don't have any funding for these two alternatives. I'm going to bring them up in a community meeting to see if we can spark some interest. This is a new image of the playground equipment. It's the same equipment as before except the swing post supports a shade structure. These are some proposed site amenities, the recycle receptacle, a new drinking fountain, a table that matches the existing one, and the bench that we've been using for park renovations. We're showing a drinking fountain that does not have a bottle filler because of cost. We like to use a high-end water fountain because it can stand up over a longer period of time. We've found this one where the buttons don't break, and it doesn't clog as easy. If you get two drinking fountains and a bottle filler, you're talking about $11,000. We can look at proposing that. The other ideas for the drinking fountain are the one in the picture or eliminating a drinking fountain and having a water bottle filler. In this day of COVID, that would not be a bad idea. Eventually it would probably be nice to have a drinking fountain. We're working on the design and community outreach aspects now. We'll be going to the community again Thursday night to review the new proposed plan. We will bring back the final plan to the Parks and Rec Commission sometime over the next couple of months to finalize. We'll be working on the construction drawings and going out to bid sometime hopefully in the fall. Sometime in the winter, more like November or December, hopefully we'll start to do the construction. Construction shouldn't last too long, probably a 30-day contract to do the work. The project has a webpage. The presentation from the first community meeting, the project summary, and the survey information can be found there. With that, I'll turn it over to the Commission for any questions or comments.

Chair Greenfield: Thank you, Peter, for a very thorough and clear and concise presentation as usual. Do any Commissioners have any clarifying questions for Peter? Looks like there are no members of the public who are looking to speak. We can move onto Commissioner comments.

Commissioner Moss: Could you make a playing field out of the field for little kids or whether anybody asked for a dog park anywhere in College Terrace in any of the parks?

Mr. Jensen: A dog park did not come up in College Terrace during the community meeting. The majority of the parks in College Terrace are not very big. The size of the
park is the size that we like for dog parks. You wouldn't want to use the whole park for a
dog park, but we can find out more about that. I don't know much about the
programming of the field. Daren, do you have any feedback on that? I don't think the
field is programmed for any type of use. The only thing that would be limiting is the
existing trees that are growing out in the middle of it. For soccer practice, it would
probably be okay.

Mr. Anderson: That's the most. It's been a tiny bit of soccer practice. It's too small for
any sort of games or athletic competitions.

Commissioner Olson: Are we not considering a bathroom here because most people
probably live close enough that they can run home to use the bathroom?

Mr. Jensen: We determined where to move forward with restrooms during the Parks
master planning process a couple of years ago. It was based upon park size and
amenities. This park's size does not meet the requirement even though there is a
playground there. The playground is used mostly by the local community. Not a lot of
people drive to it.

Commissioner Olson: Do we have a sense of whether there is still a lot of demand for
community gardens, particularly in this area?

Mr. Jensen: It was brought up in the community meeting and the community survey.
There is support for a community garden. If we build it, people would come.
Unfortunately, I don't have the funding to build it. We wouldn't be opposed if people
wanted to work on a community garden.

Mr. Anderson: Commissioner Olson, if I could add a little bit of detail to your question
about how we gauge interest in community gardens for projects like this. Catherine
Bourquin could elaborate, but when we had the church property that we recently
transitioned into a community garden, she did outreach to see if people wanted a
community garden here. If the community outreach process indicates there is some
interest, we'd probably do a little bit more to make sure there is enough. Otherwise, you
could start it and have them lie fallow, especially with a site like this where there's no
parking lot.

Commissioner Olson: Thank you for that. The one at the church is fabulous by the way.
The question about the water bottle filler, I would advocate for a water bottle filler so that
people use reusable bottles. Even when COVID is gone, I think a number of people are
still going to be creeped out by touching things. To have a hands-free way to get water is
going to be important for a long time. I would reinforce or advocate for an accessible
pathway. I'm glad you pushed forward on that.
Vice Chair Cribbs: I stopped by the park today, and it is just really a lovely little park. The things you found through the community outreach look like it'll make nice additions. I was really glad to see that. Daren, thanks for answering the question about parking because I didn't see any parking. I would worry about the community gardens because people would have to bring stuff in. I didn't see how that would work. If there is a need for a community garden, maybe we should pursue it. Peter, do you have an idea of how much a garden plot costs? Can you put a dollar figure on that?

Mr. Jensen: I haven't costed it. It's mostly the labor of removing the turf. It's not very much. You can probably start getting it going pretty well for $10,000-$15,000. It's not a big investment. Mostly it relies on the community to make the investment of time to care for it and maintain it and all that kind of stuff.

Vice Chair Cribbs: I suspect there's more work to be done to figure out whether people really want that. I like the fact that you have pointed out that there was not money for some things, but it might be a place where the community could participate in some fundraising. It's good to have that included. A great presentation; thank you very much. It is a lovely, lovely park. It just had a great feel to it.

Chair Greenfield: The walkway makes sense. It's probably required for ADA compliance, I would guess. I would support that as Jackie has mentioned. It's great to see the updated recycling receptacles as we would expect after the previous presentation. Those are great. On the community garden, I'm very supportive of the idea. I was very happy to see that in it. I was wondering if it would be a possibility for private partnership funding to assist with it. As it turns out, we don't have any funding, so yes, we would need something like that. Would there be City budget to supply hose bibs if the neighborhood community was interested in moving forward with that?

Mr. Jensen: Yes. The walkway is going to require some reconfiguration of the irrigation, and we have money set aside for that. In this area, if that valve gets abandoned, it's fairly close to the same price to adding some hose bibs there to provide water.

Chair Greenfield: Maybe I should have started off with my next question. While I'm very heartened to see the idea of a community garden, I'm concerned about the location and the proximity to trees and shade. Gardens like sun, and it does seem to be a pretty shady corner that's only going to increase with time. I was wondering if the opposite corner would be a potential location, if there are issues with running water or trying to maintain contiguous field space, although it's cut off by those big trees anyway.

Mr. Jensen: We can bring that up in the meeting Thursday to see if there are other locations. This location was more optimal because we are dividing and creating a tiny turf space that's not usable for anything. The trees are fairly upright; they don't have very large canopies. The canopy is off the ground a good amount. They will produce some
shade for the garden, but their impact would be fairly minimal. You're still going to get full sun on the garden.

Chair Greenfield: Number 5 will be a new red oak?

Mr. Jensen: Exactly.

Chair Greenfield: That's going to be covering that part of the area eventually. It's just something to consider depending on how big they're looking to grow. It sounds like construction would take place towards the end of this year. I'm not in favor of losing funding allocated for a park improvement. I'm concerned about the construction taking place if shelter in place and social distancing guidelines are still going on. We're going to have this shiny new park, playground and picnic area that people aren't allowed to use. In conjunction with sensitivity, does it make sense to spend the money on this right now? Is there some sort of a short-term swap that would make sense?

Mr. Jensen: I'm not sure about the short-term swap. We should be sensitive to whatever is happening at the time that this comes to bidding and doing the construction. I agree that because of the size of the project and the speed that they can be built, it could behoove us to wait a few months or 9 months. That's something we should consider. I don't know what that is until we get to that point. That is something staff will discuss. The playground design will come back to the Commission for final review. Hopefully, in a couple of months from now we'll have a bit more clarity, and we can talk about that more. As long as we continue to move the money out, then the money stays there. The longer it goes on, the money is less valuable than it is right now. Those are all factors that should be determined. We should keep an open dialog about the building of it.

Chair Greenfield: I appreciate that. I am all in favor of moving forward with the project. I just think we need to consider the timing. Does anyone else have any follow ups?

Commissioner Reckdahl: Peter, you talked about if you had two drinking fountains and also the bottle filler, they'd be really expensive. If we went to one drinking fountain and a bottle filler, is that more reasonable?

Mr. Jensen: I would love if we could do that. A lot of times the manufacturers try to specify that. Unfortunately, in California if we have one drinking fountain, we have to have two. We have to have both heights. That's where the expense comes from. They have to put another arm on their drinking fountain. It's for the bottle filler. It's not in the top; it's on one of the side arms. It's more costly to build.

Commissioner Reckdahl: Nothing's easy. The shade structure, I love that. As a red head growing up, I wish I'd had that over my swings. The sand is another thing. As a kid, I
spent a lot of time making huge sandcastles, but that's a neighborhood call. If they want the sand, then …

Mr. Jensen: We'll flesh that out on Thursday night. We'll see how people feel. There's room there to put a sand play area separate from the playground. If that is a need, we can add that.

Commissioner Reckdahl: If you have sand, you need some water. Would it be possible to put a dog spout on the drinking fountain so the kids can fill up the water and run it across?

Mr. Jensen: That's another drinking fountain thing. The drinking fountain company does not make a two-drinking-fountain, one-bottle-filler, and a dog bowl. You can have two drinking fountains and a dog bowl or a bottle filler and a dog bowl, but you can't have all four.

Commissioner Reckdahl: How about if you had just three, two drinking fountains and a doggie? Is that possible?

Mr. Jensen: You can have that, yes.

Commissioner Reckdahl: About the demand, in College Terrace the lots are so small that most people don't have room for a garden. If we put a community garden here, we'd get a lot of action just because they can't plant it in their backyard.

Mr. Jensen: I was surprised on the prioritization that it ranked as high as it did.

Chair Greenfield: That's partly why I'm thinking big about the opposite corner.

Commissioner Reckdahl: I agree with that.

Chair Greenfield: Thank you very much, Peter. Now, we're ready to move onto the next item, which is Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates.

5. Other Ad Hoc Committee and Liaison Updates

Chair Greenfield: Do any Commissioners have any ad hoc updates to offer that weren't included in the packet or would like to further comment on anything?

Commissioner LaMere: The Foothills Park ad hoc had a call with Daren and Kristen yesterday and will meet again next week to discuss different options and path forward in light of what happened with the pilot proposal at the City Council meeting. We also are (inaudible) one more person.
Chair Greenfield: That's coming up next on my list. If Park and Recs were to act to support an updated recommendation on Foothills Park access program to City Council, it seems like this would further delay when this item could be agendized by City Council due to the needs for an updated CSD staff report and departmental review. Is that accurate?

Mr. Anderson: Thank you for that question, Chair. Yes, it's slightly dependent on the nature of the recommendation and whether more thoughtful staff research needs to go into it to determine viability, cost, budget implications, things like that. It might depend a little bit on that, on how long it takes. Of course, a new staff report does go through a review process that takes a little bit of time. It's difficult for me to say how long that process would be, but we would do our best to expedite it.

Chair Greenfield: This is hypothetical, of course, but it's good to understand that, particularly with sensitivities within the community wanting to have City Council take up this subject at some point. Next, I want to talk about assignments on the ad hocs just to follow up from our previous meeting. I wanted to confirm that Jeff LaMere has agreed to serve as the golf liaison for the Commission. Thank you for doing so. As Ryan McCauley has left the Commission, there are roles vacated and available for assignment on ad hocs and as the community garden liaison. We currently have two members of the Commission sitting on the three ad hocs that Ryan was on. We can leave these as two-member ad hocs or we can add a third person if people are interested. These include the Baylands 10.5 acres ad hoc, which currently includes Commissioners LaMere and Reckdahl; the Foothills Park ad hoc, which is Commissioners LaMere and Olson; and the park improvements ad hoc, which is Commissioners Cribbs and Moss. There's also the liaison role for community gardens. I'd like to know if anyone is interested in joining any of these ad hocs or taking on the community gardens liaison role.

Vice Chair Cribbs: I would like to join the Foothill Park ad hoc committee.

Chair Greenfield: Thank you. Why don't we let all the Commissioners comment on what they would be interested in, and then we can work as a body to make decisions on that? Anyone else?

Commissioner Moss: I had mentioned that I'd do Foothills access too, but I'd rather have Anne do it.

Chair Greenfield: You'd defer to Anne on that. Are you interested in anything else, the Baylands 10.5 or community gardens and park improvements, which you're already on? Anybody else?

Commissioner Olson: I'm interested in the Baylands.
Chair Greenfield: Jeff, you're already on two of these. Park improvements would be the only one for you. Anne, we don't need to add someone else to that necessarily.

Vice Chair Cribbs: To which, the park improvements?

Chair Greenfield: The park improvements, which is currently you and David.

Vice Chair Cribbs: We're okay with that, unless anybody wants to join us, of course.

Chair Greenfield: Anybody up for taking on community gardens? Jackie?

Commissioner Olson: Sure.

Chair Greenfield: Thank you. What I'm hearing is that Jackie would be interested in joining the Baylands 10.5 acres ad hoc and willing to take on the community gardens liaison role. Vice Chair Cribbs would like to join the Foothills Park ad hoc. If no one has any further comments on this, we can make this happen. Since this is not an action on the agenda, we're not going to vote on this. We'll work to put this in place. That covers this agenda item. Next up is the agenda for our next meeting, which is coming up on July 28th.

Commissioner Moss: There are rumblings that the pickleball people would like maybe to create a 501(c)(3) for maintenance. I don't know if anybody's heard anything about it. I'm going to send it over to Adam.

Chair Greenfield: We can take this up on the appropriate ad hoc, the park and facility use policy, which works with the pickleball groups. Anything else before we move on?

VI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR JULY 28, 2020 MEETING

Chair Greenfield: It's important for the Commission to start focusing our efforts on some significant issues of the day. To that end, Vice Chair Cribbs and I will be meeting with staff later this week to talk about how Parks and Rec can help get involved with some of the issues going on with City programs and other things of that nature. Next month, we do have GSI Plan implementation on the calendar, continuing with our sustainability speaker series, which was very informative and useful this evening. The programs and fund development ad hocs are hoping to put something on the agenda regarding ideas for community funding of recreation programs. Did I get that right, Anne? Is there anything you'd like to add?

Vice Chair Cribbs: No. You did get that right about community funding. That's perfect. I don't know whether this is an agenda item for next time or not. I would like to suggest that we all reread the staff report that went to the City Council or maybe it was the City Council's report about equity and access and reviewing programs to see if we're really
complying. Daren provided the report to me. It was in a presentation. It's really, really good. At the end of our meeting last time, we talked a little bit about looking at all of our programs in terms of inclusion and access and fairness and was it right. Rather than us re-inventing the wheel, it would be good to read that staff report. Maybe, Daren, you could send it around to all the Commissioners. Is that appropriate?

Mr. Anderson: I'd be glad to. This is a Council staff report.

Vice Chair Cribbs: Yeah, it's the Council staff report. Thank you. It's getting late. There's a particular part at the end about Community Services, to everybody in Community Services programs. It gives us the opportunity to look at things like scholarships for swimming lessons and middle school athletic programs and a number of other programs that we want to make sure people have the opportunity to be part of.

Chair Greenfield: Thank you. Our Vice Chair has been very busy on these endeavors. I appreciate it and am fully supportive. It's a great idea to forward to that. Daren, other thoughts on next month's agenda?

Mr. Anderson: I don't know if Peter is still with us. I wanted to double check with Peter if he had any presentation information he needed to run by the Commission on Ramos or any of our other projects. If not, I'll check with him shortly and get back to you on this one.

Mr. Jensen: I am here.

Mr. Anderson: Anything on your list for agenda items for July 28th?

Mr. Jensen: The only one that I'm hoping can make it would be Ramos Park. I'll probably know better in the next week. We should be able to.

Vice Chair Cribbs: Chair, we may or may not discuss Foothill Park depending upon what the ad hoc committee says next week and how other things develop. We don't have to decide tonight. We have some time about whether or not to put it on the agenda or wait until we see what other things are going to transpire.

Chair Greenfield: If the ad hoc has something to bring to the Commission, that could potentially be on the agenda next month. We're talking about potentially four items here. That's probably too much. We probably need to go down to three items so we can make sure we're out of here next month no later than this month, which is a little later than I'm aiming for. Anything else?
VII. COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Greenfield: Does anyone have anything else to add? Council Member Kou, thank you for sitting in with us. Is there anything you'd like to say? We appreciate your presence here.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned on motion by Vice Chair Cribbs and second by Commissioner Moss at 10:18 p.m. Passed 6-0